THE MOVING IMAGE IN THE THEATRE

CONTEMPORARY SCHOLARSHIP AND THE COMBINATION OF FILM AND THEATRE GRAMMARS IN THE THEATRICAL EVENT

PHD THESIS

NIKOLAUS JACEK MORRIS

THEATRE, FILM & TELEVISION

MAY, 2011

WORD COUNT: 75,625
(86,224 WITH APPENDIX)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS:

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS:

IFTR - International Federation for Theatre Research

TAPRA - Theatre and Performance Research Association

TIWG - Theatre and Intermediality Working Group

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DECLARATION

This thesis is a presentation of my original research work. Wherever contributions of others are involved, every effort is made to indicate this clearly, with due reference to the literature, and acknowledgement of collaborative discussions.

ABSTRACT

A host of value judgments are implicit in the rhetoric and methodology of contemporary scholarship relating to the use of the moving image in the live theatre. Human performance is often fetishized in these studies, whilst the moving image is admonished as a contaminant which brings into the theatrical event a host of cultural paraphernalia including a perceived ideology derived from its mediatized code. These problematic assumptions have sustained a self-limiting paradigm of 'intermediality' that offers a narrow vocabulary through which to notate contemporary mainstream theatre productions that use video projection, such as Katie Mitchell's *Waves* (2006) and the National Theatre of Scotland's *Black Watch* (2006). This thesis offers a radical departure from contemporary scholarship by unpicking the logic of the existing discourse to construct a new paradigm that embraces the creative grammars of mainstream theatre and moving image productions.

INTRODUCTION

1. THE MOVING IMAGE IN THE THEATRE

This thesis will engage with the theoretical negotiations required in order to respond effectively to the use of moving image technology in contemporary British and American theatre productions.[1] The performances in question incorporate the moving image through a number of technical media including film and video projection, television monitors, and computer displays. When it is delivered into the theatrical *mise-en-scène,* the moving image is removed from its normative situations of cinema, television, and interactive media; as such, the moving image is both an artefact placed in the theatrical medium, and a medium in itself. This complex situation has led to the description of these events as 'multimedia' or 'intermedial' performances; suggesting a combination (or contamination) of mediatized systems of representation and live ones.[2] As its potential applications in the theatre are numerous, it would be erroneous to state that the moving image is used for any one particular purpose; this is evident in any survey of the historical and contemporary instances in which it has been employed. These instances include the use of the moving image as scenery in the mid-twentieth century work of Thomas Wilfred (1889-1968) in the United States, and the more recent work of designer William Dudley on

---

[1] Claims of cultural specificity in relation to multimedia theatre are difficult to provide. However, one can find glimpses into the alternative deployments of the moving image in European theatre cultures; for example, the work of Czech scenographer Josef Svoboda, who frequently employed film projection in his scene designs, are sometimes regarded in the tradition of Eastern European marionette theatre (Brandensky, 2007). My interview with Dutch theatre director Teunkie van der Sluijs is also revealing in this respect. He states that in the Netherlands there is no institution comparable to the Bush or Royal Court theatres in England that further playwriting, as such there are few new writers; furthermore, new texts experiment more with form due to the lack of a playwriting tradition. He adds that coupling this context with an 'auteur director tradition you are more likely to see applications of new media or digital technology in theatre' (2010). I do not explore this cross-cultural divide in this thesis, but offer it as a potential further route of research. I include a transcript of my discussion with Teunkie in the Appendix.

[2] Greg Giesekam has defined these terms: 'In work that is primarily multimedial, film or video often contributes to scenography or mise-en-scène in relatively straightforward ways – even if the technology involved is very complex' (2007, p. 10). He argues that in 'intermedial work scenography, *mise-en-scène* and dramaturgy are less easily disentangled, as the use of recorded media and live relay multiplies the scope of possible incidents, source materials, interactions, intertexts and issues, and the ways of presenting and perceiving them' (p. 10). Rajevsky offers a history of the discourse of intermediality that demonstrates its origins in German scholarship and in the work of Fluxus artist Dick Higgins (2005).

productions of *The Coast of Utopia* (2002, Olivier Theatre, London) and *Hitchcock Blonde* (2003, Royal Court, London). Also prevalent is the use of the moving image to create cinematic interludes in plays or cabaret-style performances; this has been recently found in the work of English theatre company Forkbeard Fantasy who incorporated film segments in their 'cataclysmic cabaret' *Invisible Bonfires* (2007). One often finds the moving image used to contribute dynamic lighting and images for sensory effect in productions such as Complicite's *A Disappearing Number* (2007, Theatre Royal, Plymouth). In productions such as *Time and the Conways* (2009, Lyttelton Theatre, London), the moving image has also been used to project digital actors into a performance, allowing sequences where performers interact with their digital doubles. It is also important to note that moving image media might only be used in brief moments in a production, such as the crashing waves that revealed the stage performers in the opening of Edward Bond's *The Sea* (2008, Theatre Royal Haymarket, London). The projected image might also saturate productions; examples of this include the well-documented work of companies *The Wooster Group* and *The Builders Association*, and in recent productions directed by Katie Mitchell, including *Waves* (2006, Cottesloe Theatre, London), *Attempts on Her Life* (2007, Lyttelton Theatre, London) and *...Some Trace of Her* (2008, Lyttelton Theatre, London).

Mitchell's productions at the Royal National Theatre demonstrate how the moving image has become an increasingly familiar sight in mainstream UK theatres. Video projections have been used in a number of productions of new plays at the National Theatre including Patrick Marber's *Closer* (1997, Cottesloe Theatre, London), David Hare's *The Power of Yes* (2009, *Lyttelton Theatre,* London), and Matt Charman's *The Observer* (2009, Cottesloe Theatre, London). The moving image has also been used in a number of revivals at the National Theatre, including recent productions of Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well* (2009, Olivier Theatre, London) and Brecht's *Mother Courage and her Children* (2009, Olivier Theatre, London). One now finds video projection used in West End productions such as *Alex: Live on stage* (2007, The Arts Theatre, London) and Andrew Lloyd Webber's musical *The Woman in White* (2004, Palace Theatre, London); the National Theatre's *War Horse* (2007, London) - which incorporates the

moving image - has also recently moved into the New London Theatre and will open at New York's Lincoln Center Theater in March 2011. The moving image has also been used frequently in larger-scale commercial productions such as Three Sixty Entertainment's *Peter Pan* (2009, Kensington Gardens, London) and *Ben Hur Live* (2009, O2 Arena, London). These individual examples only demonstrate a fraction of uses in mainstream theatres, and potential applications of the moving image and its technologies in the theatre. Despite this challenging variety, a canonical narrative of the use of moving image media in live performance has emerged that, whilst incomplete, demonstrates that it is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, Greg Giesekam asserts that the moving image should not be viewed as a new technology in the theatre, arguing that its use 'extends back a century, to very soon after the invention of cinema' (2007, p. 2). Despite this, the context of mediatization, against which contemporary practice takes place, makes urgent the task of analyzing the implications of deploying a media-derived artefact in the live theatre.

HISTORY

The earliest documented uses of the moving image artefact in performance are found in the late nineteenth century and precede its development into cinema and television. Waltz (2006) describes late nineteenth-century uses of the moving image for creating dynamic scenery in theatre productions, locating the earliest example in the United States in 1898 where producer Lincoln J. Carter (1865-1926) utilised film to create spectacular effects in his Civil-War play *Chattanooga* (Chicago, 1899).[3] Waltz and Giesekam (2007) also explore the short films created by French filmmaker Georges Méliès (1861-1938) for incorporation into music hall performances at the Folies Bergère nightclub in Paris as early as 1904.[4] Ever since these early

---

[3] Waltz describes how 'Carter sent characters onboard a locomotive plummeting into the depth of an upstage setting. Remarkably, the backdrop accommodated this audacious *coup de théâtre*, for the perspective melted forward in motion as the train, center stage, appeared to retreat down its track.' (2006, p. 547). The effect is also described in Pratt (1975).

[4] Giesekam claims that the earliest of Méliès' films 'specifically created for use in theatrical production' was a ten-minute film commissioned by the Folies Bergère in 1904 for one if its revues. He describes the film, which featured the cast of the live revue, revealing that it follows a satirical character, based on Leopold II of Beligium, driving a fast car to Monte Carlo and causing mayhem, accidentally flattening a

3

examples, the moving image has been incorporated into a plethora of European and North American productions throughout the twentieth century; while it is difficult to demarcate specific periods or locate exemplary productions, the work of notable practitioners has become canonical in historical narratives.

Michael Kirby has focussed on the 1920s work of German architect Walter Gropius (1883-1969), who formed part of the Bauhaus school, that he argues employed science and technology for artistic ends (1966, p. 50).[5] He outlines the 'Total Theatre' vision towards which Gropius strove, and describes theatrical productions that bombarded the viewer with sensory cues and information through the use of moving images:

> [...] presenting film, light, and performance images to the observer from various angles and distances, the Bauhuas artists hoped to create a more complex and - as underlined by their writing – more profound theatrical experience.' (1966, p. 50)[6]

This aesthetic has been traced to the more widely notated work of German director Erwin Piscator (1893-1966), with whom Gropius collaborated, and who utilised film projection in politicized performances and revues that include notable productions of Ernst Toller's *Hoppla!*

policeman on the way, who is later re-inflated with a bicycle pump. Giesekam reveals that the film was later released into cinemas as *Le Raid Paris-Monte Carlo en Deux Heures*. He argues that despite the potential continuity between the performers in the film and on the stage it is most probably that it 'operated as an independent episode' (2007, p. 28). Giesekam may be correct in this particular instance, but intriguing research by Waltz has suggested that Méliès' music hall films were 'antic-filled motion-picture prelude[s] to a stage entrance, "revealing" to an audience the comic reasons for a performer's delay'; she argues that this use of pre-recorded film in the music hall has since been employed in television shows and is a common device on late-night talk shows such as Late Show with David Letterman (1993-present) and Late Night with Coman O'Brien (1993-2009) (Waltz, 2006, p. 551). This argument is particularly interesting in light of Philip Auslander's narrative on the remediation of theatre's devices in the television throughout the twentieth century (Auslander, 2008).

[5] Giesekam describes the Bauhaus movement's 'synthesising approach to the arts and an accommodation between the arts and technology' (2007, p. 256). Bert Cardullo has described the circumstances by which the moving image became part of the Bauhaus group's theatre work: 'The attempts of the Bauhaus group to create a non-representational, manifestly manufactured "total theatre" themselves involved the incorporation of film into the ultimate theatrical experience, as did the production experiments of Marinetti's "Futurist Variety Theater" in Italy.' (2006, p. 308) Cardullo has also argued that the 'total theatre' of the Bauhaus group was incited by a perceived challenge from the cinema. He argues that early twentieth-century avant-garde theatre tried to imitate and incorporate the 'visionary capability' of film form (2001, p. 3). He demonstrates that the 'dreamlike fluidity' of the moving image led to a challenging of theatre's subordination material space through experimental works in France, and the expressive use of lighting in German expressionist theatre to emulate the camera's subjectivity (2001, p. 3). See also, (Cole, 1963).

[6] Giesekam describes Gropius' 1927 produced designs for the 'Total Theatre'; he states that the designs were 'intended to incorporate multiple, mobile stages and the technology necessary to surround the audience with film projection' (2007, p. 256).

We're Alive (1927) and Bertolt Brecht's *Schweik in the Second World War* (1928).[7] Piscator's own monograph *The Political Theatre* (1929) demonstrates how film was utilised in numerous ways in his productions: including isolated moving image interludes, documentary evidence, dynamic scenery, scene titles, and to provide commentary and meaning as a companion to stage events (Piscator, 1929).[8]

Czech scenographer Josef Svoboda (1920-2002) is also a major figure in the history of incorporating the moving image into the theatre. Svoboda used film, video and television technologies to create ambitious designs for nearly four hundred theatre and opera productions, and performance installations, across Europe (Burian, 1974, p. xix). Svoboda also founded the theatre company *Laterna Magika* in Prague which continues to stage the multimedia productions he devised, including the celebrated *Wonderful Circus* (1977) and *Graffiti* (2002). Inspired by the expressive spaces envisioned by early-twentieth century scenographic artists Edward Gordon Craig (1872-1966) and Adolphe Appia (1862-1928), Svoboda praised the moving image as a dynamic artefact that could be incorporated into the theatrical *mise-en-scène* which, he argued, should itself become 'dynamic, capable of expressing changing relationships, feelings, moods [...] during the course of the action.' (Svoboda as cited in Burian, 1974, p. 27)[9] He embraced many moving image technologies, such as closed circuit television in Sarah Caldwell's *Intolleranza* (1965, Back Bay Theatre, Boston)*,* insisting that 'theatre technology is active and capable of dramatic action' (Svoboda, 1993, p. 27); his methods

---

[7] Giesekam has demonstrated that Piscator 'regularly mixed with members of the Bauhaus' and in particular Walter Gropius who designed his private apartment (2007, p. 256).

[8] Giesekam has demonstrated through Piscator's work in the 1920s that 'the introduction of documentary material' through the moving image 'may illustrate the historical context of fictional action, or the montage of contrasting material may dialectically evoke a quasi-choric commentary on the onstage action' (2007, p. 11). Piscator's multimedia work is contextualised within the history of stage directors in Edward Braun's *The Director and the Stage* (1996); he includes descriptions of the moving image in individual productions such as *In Spite of Everthing* and Alfons Paquet's *Flags* (Volksbughne Theatre am Bulowplatz). Striking in his descriptions are the scale of the productions. The Volksbuhne is described as seating 1800; Braun describes how 'slides were projected onto screens flanking the stage, showing posters, newspaper extracts, manifestos, and sometimes a title for the next scene in the manner of the silent cinema' (1996, pp. 148-149).

[9] Giesekam indicates that Svoboda was 'Strongly influenced by Edward Gordon Craig and Adolphe Appia', and as such 'desired to create theatrical spaces which were readily transformable and had a dynamic rhythm to them rather than a concern for naturalistic detail' (2007, p. 52).

put the image in situations outside its normative encounters in cinematic and televisual media by using unconventional delivery methods such as projecting onto a 'mobile cluster of lines, on fragmentary surfaces, or on sticks or rods' (1993, p. 27). Despite the expressive uses of the moving image in Svoboda's work, the predominant narrative of multimedia theatre from the 1960s onwards has not explored this, focussing instead on the ontological conundrum of incorporating a media artefact such as the moving image into a live performance.

Michael Kirby's article 'The uses of film in the new theatre' (1966) and Gene Youngblood's monograph *Expanded Cinema* (1977) have commented on the use of the moving image in the live 'happenings' created by artists such as Robert Whitman in New York who used projected film within performance-art installations.[10] These experimental works led to a wave of performance-art that incorporated video images following the development of the Sony Portapak video camcorder in 1967, which democratised the moving image-making process (London, 1985); (Dixon, 2007, p. 87); (Giesekam, 2007, p. 72). Video-recorded images became widely used in the postmodern collage-like productions produced by theatre companies such as *The Wooster Group* and *The Builders Association* in the United States, and *Forced Entertainment* in the United Kingdom. Extensive research has been made into the way these companies have used the moving image to bring alternative texts into the theatrical event, and in order to create reciprocal commentaries on media culture (Savron, 1986); (Etchells, 1999); (Helmer, 2004); (Lehmann, 2006); (Dixon, 2007); (Giesekam, 2007); (Zarrilli, 2008); (Bailes, 2009); (Klich, 2010); (Lavender, 2010).[11] The democratisation of video continued with the development of low cost acquisition formats such as VHS (1976) and the proliferation of home camcorders in the 1990s; the cost and quality of moving image acquisition, post-production, and delivery became even more accessible and sophisticated through the development of digital video formats in the 2000s. Giesekam adds that since the 1980s the use of film and video in

---

[10] See also, Michael Kirby's monograph *Happenings* (Kirby, 1966)

[11] Despite the plethora of examples available in mainstream theatres, the work of these companies have informed a large degree of scholarly material concerning the use of the moving image in the theatre. Greg Giesekam's *Staging the Screen* (2007) places an emphasis on their work at the expense of a number of other possible trajectories.

'mainstream theatres' has proliferated and is no longer mainly the preserve of individual 'companies and performance artists' (2007, p. 2). The 'video designer' has now become frequently credited in theatre productions; the British company 59 Productions has, over the last decade, produced a range of video designs for live theatre and opera performances including Katie Mitchell's *Waves,* and the National Theatre of Scotland's *Black Watch* (Edinburgh Drill Hall, 2006), and have since become an associate company of the Royal National Theatre in London.

This rich history demonstrates that despite anxieties of contamination found in the popular press - including the description of video in theatre as a 'giddy old maiden aunt got up in footless tights and a mini skirt who think [sic] she is being awfully daring' (Gardner, 2006) - proficiency in the moving image has become professionalised in the mainstream theatre.[12] Handbooks and overviews of a theatre technician's craft contain detailed instructions for incorporating film and video projection in a theatre production for a variety of purposes (McCandles, 1939); (Wilfred, 1965); (Bellman, 1977); (Cadena, 2002); (Carver, 2009). In 2009 the Yale School of Drama in the United States announced that a new concentration in 'Projection Design' would be taught from Autumn 2010; a press release from the department describes it as 'the first such course of graduate theatre training in the United States' (Yale School of Drama Press Release, n.d). In stating the rationale behind the course, faculty member Wendall Harrington describes the projected image as 'a powerful tool', and states that this new concentration will allow 'designers at the forefront of this medium' to 'have the opportunity and responsibility to encourage its eloquent use.' As the moving image has become established as

---

[12] Theatre critics have responded variously to contemporary uses of the moving image in the theatre. Lyn Gardner has praised many multimedia endeavours, including the National Theatre of Scotland's *Black Watch* (Edinburgh Drill Hall, 2006) and Katie Mitchell's *Waves* (2006), yet has expressed caution that 'too often video in the theatre is a mere distraction' (2006). In a more recent article, Gardner has argued that 'Increasingly, the technology has become the show, rather than in service of the show. Back in the 80s I remember once joking with a colleague that the growth of computer technologies would eventually led to a situation where actors become redundant and we would simply go to the theatre to watch the set. (2008). Critic Michael Billington has expressed an anxiety amongst theatre technicians 'about the impact of video projection on lighting' (2009). He asks whether there is a ' danger that video will usurp the role of the lighting expert, whose job it is to paint pictures?' Despite these anxieties, one regularly finds that critics accept video design as common practice.

common practice in the mainstream theatre, it is essential that scholarly enquiries are able to notate its activity. Despite this, contemporary responses to the moving image artefact in combination with live performance have taken a number of divergent trajectories that complicate this task.

2. SURVEY OF CURRENT SCHOLARSHIP

As the moving image is an artefact related to a variety of media, current scholarship on its deployment within a live performance encompasses various disciplines including performance studies, theatre studies, film studies, digital arts and cultural theory. As responses to the use of this technology in the theatre can be found in many disciplinary homes, it becomes difficult to locate focussed arguments concerning the moving image; descriptions of the use of film and screen media in theatre are often embedded within works that focus on media technologies in general which places the moving image within a wider digital aesthetic and in a variety of live situations including virtual performances spaces. For example, Matthew Causey's monograph *Theatre and Performance in Digital Culture* (2006) observes these technologies in relation to a mediatized culture where he assumes that the 'material body and its subjectivity are extended, challenged and reconfigured through technology' (p. 16). As a result, his study regards projected video in the work of companies such as The Wooster Group, whom he argues 'confronts the ideological effects and cultural politics of mediatization by burying technology deep and immovably into the performance moment' (2006, p. 46).[13] This focus on the ideology of combining the moving image with live performance is a common concern in contemporary scholarship on this subject; however, these responses are limited in their application to the variety of mainstream examples I have identified. My focus will be on the moving image only, yet it is vital to understand the various scholarly currents that touch upon this practice, and how

---

[13] Causey proceeds to examine 'posthuman' and 'postorganic' performance in virtual theatres, thus further distancing the mainstream theatre in his study. (2006, p. 47)

their comments on the moving image in the theatre are contextualised within wider arguments on digital culture.

The moving image is only one of a plethora of technologies that have been incorporated into the theatre; as such, it is often contextualised within wider narratives of theatre's relationship with technologies such as lighting, stage machinery, and new fabrics, dyes and craft methods. Christopher Baugh's monograph *Theatre, Performance and Technology* (2005) provides an historical demonstration of how 'technology, machinery and special effects have always been a part of the experience of theatre and performance' (2005, p. 1). His study is an all-embracing overview of theatre technology, and does not specifically engage with the moving image; however, he does argue that recent video and digital imaging technologies have allowed the moving image to be 'projected onto stage surfaces with considerably more control and accuracy' than previous practices that used film or slides (2005, p. 215). His observation leads him to suggest that these new ways of presenting the moving image in the theatre have contributed 'metaphors of transience, instability, multiple framing and interactivity to a postdramatic world of performance' (2005, p. 215).[14] The accessibility of digital tools is woven into Baugh's underlying thesis on the ideological implications of using technologies in the theatre. Baugh argues that technological artefacts may 'serve as symbols of power and authority' when incorporated onstage (2005, p. 1). To demonstrate this, he traces a trajectory from the mechanical and literal elevation of god-characters in the Greek theatre - the *deus ex machina* - to the 'power of control' offered through computing technology from the 1990s which, he argues, has extended control 'into the rehearsal space and the studio' (2005, p. 213). These arguments

---

[14] The term 'postdramatic' derives from Lehmann's influential study that distinguishes 'theatre' (as a mode of performance) and 'drama' (the Aristotelian concept) to identify productions and practices in the twentieth century - works such as *Attempts on Her Life* (Martin Crimp, 1997) and *4.48 Psychosis* (Sarah Kane, 2000) - that cannot be effectively tested against a 'dramatic' paradigm. (Lehmann, 2007)

touch on the notion of 'techne', later articulated by Lavender (2006), which are essential to understanding the problem of theorising on the moving image in the theatre.

Lavender defines the 'techne' as the '*application* of craft skill for particular purposes' (2006, p. 551). He argues that 'theatre is defined by technes in ways that reach beyond the straightforward effects of the technologies in play', arguing that they 'make for an alteration to the modes of representation – how we show things and how we see things' in the theatre (2006, p. 551). This is a crucial statement in relation to the moving image in the theatrical event. The moving image differs from technical processes of sound amplification, costume-making, and scenery construction because of its association with the serially reproducible forms of cinema, television, and interactive entertainment; media through which it is normally experienced. As such, the moving image is often regarded outside its normative situation when it is incorporated into the theatre, and is therefore often described using a rhetoric of contamination.[15] Prior to Baugh and Lavender's arguments, Pavis engaged with this conflict in *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture* (1992), where he describes the difficulty of describing 'mechanisms of interference and contamination among various media and between theatre and media' (p. 113). This rhetoric implies a notion of theatre's purity as a live form; yet Pavis contradicts his statement by arguing that cross-media exchange between the theatre and the moving image's normative media must be taken into account, as developments in 'one medium can affect others, by making available new technical possibilities which can also modify other media' (1992, p. 113). While it is obvious to consider the mass media's influence on the theatre, Pavis' argument is significant in its assertion that theatre 'cannot be protected' and 'cannot escape the socioeconomic-technological domination which determines its aesthetic dimension' (1992, p. 134). Pavis' work demonstrates an anxiety of mediatization concerning the theatre's incorporation of technologies such as the moving image; despite this, his conclusion is to resist 'artistic protectionism', and instead

---

[15] Giesekam opens his monograph *Staging the Screen* (2007) quoting an article by Guardian critic Mark Lawson who states that productions are 'apologising for not being films' (Lawson, Guardian, 5 April, 2003); (Giesekam, 2007, p. 1). Giesekam argues that 'The reaction against employing film or video in theatre has been partly shaped by this long-running tension and oscillation between a stripped down theatre and one that enjoys the visually spectacular' (p. 5).

promote cross-media experimentation (1992, p. 134). Pavis' rhetoric provides a conundrum: the anxiety of contamination he describes is contradicted by his insistence that the theatre is always a reflection of its mediatized context; as such, it is difficult to conceive of the implied purity of the theatre. Despite this, contemporary scholarship often draws ontological lines that distinguish the mechanically produced moving image artefact from the live theatre.

The current discourse on theatre's relationship with mediatized forms has since been dominated by the opposing arguments provided by Peggy Phelan and Philip Auslander. Phelan's *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (1993) maintains a binary ontology separating live performance from mediatized forms. The 'unmarked' of the title refers to performance, placing it outside the mass media through a linguistic argument that sees the 'marked' medium of written language unable to reproduce the 'unmarked' performativity of the spoken word (Phelan, 1993). As such, Phelan indicates that recording media are incapable of reproducing the unmarked elements of human action. Phelan's problematic, yet influential, conclusion is that the theatre, and live performance in general, are privileged by an ontological separation from the mass media.[16] Philip Auslander's influential monograph *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (1999; 2008) has been celebrated for its deconstruction of Phelan's perceived binary.[17] In *Liveness,* Auslander re-positions the theatre as a participant within a cultural economy dominated by mediatized representations, arguing that its own system has become remediated by cinema, television, and computing (Auslander, 2008). Auslander's narrative is one of

---

[16] Phelan's influence is felt across the discourse of performance and technology. Causey's recent study draws on Phelan's ontological arguments (2006, p. 3); he argues that although her book is not concerned with digital culture, 'it does set up an important discussion regarding the ontology of performance' (p. 5). He remarks how Phelan 'disregards any effect of technology on performance and draws a non-negotiable, essentialist border between the two media' (p. 6). Dixon's *Digital Performance* (2007) includes a outline of Phelan's 'assertion of live performance's unique ontology and its resistance to media reproductions'.

[17] Causey offers Auslander's thesis as a counter-argument to Phelan's (2006, p. 5). While considering both as essential texts, he considers Auslander's 'the most important', arguing that it 'is a touchstone in thinking through the nature of performance in mediatized culture' (p. 6). Dixon devotes a section of his monograph to the opposing arguments of Phelan and Auslander under the heading 'Phelan Versus Auslander', where he argues that their 'theories clash violently' (2007, p. 122). He demonstrates how Auslander 'takes Phelan to task' but states that 'despite the rigor and intensity of Auslander's argument, which is built carefully and relentlessly brick by brick, there is frequent hesitation and uncertainty in his voice' (p. 123). One might argue that Auslander does not comprehensively rebut Phelan's thesis, and as such they both stand as influential scholars on opposing sides of an argument concerning theatre's relationship with media technologies.

colonization[18], whereby aspects of live performance have been reproduced and altered by media technologies; his study is of particular interest to my engagement with the moving image in the theatre, as he extends the implications of his model of cultural dominance into the theatrical event itself. Auslander's rhetoric sees the moving image as a negative attribute in the theatre that aggressively occupies a territory previously defined not by its ontology, but its 'epistemology'.[19]

When Auslander engages with contemporary uses of the moving image in performance, he emphasises the normative experience of this technology in the cinema, television, and on the internet (Auslander, 2005); (Auslander, 2008). He presents a contentious argument that media technologies brought into a theatrical event result in the reading of that performance through the normative frame of the dominant technology; he distils this into the crude formula 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual' (2005, p. 1); (2008, p. 42). While this formula is an overly simplistic conclusion, Auslander offers more detailed explanations that place this in a context where he argues that mediatized 'epistemology' has become embedded in live performance; he therefore argues that the moving image in the theatre must be regarded in relation to this. Moreover, Auslander's model of dominance in the theatrical event leads him to criticise assumptions that 'live and filmed representations can be combined as complementary and equally compelling languages', arguing that in these mixed-media instances the 'eye would inevitably be drawn to

---

[18] Auslander states that an 'ideologically engrained sense of television as a live medium makes its historical relationship to the theatre different from that of film, and enabled television to colonize liveness, the one aspect of theatrical presentation that film could not replicate' (Auslander, 2008, p. 13).

[19] The origin of this term from Auslander's monograph *Liveness* (2008) is worth quoting in full: 'More intimate live performances may not be mediatized in the same way or to the same effect. Inasmuch as mediatization is the cultural context in which live performances are now inevitably situated, however, its influence nevertheless pervades even these smaller-scale events. I have already discussed this relation to the documentation of performance art. But mediatization is not just a question of the employment of media technology; it is also a matter of what might be called "media epistemology."' (Auslander, 2008, p. 36). Auslander adds that what 'we are seeing in many cases is not so much the incursion of media-derived "technics" and techniques into the context of live performance but, rather, live performance's absorption of a media-derived epistemology' (p. 37). In doing so he also observes theatre productions whose staging and marketing is subordinated to mediatized forms, and which are often designed for recording for DVD and cable-television. Auslander states that he 'first became aware of the imbrication of theatre within the economy of repetition in the early 1980s when I noticed that a number of the Broadway productions I was seeing had been underwritten in part by cable television money with the understanding that taped versions of the productions would appear later on cable networks' (p. 30).

the screen' (2008, p. 40). While Auslander purports to deconstruct Phelan's binary ontology, his arguments seem to re-balance it, affording the dominant value to the mediatized artefact; as such, his conclusions suggest that the moving image is so compelling that it cannot co-habit with the human performer, arguing that the 'presence' and 'aura' of performance are de-valued in a mediatised culture (Auslander, 2005) (Auslander, 2008, p. 66). Auslander's scholarship offers a foundation through which to observe the moving image as a cultural artefact in the theatre; however, his rhetoric of contamination and dominance restrict the ways in which multimedia theatre can be analysed. I would argue that these charges make urgent the task of devising a new methodology that embraces the moving image, and its context as a cultural artefact, whilst demonstrating its co-habitation with the theatre. While Auslander's study hangs over the contemporary discourse through its assertion that the status of the moving image's normative frame encroaches into the theatrical event, previous studies have not faced these anxieties, and thus demonstrate attempts to celebrate the successful use of the moving image in performance.

MULTIMEDIA THEATRE PRACTICE

Aside from the reflective writings of practitioners such as Erwin Piscator's *The Political Theatre* (1929) and *The Dramatic Imagination* (1945) by American designer Robert Edmund Jones (1887-1954), scholarly attempts to reconcile the use of film technology in the theatre began in the second half of the twentieth century. Sontag's essay 'Film and Theatre' (1966) reflects on the use of the moving image in the mid-twentieth century by practitioners such as Piscator and Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956), and on its use in the 'happenings' of the 1950s. Sontag identifies two 'stereotyped' uses of the moving image: film as a '*document*, supportive or redundant to the live stage events' in political theatre, or as a '*hallucinant'* in the Happening, and 'mixed-media discotheque' (1966, p. 303). Sontag is critical of these applications, arguing that while the use of the moving image 'may be enlarging from the point of view of theatre [...] in terms of what film is capable of, it seems a reductive, monotonous use of film' (1966, p. 303). Judging the ontological potentiality of both media, Sontag arrives at the – perhaps obvious –

conclusions that the moving image artefact is limited in its development as it can 'only become bigger (multiple screens, 360° projection, etc.) or longer in duration or more internally articulated and complex' (1966, p. 304). On the other hand, Sontag argues that the theatre 'can be anything, everything'; concluding that 'films can only be more of what they specifically (that is to say, cinematically) are' (1966, p. 304). Sontag is ultimately unable to find a satisfying summation of the moving image's activity in the theatrical event, declaring that 'We need a new idea' (1966, p. 305). In the same year of publication, Michael Kirby's essay 'The uses of film in the new Theatre' (1966) focuses less on the specificity of theatre and film as media, and instead makes a clear distinction between the moving image as an artefact in the theatre and its normative experience in the cinema. He argues that the 'film experience is not necessarily a single rectangle of light and shadow that flickers at one end of a darkened room' (Kirby, 1966, p. 49). This is an important distinction which suggests that rather than a contaminant from another medium, the moving image can be regarded as an isolated visual element of the theatre; despite this, the contemporary notion of mediatization - as articulated by Auslander - complicates this idea.

While it may appear that a gap exists between Sontag and Kirby's endeavours and contemporary scholarship on the moving image in the theatre, writings on these practices in the 1970s and 1980s are found embedded within studies of ensemble groups, such as *The Wooster Group* and *Forced Entertainment*, who have a history of incorporating media technologies into their productions. I have found no direct scholarly engagement with the moving image until the recent studies of 'intermediality' in the theatre. However, the reflective work of practitioners does contain many insights into their own use of moving image technology.[20] Svoboda asserts

---

[20] In 2010 I conducted an interview with Dutch theatre director Teunkie van der Sluijs, who described his recent work experiments with video design at the Young Vic theatre in London. He stated that the image can be used to 'reveal' information, but in a way that subverts stage activity. He argues that this is to do with the literal brightness of the image, and not the cultural status of the image. He states that 'If there's an actor onstage and a video screen behind them or above them: that's where the audience attention goes. Even if you make it smaller it will always be as bright, or brighter than an actor will ever be.' As such, he argues that 'when you see narrative developed by actors onstage, but an image is flashed up, that undermines the story that's been developing on the floor because it gives a new set of information'. He states that the video projection offers the same effect as 'having a character appear upstage when another

that the moving image, and any technological artefact, must be placed in service to the collaborative goals of the theatre company (Svoboda, 1993). He takes the point of view of the scenographer, but contextualises technology in the theatre within broader themes of ensemble collaboration and spatial awareness:

> It's necessary for the entire theatrical team to have a collective perception of space, movement, rhythm, and time during the work's preparation. Several important things take place during this period: the creative shaping of various spaces, and the development of certain relationships – between details and the whole, between objects and subjects, between the live, corporeal stage action and perhaps film or other technologies. (Svoboda, 1993, p. 14)

These reflections raise important questions about the creative motivation of using the moving image in the theatre. Sontag and Kirby's analysis cannot answer these questions, as they were writing in a context from which contemporary scholarship and practice is far removed, as recent developments in digital media have resulted in more complex engagements with the theatre and the moving image.[21] Surprisingly, there have been few attempts to theorise on the use of the moving image alone as seen in the – now dated – work of Sontag and Kirby. It seems as though the contemporary context of mediatization has complicated the reception of the moving image artefact to the extent that analysis of its use in the theatre has become less concerned with its expressive and narrative contribution to *mise-en-scène,* instead considering approaches that engage with the discourse of postmodern culture.

is downstage', describing it as 'another way of doing a reveal.' He adds that it is a 'very exciting reveal as a practitioner because you can do so many different things, even though you're limited to a 2D surface' (2010).

[21] Steve Dixon's ambitious monograph *Digital Performance* demonstrates how 'computer technologies played a dynamic and increasingly important role in live theater' in the 'last decade of the twentieth century' (2007, p. 1). Maria Chatzichristodoulou and Rachel Zerihan's introduction to their recent volume *Interface of Performance* (2009) asserts that technologies have 'become increasingly integrated into theatre and performance practice' (p. 1). In addition to the practical use of technologies, the aesthetic implications of digital culture have also led theorists to argue that the way spectator's consume the theatre and the moving image has altered profoundly in the last decade. Ric Allsop has argued that the relationship between 'bodies, texts and technologies' in contemporary culture 'brings the whole human and post-human sensorium into play in ways which would have been unachievable and unthinkable until recently' (2009, p. ix) Dixon has also negotiated the theatre in the context of discourses of 'posthumanism' (2007, pp. 147-156). In relation to the moving image, Laura Mulvey's monograph *Death 24x a Second* (2006) has demonstrated new ways of spectating the moving image where cinematic texts are now available through digital media that offer the viewer increasing control over their consumption and pleasure taken in the artefact. Philip Auslander has also written on the experience of moving image reproductions of performances through websites such as YouTube (2009).

Contemporary scholarship has negotiated the problem of the moving image's compelling normative systems by arguing that the theatre is a stage for technologies. Murphie's article 'Negotiating Presence' (2003) articulates this logic by regarding 'the performance of the new technologies *themselves* as events simply existing among other events' (2003, p. 353). Murphie affirms this model, arguing that 'it broadens the scope of what can be *considered* performance.' (2003, p. 353-354) An influential model explaining this logic is the theatre as a 'hypermedium' (Kattenbelt, 2007). Kattenbelt coins the term to describe what he argues to be the theatre's ability to present other media without mediating them. This argument is often employed by the Theatre and Intermediality Working Group (TIWG), for whom the 'hypermedum' has become a fundamental principle (see Chapter 1). While this term has come into use in recent years, one finds that it describes long-held assumptions regarding the performance of the moving image in the theatre; Giesekam has demonstrated how companies such as the Wooster Group 'stage the screen' in order to comment upon the culture, market and ideology of the moving image and its apparatus (Giesekam, 2007).[22] His monograph *Staging the Screen* (2007) resists anxieties of contamination to argue that it is a 'futile task to drive out invaders to theatrical space', adding that as 'media plays such an important role in our lives, it makes sense for practitioners to acknowledge this in their work.' (2007, p. 24) While he successfully challenges the negative rhetoric of contamination, Giesekam regards the multimedia theatre as a presentational stage (2007, p. 10). Therefore, he eschews a plethora of contemporary mainstream productions in favour of analysing 'intermedia' theatre; this leads Giesekam to maintain an argument that when the moving image is deployed in the theatrical event, it subjects itself to a critique of how its normative media of film and television operate (2007, p. 20). This is a problematic assertion that assumes spectators are more attentive when

---

[22] In Chapter 1, I demonstrate how this scholarly approach has built upon the influential scholarship of Johannes Birringer, whose monograph *Media & Performance: Along the Border* (1998) privileges the ontologically live theatre as a place in which to scrutinise the ideological codes of the moving image that have saturated mediatized culture in the latter half of the twentieth century.

viewing live performances and therefore more active and critical in their readings of live events, a curious model of spectatorship outlined in many recent studies such as Nibbelink and Merx's essay on 'intermediality' (2010; see Chapter 4).

It is striking that these assumptions about active spectatorship are found in scholarship that engages with a discourse of 'intermediality', and it is therefore relevant that Giesekam distinguishes - via an historical argument - between multimedia theatre and contemporary 'intermedial' practice (Giesekam, 2007). He argues that, whereas 'multimedia' describes a situation where 'video is one aspect of other apparatuses', 'Intermedia is more appropriate when neither action nor media would make any sense without the other' (2007, p. 8). Through this distinction, he argues that *mise-en-scène* and 'dramaturgy' are 'less easily entangled in intermedial work', describing contemporary work where technology is a performer whose presence compels the reading of tensions in relation to a wider cultural economy. This perceived amalgamation of the visual field with 'dramaturgy' describes postmodern 'collage' productions where 'recorded media and live relay multiplies the scope of possible incidents, source materials, interactions, intertexts and issues' (Giesekam, 2007, p. 10). Giesekam contextualises intermedial work within mainstream practice, but his analysis concentrates on practitioners who consciously 'stage the screen' in these ways. As such, his conclusions neglect the majority of theatre practice where the media artefact may not be privileged as an object for scrutiny, and where it may be more valid to describe the encroachment of media epistemology.

The classification of contemporary multimedia performances as 'intermedia' is not restricted to Giesekam's study. Steve Dixon also makes this distinction, arguing that a period of multimedia work between 1911-1959 covers the experimental work of Frederick Kiesler (1890-1965), Erwin Piscator, Robert Edmond Jones, Josef Svoboda and the "Happenings" of the 1950s (2007, p. 74-85); Dixon argues that attention has since turned to 'Intermedia

performance' (2007, p. 89).[23] Dixon's ambitious monograph *Digital Performance* (2007) provides a detailed overview of 'intermedia' practice that incorporates digital technologies, and contextualises this within an historical narrative of multimedia. Despite the value of this study, its focus is too varied to offer a stable model for reading the moving image in performance, as its remit considers a range of digital practices - including genetics and cyborg technologies in the work of performance artist STELARC - in a variety of live performance genres such as dance and installation art. The activity of the moving image in the theatre is thus obscured by its contextualization within an all-encompassing consideration of 'digital technologies'. For example, Broadhurst and Machon's edited volume *Performance & Technology* (2006) contains essays on a variety of technologies, such as motion tracking (Wechsler, 2006) and virtual reality in dance (Brown 2006). Broadhurst's monograph *Digital Practices* (2007) also focuses on performance in general, observing how digital and interactive technological artefacts have created new performance formats. These volumes contribute to wider discourses on the implications of human performers interacting with new digital tools, such as 'posthumanism' and the notion of the 'cyborg' (see Dixon, 2007, pp. 147-156), but do not provide useful explorations of the moving image medium and its pre-digital cinematic and televisual codes of participation. While these works might fit the remit of intermedia performance, I would argue that their conclusions are restrictive to specific participatory conditions in the theatrical event.

The restrictive lens provided by the theatrical performances described in the works listed above are best illustrated in the context of scholarship on the theatrical event itself. The Theatrical Event Working Group (TEWG), who form part of the International Federation for Theatre Research (IFTR), have presented a useful analysis of the conditions of theatrical performance in their volume *Theatrical Events: Borders, Dynamics, Frames* (2004). Hans Van Maanen's chapter 'How Contexts Frame Theatrical Events' demonstrates a number of participatory conditions that frame a theatre performance. These include the *communicative*

---

[23] Due to the almost simultaneous publication of Dixon's *Digital Performance* and Giesekam's *Staging the Screen*, it is unclear whether the multimedia/intermedia reflects a transmission from either scholar.

frame which describes 'systems of perception *shared* by the participants'; Van Maanen argues that this is 'closest to the event and actually constructed within the event' (p. 243). However, a number of frames are identified that inform the communication within the moment of the event itself; of immediate significance to my enquiry is the '*institutional frame*':

> On this level it is the theatre world as a whole, understood as a historically developed system of production, distribution and reception in a certain cultural entity, that frames all sorts of theatrical events. (Van Maanen, 2004, p. 245)

Van Maanen argues that 'organizational framing elements can deviate from or even clash with general institutional principles' (p. 245).[24] On the balance of this, I would argue that the intermedia events that have provided the focus for studies of the moving image in the theatre are limited to theatrical events where the institutional frames legislate participatory conditions that invite complex readings of the technologies presented within performance. These readings cannot be relied upon in wider institutional frames such as the mainstream theatre; as such, the rhetoric of 'theatre' found in the discourse of intermediality might be regarded as misleading; despite their legitimacy as theatrical events, the prescriptive conditions of 'intermediality' offer insights to a highly specific theatre culture. On the balance of this, I find efforts to foreground the 'theatre' in the discourse of intermediality to be questionable.

THEATRE AND INTERMEDIALITY WORKING GROUP

The IFTR founded the 'Theatre and Intermediality Working Group' (TIWG) in 1998; their remit is the study of theatre and performance in the 'context of other media' (Theatre Studies Utrecht University, n.d.). The group work from the assumption that the theatre is a unique hypermedium for the staging of 'intermedial performances', and this invites the study of 'medial spaces and intermedial relationships' experienced through the intersection of live performance with 'cinema, television and, in particular, digital technology' (Theatre Studies

---

[24] The 'organizational frame' is described as the 'physical aspects of a meeting within which the event will happen, particularly the aspects of place and time of the meeting and the ways in which these aspects are used in the particular event' (Van Maanen, 2004, p. 244).

Utrecht University, n.d.). Their methodology is often by case history and the notation and analysis of individual performances 'to assess the impact of, for example, digital technology on theatre practice or compare ideas about how current trends in theatrical or cinematic performances blur clear-cut boundaries between media' (Theatre Studies Utrecht University, n.d.).

Intermediality in theatre and performance (2006) is TIWG's first volume of essays. In their introduction to the volume, editors Chapple and Kattenbelt draw on the work of German scholar Jens Schröter to define four types of intermediality: the combination of media to create new forms; the use of representational modes in alternative media; the representation of one medium in another; and the definition of a medium's ontology in relation to another (2006, p. 13). These definitions broaden the scope of intermediality from 'staging the screen', and essays contained in the volume focus on a variety of multimedia formats that incorporate the moving image. These include Lavender's striking essay on the potential sensory effects of the moving image in performance, and Merx's analysis of the use of video to represent time and memory in Guy Cassiers' production *Proust 1: Swann's way* (Rotterdam, 2003)*.* These two essays are of particular interest to me, and I will engage with them in more detail in later chapters. As I will demonstrate in Chapters 2 & 4, Merx's essay is striking in its departure from TIWG's focus on productions that 'stage the screen'; furthermore, both Merx and Lavender's arguments ask questions of the expressive effects of the moving image in the theatre. Therefore, in Chapter 4 I will scrutinise them further to locate a contemporary insight to the visceral and emotive qualities of the moving image.

The second volume produced by the working group, *Mapping Intermediality in Performance* (2010), places more emphasis on a digital context for the theatre. Lavender describes this context and its implications for the theatre, arguing that 'mobility, speed and immediacy, interaction, task-specific communication and the apparent erosion of distance' are

part of a contemporary digital aesthetic (2010, p. 125). [25] The various 'instances' of intermediality described in the volume illustrate this, focussing on productions that incorporate interactive digital systems and that reflect the aesthetic Lavender defines. These include Berlin-based artist Christopher Kondek's *Dead Cat Bounce* (Theater am Halleschen Ufer, 2005) which gambled the audience's entrance fee on the New York Stock Exchange and projected share details live throughout the performance (Wiens, 2010). The moving image is therefore studied as part of interactive digital performances, such as *Aki Anne II* (Amsterdam, 2007), which presented a live performer simultaneously performing onstage and as an avatar in Second Life; where video projection was used to present the virtual world (Koski, 2010). The implications and anxieties of using the moving image in the theatre are explored by Sarah Bay-Cheng's essay 'Temporality', which sets out the perceived problems of analysing the combination of theatrical systems and media technologies in contemporary productions. She outlines how '*technical reproductions'*, such as the moving image, are seen as 'incompatible with theatrical space', suggesting that the 'conception of theatre is thus troubled by intermedial practices' (Cheng, 2010, p. 93). Evoking again a notion that mechanically produced media destabilize an assumed purity of the theatre, Cheng's essay provides one of the most recent provocations concerning media technology in the theatre. She states that 'a key concern is how actors and audience behave within new spatial and intermedial configurations' (2010, p. 96). This thesis will attempt to negotiate some of these anxieties, but while TIWG's remit encompasses all digital and media technologies, and a variety of performance genres, my focus is on the moving image as an artefact in the theatrical event that does not limit the 'institutional frame' to the participatory conditions of intermediality.

---

[25] The provocation at the Theatre and Performance Research Association (TaPRA) *Dealing with the Digital* symposium (London, 2010) concerned a digital aesthetic in the theatre.

Current scholarship has become increasingly concerned with the mediatized culture in which the theatre participates; this has led to the moving image artefact being regarded for its technology and normative experience (video, film, computer screen) or for its ontology (virtual, digital), rather than its content and synthesis with the theatre's visual field. As such, existing analyses are curiously self limiting as they obscure the moving image's contribution to the event by focussing on unseen elements of its incorporation including motion tracking (Weschler, 2006) (Goodman, 2007) (Broadhurst, 2007) (Dixon 2007), and internet communication (Dixon, 2007) (Wiens, 2010). Studies have also included technologies that fall outside the theatrical province, such as genetics (Dixon, 2007; Broadhurst 2007).[26] As the study of the moving image has become entangled within the discourse of intermediality and numerous technologies, I would argue that a gap has been left in our understanding of what the moving image artefact contributes to theatrical events outside the narrow remit of contemporary scholarship. Despite this, studies made earlier in the twentieth century are of limited use due to their documentation of events outside contemporary mediatized and digital culture.

Key historical productions have been incorporated into various studies that contextualise 'intermedia' performance within a wider narrative of multimedia practice; these include works by Josef Svoboda and Erwin Piscator (Sontag, 1966); (Burian, 1971); (Innes, 1972); (Braun 1982); (Baugh, 2005); (Dixon, 2007); (Giesekam, 2007). These historical studies do not provide adequate insights into contemporary experiences of the moving image; for example, Sontag's 1966 analysis of Brecht's use of the moving image is married to a particular context. Historical productions are problematic as sources for analysis of contemporary practice, yet the performances that form the archive for contemporary scholarship have been self-determining and have thus narrowed the 'institutional frame' required to take part in what

---

[26] The study of theatrical performance in virtual worlds (Giannachi, 2004; Fenemore, 2007; Broadhurst, 2010) is an interesting and valid concept but would be distraction for studies of the moving image as an artefact in the traditional theatre.

has become a scholarship-driven fringe theatre culture that focuses on technically sophisticated productions, or installations, that are devised in order to explore intermediality itself. The methodology of the recent studies compiled by the TIWG is thus problematic due to their broad definition of the theatre as 'all live performing arts, where performer and spectator share the same place at the same time' (Chapple and Kattenbelt, 2006, p. 20). The instances of intermediality contained in TIWG's volumes include, for example, the moving image as used by Video Jockey's in Rotterdam and Amsterdam nightclubs (Turco, 2010); and the work of CREW, whose work tests the 'progress and feasibility' of interactive interfaces designed by university research departments (Vanhoutte and Wynants 2010). The working group documents dance and performance art alongside theatre, and often *as* theatre; this methodology neglects the specific and sophisticated grammars of creating and reading performance in a theatrical paradigm. Furthermore, the more theatrical endeavours documented in these studies are selective, focussing on experimental European companies and performance artists, or practice-as-research productions. These include Berlin-based Rimini Protokoll's play *Mnemopark* (2005) which explored the 'strategies for both mediating and mediatising 'actual' people and places in an intermedial performance setting' (McKechnie, 2010, p.75). By focussing on work such as this that explicitly engages with intermediality, contemporary scholarship leaves untouched the plethora of multimedia work that is not predominantly aimed at scrutinising the technologies it employs.[27]

Under consideration in this thesis are performances that incorporate the moving image within the normative participatory conditions of the 'institutional frame' of the theatrical event as described by Van Maanen (2004). However, the mediatized context in which multimedia events such as these now occur require the acknowledgment of the moving image's own normative experiences; these have become increasingly complex in contemporary culture, and while the technologies that display the image in the theatre have become more sophisticated

---

[27]An exception is the work of Canadian practitioner Robert Lepage and his company Ex Machina, whose work in the theatre has been engaged with extensively in various studies (Dixon, 2007; Giesekam, 2007; Pluta 2010; Dudjerović , 2009; Dudjerović, 2010).

and affordable, studies into their potentiality and activity within the theatrical event lack a sophisticated analysis of the contribution of their normative grammars.[28] For example, Arnold Aronson accepts that when the moving image is used in the theatre, the 'self-contained world of the stage is suddenly perforated by a live image animated by light with different systems of reference' (2005, p. 93). He also asserts that spectators' continuously changing relationships with media in a digital age mean that a new technology cannot simply be placed on the stage as an element of performance, and that its cultural status must be taken into account (2005, p. 96). Despite this, Aronson's descriptions of the moving image's activity in the theatre are plagued with negative connotations that lead him to conclude that 'film and video, does not work' in the theatre (p. 86):

> Unless the intent is specifically to create a sense of dislocation and disjunction, or to draw upon the cultural signification of film and video in our media-saturated age, the placement of such technology and imagery on the stage is tantamount to carrying on a conversation in two languages. (p. 87)

Aronson's analysis, contextualised by his wider study into scenography, does not see a contamination of the moving image, but incompatibility; therefore he privileges its intermedial use, assuming that its staging in live theatre allows scrutiny of the mediatized culture it is perceived to represent. I would challenge Aronson's assertion that the languages of stage and screen are incompatible,[29] and would argue instead that the current discourse lacks a paradigm through which to observe how the normative grammars of the moving image are used creatively by theatre practitioners. The discourse of intermediality offers few insights into this, as its research often focuses more on the implications of technical innovation rather than creative motivation.

In the study of dance, Coniglio has cast doubts on the validity of research and practice that focuses on the technological tools employed in certain productions rather than on the way

---

[28] In the moving image I regard the 'normative' grammar to be 'classical continuity', outlined in detail in Chapter 2.

[29] The notion of theatre as a language is a contentious discourse that I outline in Chapter 2.

they have been used to create 'aesthetic content' (2006. p. 78); his provocation is worth quoting in full, as these questions can also be asked of studies of intermediality in the theatre:

> Using new technology to further expression has always been the realm of the artist, but how often have these explorations that focused on the technology itself remained important in our canon? While the early films of the Brothers Lumère are important, they do not have the resonance of *Citizen Kane*; the same holds true for the early *pianoforte* [...] while it may be true that we cannot have *Citizen Kane* without *A Trip to the Moon*, I feel we need to question where we are in the progression of the new technologies as applied to mediated performance.' (Coniglio, 2006, p.80-81)

Coniglio calls for more 'content-driven' work that incorporates technologies, questioning the 'function' of practitioners to demonstrate new techniques (2006, p.83). One might interpret Coniglio's rhetoric as an argument for studies that draw on existing modes of participating and taking pleasure in an art-form, rather than those that concentrate on new tools that have not necessarily been used with inventiveness or success. I share Coniglio's caution when engaging with the discourse of intermediality in the theatre. I would argue that the limited institutional frame sustained by TIWG's research methods have perpetuated a discourse that view media as objects of interest *as media*, thus neglecting their full capability in the theatrical event as narrative and expressive tools.

INTERMEDIALITY AND THE 'META-TEXT'

The methodology of recent studies on the intermediality of performances that employ the moving image has privileged it as a performative artefact; to this extent, Giesekam is correct to find examples of intermedia practitioners 'staging the screen' (2007, p. 20). Due to the self-reflexive paradigm of performing technologies and intermediality found in contemporary scholarship, one find modes of spectatorship that place unrealistic demands on the viewer, and that are restricted to intermedia performance. For example, TIWG's assumption that the theatre operates as a 'hypermedium' has led Chapple and Kattenbelt to assume that intermediality activates a change in the spectator's perception, allowing them to scrutinize the construction of 'social and psychological reality' in these events (2006, p. 22). The logic behind this assertion is a

mode of spectatorship in which the viewer is invited to read a 'meta-text' that is engendered as a space in-between the medialities of the theatre and the moving image when they are combined. Dixon uses this rhetoric as he argues that the 'conjunction of live performance and digital imagery can produce a particular, hybrid form', which he describes a 'sense of *in-between-ness*':

> [...] a liminal space operating between the screen images and live performers - is often the essential kernel, what one might even call the "metatext" of digital theater production. (2007, p. 337)

This 'meta-text' thus becomes the focus of the discourse of intermediality, which Rajevsky describes as 'all those phenomena that (as indicated by the prefix inter) in some way take place between media' (2005, p. 46). By this logic the discourse of intermediality finds combinations of the moving image and the theatre to be inherently reflective. According to Chapple and Kattenebelt, a combination of media invites the analysis of the 'multiple perspectives' between them and foregrounds the 'making of meaning by the receivers of the performance' (2006, p. 20). This logic has been extended into many of the working group's studies, including Nibbelink and Merx's contribution to their most recent volume, where they argue that 'in intermedial performances spectatorship in itself becomes a self-reflective act' (2010, p. 218). Regarding the moving image, this implies that the viewer is normally passive in relation to media; this is itself a problematic assumption that might be said to draw from classical film spectatorship theory of Daniel Dayan (1974), Jean-Louis Baudry (1975, 1976) and Laura Mulvey (1975). However, this ideological unravelling of the moving image in the 'meta-text' of intermediality is less of a revelation if one considers recent revisionisms and developments in film spectatorship theory that implicate a more active film viewer (Allen, 1997); (Mulvey, 2006); (Barker 2009).[30]

The methodologies that serve the assumptions of TIWG are drawn from the scholarship of Phelan and Birringer who privilege theatre's 'liveness' in relation to media artefacts (See Chapter 1). These assumptions are sustained by the analysis of postmodern collage-like performances that incite self-reflective readings; as such I would argue that the logic of

---

[30] I demonstrate the discourse of spectatorship in relation to multimedia theatre in Chapter 4.

intermediality is inapplicable to the range of multimedia encounters possible in the theatre. However, if one moves away from the logic of intermediality, then new difficulties arise from the paradigm of mediatization, liveness, and dominance theorised by Auslander. Scrutinising how the moving image might be read as an artefact in the theatre cannot currently be divorced from its normative frames of cinema, television, and computing. Despite this, the extent to which the cultural status and ideology of the moving image has encroached into the theatrical event has not been effectively proven, and I will argue that the compelling language of the theatre is not so easily subordinated to the grammars of the screen in performance. It is clear that a methodological problem has resulted from insufficient dialogue between theorists of theatre and film; as a result, contemporary scholarship has neglected how grammars of the moving image are useful for practitioners incorporating it into the theatrical event, and how these images might be read for meaning and pleasure when synthesised with performance in various ways. Frustratingly, a language of intermediality that is predicated on certain assumptions has dominated the discourse, this is despite the already sophisticated grammars of theatrical and moving image events that have evolved through a reciprocal relationship between practitioners, performers and spectators.

NOTATION

A major implication of the problematic methodology employed within the current discourse is an inability to notate theatre productions effectively that incorporate the moving image. The assumption of self-reflective spectatorship of intermediality results in readings that are either hieroglyphic - in that the image-making technology is a performative symbol - or overly simplistic and limited to individual instances. For example, Aronson argues that the moving image, when placed in the theatre, creates a 'disjunction of perceiving a different world' (2005, p. 88). This generalization would not, for instance, apply to productions where projections bring moving image artefacts into the visual field that synthesise with the *mise-en-scène* to create an illusion, such as the holographic dancer effect experienced in *Time and the*

27

Conways (2009)*.* Another problem has been notations that focus on the ontology of the moving image and its technology; Aronson argues that the moving image is always a reproduction of a past subject, which he argues is a 'negative virtue on stage' (2005, p. 89). This statement fetishizes both the moving image as a reproductive technology, and the theatre as an 'unmarked' – to borrow Phelan's term – medium. It also neglects instances of incorporating the moving image that use live video-feed, such as Katie Mitchell's productions *Waves* and *Attempts on Her Life,* and is also problematic in its assumption that audiences are compelled to read the moving image artefact for its ontological characteristics rather than its contribution to the visual field and the diegesis of the performance. I will argue that, as a complex and sophisticated representational system, the activity of the moving image must be regarded in more ambitious ways that take into account both the grammars of its normative media and its compelling activity within the system of the theatrical event.

4. METHODOLOGY

It is unrealistic to legislate for the activity of the moving image in the theatre as its potential applications are radically various. Nonetheless, a more effective paradigm of how and why these technologies are used, and how they are read in theatrical events, must be investigated. This thesis will put pressure on existing theoretical models in order to intervene in the current discourse. I regard the moving image as a now established component of theatre's language, and therefore question assumptions of contamination and mediatization, and studies that fetishize it as a new technology. I will focus on productions that fill the gap left by the current discourse of intermediality, scrutinising theatre productions that do not use the moving image in order to comment upon it as a medium, but which take advantage of its activity and grammars in order to serve narrative and to create emotional and visceral effects for spectator. In doing so I will focus on Katie Mitchell's production *Waves* (2006, see Chapter 3), the National Theatre of Scotland's *Black Watch* (2006, see Chapter 4) along with brief instances from my

own work as a video designer for a number of productions at the York Theatre Royal Studio, including Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest* (2007, York Theatre Royal Studio), and Mary Luckhurst's *Celebrity* (2008, York Theatre Royal Studio). The rationale behind this archive is to provide situations through which to test the current discourse that allow for an understanding of the creative motivation behind decisions in the use, design, editing, and delivery of the moving image in a theatrical event.

MEDIATIZATION

Auslander's theories on liveness, and the subsequent studies undertaken by TIWG, demonstrate that the contemporary use of the moving image in performance cannot be divorced from its context as a mass media artefact. My first chapter will scrutinise the perceived ontological divides between live performance and screen media which have made difficult the task of notating the activity of the moving image in the theatre. In particular, Auslander's dissection of this binary has offered conclusions on the theatre's operation in a cultural economy which place the moving image in a dominant position over the live performer, therefore privileging it as the most compelling element of the theatre's visual field due to its cultural status. I will negotiate the theories that underpin Auslander's model of dominance in order to engage with the ontological concerns of incorporating the moving image, with its cultural paraphernalia, into the theatrical event. This will also bring into question the validity of studies, such as Nibbelink and Merx's theories on spectatorship (2010), that conceive of the theatre as a stage to perform technologies; a model that does not fit the plethora of multimedia productions that the current discourse has overlooked. The ontological and cultural discourses that I will engage with are necessary for two reasons: first, the moving image has developed into a sophisticated representational system that is normally experienced in situations that are not theatrical; second, the moving image artefact is a commodity, serially reproducible, and often considered the binary opposite to the 'live' theatre. Therefore my first chapter will set out the key theoretical assumptions that underpin the current discourse on theatre's relationship with

the moving image. My aim is to put pressure on existing models in order to gauge the extent to which this context - and the paradigms of 'liveness' and 'mediatization' - impact upon the moment of presenting the moving image artefact in the theatrical event itself.

The discourse of intermediality has produced models of reading the moving image in the theatre which need challenging. My second chapter will therefore explore the grammar of the moving image and its synthesis with the language of the theatre. Attempts to locate a language of the theatre have proved difficult for scholars; Ubersfeld has maintained that we 'can admit that we cannot "read" theatre, but we must do so nonetheless' (1999, p. xxi). The most relevant study to the reading of multimedia theatre is the influential research undertaken by Gay McAuley (1999), who has focussed on how theatrical space can be read as a language. Oddey and White draw on McAuley in their volume *The Potentials of Spaces* (2006) and argue that the theatre is a predominantly spatial medium, and that the incorporation of video projection must be read in this context. I would argue that spatial language in the theatre must also be considered alongside the 'presence' of the human performer. A challenging quality of the theatre for analysis, 'presence' has generated a vibrant discourse that I will outline in more detail in Chapter 2. However, it is important to assert that Cormac Power's *Presence in Play* (2008) has re-invigorated the current discourse on presence, and has provided new paradigms through which to examine contemporary multimedia productions. In particular, Power's division of stage presence into three distinct modes - the fictional, the auratic, and the literal – provide an urgent paradigm through which to view the collision of theatrical and moving image systems. In contrast to the language of theatrical space, which has focussed on spatial awareness and the human performer, the moving image's language has been located in editing; in particular the continuity style of classical Hollywood (Bazin, 1967); (Fairservice, 2001); (Dancyger, 2007). More recent studies of expressive editing styles (Orpen, 2006); (Dancyger,

2007), the 'intensified continuity' of contemporary action sequences (Bordwell, 2002), and in 'feeling state' sequences such as music videos (Dancyger, 2007), also provide routes of enquiry.

CREATIVE MOTIVATION

The use of technology in the discourse of intermediality is motivated by the engendering of a meta-text for the spectator's scrutiny. As this thesis will seek to depart from TIWG's methodology, this raises the question of the motivation for combining the theatre with the moving image. Furthermore, the practitioners' intentions in incorporating the moving image in the mainstream theatre is a startling erasure in the current discourse. Christine White's article on theatrical space demonstrates this, and calls for the use of these technologies to extend into the rehearsal space to create laboratories of experimentation (White, 2006, p. 93). In order to explore this further, I have interviewed cast members involved in devising Katie Mitchell's *Waves*, an adaptation of Virginia Woolf's novel *The Waves* (1931). On the balance of my analysis of the languages of stage and screen, and the mediatized context in which contemporary productions might combine them, my third chapter will explore how the normative grammars of the moving image have been embraced by practitioners in this production, which used video images to contribute visual cues that allowed the *mise-en-scène* to simulate effectively the 'stream-of-consciousness' technique of Woolf's novel. To do so, decisions were made that require the viewer to read cinematic grammars within performance. *Waves* therefore provides an excellent case-study as its multimedia staging puts pressure on existing scholarship on the human performer in the multimedia event, permitting investigative analysis of how the moving image might compel as an artefact within theatrical space inhabited by actors.

SPECTATORSHIP

Attempts have been made to theorise on the unique spectatorship of multimedia theatre (Lavender, 2006); (Nibbelink and Merx, 2010). Oddly, few studies have drawn on the sensory

and visceral effects of the moving image in live performance, with Lavender providing the most interesting inroad to this question in his essay 'Mise en Scène, Hypermediacy and the Sensorium' (2006). Despite Lavender's intervention, the validity of existing paradigms of spectatorship in intermedia performance must be questioned due to a limited exchange between existing models of film and theatre spectatorship. Recent developments in theatre studies have identified embodied models of spectatorship that implicate the viewer as an active thinking participant (Shepherd, 2006); (Read, 2006);(Rancière, 2009). This is often placed in contrast to passive modes of film spectatorship (Dayan, 1975), which have recently been revised in interesting ways (Allen, 1997); (Mulvey, 2006); (Barker, 2009). Despite this, the discourse of intermediality relies on out-dated models of the passive spectator in order to sustain its rationale of 'staging the screen'. In Chapter 4 I will attempt to synthesise recent theories of spectatorship in film and theatre in order to arrive at a more elegant and useful model for notating the moving image in performance. Though it is now a dated model in the current discourse of film spectatorship, I have found the work of Richard Allen (1997) extremely useful in its demonstration of illusion in the representational cinema. In particular, his theory of 'seeing aspects' provides a useful explanation of how spectators instantaneously participate in a number of possible readings of the moving image. Recent scholarship has also demonstrated new modes of digital spectatorship of the moving image to describe how the viewer might take pleasure in the image in the theatre (Mulvey, 2006); (Auslander, 2009). Furthermore, Jennifer Barker's recent monograph *The Tactile Eye* (2009) demonstrates the visceral pleasures - and displeasures - of viewing the moving image; these studies shed light on the expressive and visceral effects of the moving image in theatre. Complemented by the wider discourse of theatre spectatorship, these recent studies offer insights for the analysis of the bombardment of visual imagery provided to the viewer in multimedia performances such as *Black Watch,* where space, performer, and imagery place demands on scholarly engagements with spectatorship, but are seemingly easy for audiences - versed in the grammars of theatre and film - to read.

CHAPTER 1:
THE MOVING IMAGE AS A CULTURAL ARTEFACT IN THE THEATRE

1. THEATRE CULTURE AND MOVING IMAGE MEDIA

The mediatized culture in which contemporary theatre takes place complicates any enquiry into its incorporation of the moving image artefact. A questionable model of the theatre as a 'hypermedium' has allowed the negotiation of this obstacle in the prevalent discourse of intermediality. Based on frameworks laid down by Frederich Kattenbelt and Peter Boenisch, TIWG's analysis of the moving image in the theatre reveals its culturally ingrained mediality within a 'meta-text', thus legislating for its reflexive application in performance. In this chapter I will put pressure on this methodology and the paradigms of theatre's ontology that underlie it, thereby demonstrating the limitations of this approach for the analysis of mainstream theatrical events. I have already introduced the scholarship of Philip Auslander as an influential alternative that situates the theatre in constant cultural conversation with the moving image, but would argue that this is also problematic. Auslander's rhetoric of dominance and contamination suggests that his thesis is unsatisfactory for the analysis of the creative combination of the languages of stage and screen; indeed, Auslander doubts that this is even possible in contemporary culture (2008, p. 40). Demonstrating the flawed trajectory of Auslander's models of cultural economy and his formula of the dominance of the moving image in the theatrical event, I will negotiate an alternative methodology of my own that makes no value judgements on the use of the moving image – with its culturally-engrained grammars and methods of consumption - alongside the compelling grammars of the theatre itself.

There is a considerable distance between contemporary experiences of the moving image in the theatre and the earliest examples of its incorporation in live events; this is due to the moving image's development into a mass-experienced cultural artefact and, moreover, a compelling and sophisticated representational system. This can be illustrated via Gwendolyn Waltz's historical research into the earliest uses of the moving image in live performance. She argues that the first uses of film in theatre, at the end of the nineteenth century, occurred at a time when 'it was unclear just what motion pictures would become' (2006, p. 547).[31] She concludes that:

> [...] motion pictures eventually developed an artistic form and exhibition format that was, and continues to be, related to the theatre though it has its own identity. To see a film effect in a stage play meant something different to an audience member between the years 1897 and 1917 (when film was new and its form in flux), as compared to an audience member of 1927 or later when silent, then sound movies had become an integral part of modern culture and narrative construction dominated filmmaking. (2006, p. 572)

On the balance of Waltz's statement, I would argue that it is with difficulty that any enquiry into the moving image in the theatre could disregard what I would term its 'normative experience' as a cultural artefact.

Since the pioneering narrative films of D. W. Griffith (1875-1948), the moving image has developed a compelling representational grammar (Dancyger, 2007); (Orpen, 2003). Furthermore, the medium has a sophisticated cultural relationship with its spectators who take pleasure in the moving image in ever-changing ways (Mulvey, 1975); (Mulvey, 2006); (Auslander, 2009). It is therefore not surprising that contemporary theatre scholarship often emphasises the theatre's relationship with this medium. In his recent essay 'The Intermedial Performer Prepares', Henk Havens states that the theatre is 'unthinkable anymore without

---

[31] Waltz's essay continues to argue that early-twentieth century multimedia production 'provides an entry to the study of the interstices and intersections of theatre and film during a period before divisions between these media were drawn and roles defined.' (2006, p. 548) While this argument is not the subject of this thesis, Waltz's comparison with contemporary production raises essential questions regarding the subsequent division of live and moving image media in the twentieth century.

technology and intermediality'; arguing that no-one 'can be trained as a theatre professional, without at least being aware of the image languages of cinema, television and the digital media' (Havens, 2010). Havens perhaps goes too far, while lighting and sound technologies are commonplace in professional theatre practice, there is nothing to legislate that the theatrical event should include the moving image. However, his statement is significant as it suggests that the theatre and its practitioners are versed in the grammars of the mass media. I would argue that theatre now takes place in a culture saturated with moving image media; as such, these media provide a context for live performance regardless of whether they are incorporated into its *mise-en-scène.* This has been explored by Philip Auslander in *Liveness,* where he argues that 'theatre (and live performance generally) and the mass media are rivals, not partners':

> Neither are they equal rivals: it is absolutely clear that our current cultural formation is saturated with, and dominated by, mass media representations in general, and television in particular (though television is admittedly locked in combat for cultural and economic dominance with the Internet and telecommunications). (2008, p. 1)

I have already demonstrated that Auslander's rhetoric of contamination and colonization implies a negative disturbance of live performance by the technologies and 'epistemology' of the moving image. However, few studies - and Auslander is guilty of this - have looked outside the academy to identify whether these anxieties are felt by professionals working in the mainstream theatre.

Anne Nicholson Weber has conducted interviews with a number of theatre practitioners on their work in the context of contemporary mass media; these are compiled in her volume *Upstaged: Making Theatre in the Media Age* (2005). In this volume, American theatre director Michael Kahn observes that theatre audiences are versed in moving image representations; as such he describes a 'quicker processing, more visually sophisticated audience' (p. 70). Describing productions that 'give you images and text at the same time because the audience can watch it all', he foresees that 'a new kind of theatre will come of that - sort of an MTV

theatre' (p. 70).[32] Kahn's comments are intriguing as they demonstrate that theatre production and reception reflects a mediatized culture. I would be inclined to agree, and am interested in demonstrating how the moving image has been embraced by practitioners for its own grammars and modes of consumption. Despite this, studies such as Auslander's have described these cultural conversations negatively, implying that the theatre has become dominated by its mass media counterparts. It is thus significant that Kahn does not express similar anxieties, stating instead that 'all of these media are important for the culture and should exist simultaneously' (p. 70).[33] Indeed, Kahn demonstrates that directors have become increasingly proficient in handling both theatrical and moving image media, arguing that 'the healthiest thing is to do a little bit of everything' (p. 72).

Kahn's remarks suggest that the participation of theatre audiences has been shaped by their experiences of moving image media; furthermore, his description of practitioners moving across media demonstrates additional routes of cultural conversation between them.[34] I would argue that the professional realities revealed by Weber's interviews demonstrate a considerable distance between recent scholarship on the theatre's relation to the mass media, and the ways in which practitioners negotiate this contemporary landscape. The prevalent discourse of intermediality has failed to account for these mainstream practices; furthermore, the negative rhetoric I have identified in recent scholarship has expressed an anxiety of media dominance over the theatre that seems erroneous when regarding the realities of contemporary theatre culture. In this chapter I will scrutinise the assumptions of theatre's ontological purity and its mediatization that have informed the questionable approaches taken by TIWG and Auslander

---

[32] Ken Dancyger provides an interesting account of the 'feeling stage' editing style of MTV music videos (2007).

[33] Kahn is, however, anxious that theatre culture may 'develop an audience that doesn't listen, or listens fast and somewhat superficially' (p. 71).

[34] Weber's interview with theatre and film director Nicholas Hytner produces similar revelations; it is significant that his descriptions of contemporary theatre culture are extremely positive. He argues that 'actors are being better trained, directors are being better trained'; Hytner also remarks upon 'the twentieth century's explosions of energy in British playwriting' (Nicholas Hytner, as cited in Weber, 2005, p. 1).

whose influential models have negotiated the theatre's relationship with the moving image in problematic ways.

THE PROBLEM OF MECHANICAL REPRODUCTION

Multimedia theatre presents an ontological conundrum, whereby a mechanically reproduced moving image is placed within a live performance that is not - and many would argue cannot be – considered reproducible.[35] I am consciously borrowing the rhetoric of Walter Benjamin's essay 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936, 1970), which demonstrates fundamental ontological differences between reproducible media and live performance. A number of studies have made assumptions based on Benjamin's logic, as Matthew Causey has argued:

> [...] much of the contemporary discourse surrounding live performance and technological reproduction establishes an essentialized difference between the phenomena, from Walter Benjamin (1968) to Peggy Phelan (1993).
> (Causey, 2006, p. 15)

It is essential to demonstrate the fundamental logic of Benjamin's distinction, as his negotiation of the difference between performance and moving image media is both consciously and unconsciously challenged and embraced by key scholars of media and the theatre such as Phelan (1993), Birringer (1998), Kattenbelt (2006), Boenisch (2006) and Auslander (2008).

Benjamin establishes that in 'principle a work of art has always been reproducible'; he explains that imitations and replicas could be produced 'by pupils in practice of their craft', artists who sought to 'diffuse' their works, and by 'third parties in pursuit of gain'. (1970, p. 220.) However, Benjamin identifies a crucial shift in the early twentieth century from these manual methods of duplication towards technical processes. Crucially, he argues that the invention of photography represented the first moment that reproduction was 'accelerated so enormously that it could keep pace with speech'; what followed were significant developments

---

[35] Peggy Phelan has defined performance as 'representation without reproduction' (1993, p. 3).

37

including the advent of the moving image, and the eventual emergence of photography and cinema as art-forms that were not reproductions of existing works:

> [...] technical reproduction had reached a standard that not only permitted it to reproduce all transmitted works of art and thus to cause the most profound change in their impact upon the public; it also had captured a place of its own among the artistic processes. (p. 221-222)

Benjamin argues that the moving image became a reproducible work of art in its own right, therefore becoming an artefact with no authentic original; as such, scholars of multimedia theatre have often considered the moving image as a commodity within an economy of reproductions from which live performance – which retains its unique authenticity – is exempt.[36]

According to Phelan, the moving image - and other mechanically reproduced artefacts - must be considered 'marked' forms; she argues that live performance, including the theatre, is thus placed in the privileged position of being 'unmarked' by the mediating apparatus of reproduction (1993).[37] Phelan's argument therefore sustains Benjamin's distinction between performance in the theatre and the reproduction of this activity by the camera. Considering process reproduction in relation to human performance, Benjamin makes a clear distinction between the activities of the stage actor in the theatre and their representation on film. Crucially, he argues that the authenticity of the human performance is not diminished by its mechanical reproduction.[38] Instead, Benjamin maintains that both the original and the reproduced performance co-exist as unique works of art in their own right; he provides a logical outline of this distinction that is worth quoting in full:

---

[36] One finds this assumption in Birringer's *Media & Performance* (1998); furthermore, I would argue that this distinction is crucial to the methodology of TIWG. Phelan has been influential in maintaining this paradigm, but it is crucial that Auslander's model of theatre's participation within an economy of reproduction also relies upon Benjamin's model and extends it through Jean Baudrillard's logic of the 'precession of simulacra'. These concerns will be explored further in this chapter.

[37] The mediation of performance by mechanical apparatus is described by Phelan via 'two laws' of representation: 'it always conveys more than it intends; and it is never totalizing' (1993, p. 2).

[38] This loss of authenticity is demonstrated when works which are not performances are reproduced: 'The situations into which the product of mechanical reproduction can be brought may not touch the actual work of art, yet the quality of its presence is always depreciated' (1970, p. 223).

> The artistic performance of a stage actor is definitely presented to the public by the actor in person; that of the screen actor, however, is presented by a camera, with twofold consequence. The camera that presents the performance of the film actor to the public need not respect the performance as an integral whole. Guided by the cameraman, the camera continually changes its position with respect to the performance. The sequence of positional views which the editor composes from the material supplied him constitutes the completed film. (1973, p. 230)

This description of the moving image representation of performance dictates that the film actor is 'subjected to a series of optical tests' to which the stage actor is not (p. 230). By this logic, the moving image therefore provides a mediated representation of a human performance, and not a reproduction of performance itself; therefore one might argue that the media artefact does not touch upon the theatre when documenting it.[39] Benjamin's distinction has been maintained by scholars such as Phelan and Birringer, but collapsed by Auslander who argues that Benjamin does not take into account a 'doubling back', whereby 'older forms emulate and incorporate newer ones' (2008, p. 37). I will eventually demonstrate and put pressure on these divergent theoretical trajectories, but it is first essential to explore how Benjamin's distinction relies upon the agency of the human performer, which he relates to a notion of the unique 'aura' of authentic and non-reproducible works.

Benjamin argues that an artwork reproduced by the still or moving image is diminished in its authenticity, adding that one 'might subsume the eliminated element in the term "aura" and go on to say: that which withers in the age of mechanical reproduction is the aura of the work of art' (1970, p. 222).[40] It is therefore crucial for my enquiry into theatre's mediatized context that Benjamin does not regard this erasure of aura when he examines the representation of human performance on film. Benjamin argues that the agency of the human performer distinguishes their performance from its moving image representation:

---

[39] Auslander has attempted to describe the experience of the moving image as 'performance' in a number of essays including 'The Performativity of Performance Documentation' (2006) and 'Reactivation' (2009).
[40] Dennis Kennedy has questioned the reality of Benjamin's claims on diminished authenticity and aura: 'for all its credibility in the 1930s and historical importance thereafter', he argues that Benjamin's thesis 'must not be conflated with market value. The ready availability of cheap reproductions, or Baudrillard's exposure of the simulacrum, have not reduced the auction successes of Picassos and Rembrandts' (Kennedy, 2009, p. 8).

> [...] the film actor lacks the opportunity of the stage actor to adjust to the audience during his performance, since he does not present his performance to the audience in person. (p. 230)

This distinction relies on a notion of 'presence'; in particular, what Cormac Power terms 'literal presence' which describes the 'sense in which spectators are present in the theatre with the actors and with other spectators' (2008, p. 87).[41] The human agency implied by the participatory conditions of being present at the theatre informs Benjamin's thesis; on the balance of this, he argues that the cinema heralded the first time that 'man has to operate with his whole living person, yet forgoing his aura' (p. 231). Benjamin therefore concludes that 'there can be no replica' of live performance:

> The aura which, on the stage, emanates from Macbeth, cannot be separated for the spectators from that of the actor. However, the singularity of the shot in the studio is that the camera is substituted for the public. Consequently, the aura that envelops the actor vanishes, and with it the aura of the figure he portrays. (p. 231)

One might argue that the reciprocal agency of spectators and performers within a theatrical event mediate performance in ways that are distinct from the camera. Therefore the theatre performance cannot be mechanically reproduced, and is thus ontologically distinct from the moving image artefact.

Benjamin privileges the theatre's 'liveness' by describing human agency as anathema to the mechanically reproduced artefact; his rhetoric reflects this as he writes that 'the sight of immediate reality has become an orchid in the land of technology' (1970 p. 235). Auslander's anxiety of the theatre's contamination by the moving image is based on this foundational value, as does the methodology of TIWG who understand the theatre as a 'hypermedium' for staging the media artefact. In order to put pressure on these divergent trajectories, I will demonstrate how the ontological distinction between performance and mass media have been articulated by Peggy Phelan and Johannes Birringer, whose political emendations of Benjamin's thesis have

---

[41] I contextualise Power's recent study in the wider discourse of stage presence in Chapter 2 .

informed the questionable approaches of recent scholarship and practice that 'stages the screen'.

2. STAGING THE SCREEN

I have already demonstrated that recent scholarship by Giesekam (2007) and TIWG has understood the use of the moving image in the theatre as inherently reflexive; Aronson goes as far to argue that the combination of stage and screen can only operate successfully when the intent is to 'draw upon the cultural signification of film and video in our media-saturated age' (2005, p. 87). This is a limiting approach to the moving image in the theatre, yet it is curious that these assumptions have saturated the current discourse. This approach has been sustained by a political paradigm of live theatre which privileges its non-reproducible ontology in order to exempt it from the ideological codes of mediatized artefacts. A key assumption in these studies is that the saturation of media artefacts in the twentieth century has affected the ideology and ecology of modern culture (Couldry and McCarthy, 2004). Dennis Kennedy has observed this in relation to contemporary spectatorship:

> [...] the incursions of electronic simulations are so pervasive that there is no substantial difference between watching and not watching. Citizens in the capitalist world have little choice but to be part of the spectacularization of life. (Kennedy, 2009, p. 7)

Kennedy's rhetoric of 'simulation' reflects the extent to which the scholarship of French philosopher Jean Baudrillard has influenced the discourse of the ideology of mediatized artefacts. Baudrillard's logic of serial reproduction informs the anxieties of media culture that pervade the scholarship of Phelan, Birringer, TIWG and Auslander; oddly, his work has informed divergent interpretations of the use of the moving image in contemporary theatre. Therefore, it is essential to briefly outline his argument, and to consider the discourse of contemporary theatre and media in relation to his thesis.

In *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* (1981), Baudrillard describes the effect of mass 'mediatization' as 'closed systems of models of signification from which no event escapes' (p. 175). He argues that the media is 'no ensemble of techniques for broadcasting messages; it is the *imposition of models.'* (p. 175). In his subsequent publication *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities* (1983a), he remarks that these messages are not consciously read by recipients but are 'absorbed' by 'the masses', and thus perpetuate 'the dominant form of the medium' (p. 100). Baudrillard therefore regards changing human ecology in a mediatized culture where reality simulates the serially reproduced representations that saturate it. His most influential description of this paradigm can be found in his publication *Simulations* (1983b), where he extends Benjamin's essay on mechanical reproduction in order to demonstrate the effects of production on a massive scale in the late twentieth century.

Baudrillard takes his cue from a phrase located towards the end of Benjamin's essay: 'Quantity has been transmuted into quality', which describes how the 'greatly increased mass of participants' afforded by the mechanical reproduction of artworks' has produced a change in the mode of participation' (Benjamin, 1973, p. 241). Baudrillard argues that Benjamin's statement reflects 'new territories without a tradition of classical productivity, and that are placed immediately under the sign of reproduction' (1983bp. 99). This refers to the moving image artefact becoming conceived as a mass producible work in itself, and not as the mechanical representation of a referent such as human performance. From this, Baudrillard demonstrates the cultural significance of a changing human ecology whereby art-works are generated *en-masse*. He indicates that a 'new generation of signs and objects' arrived with the industrial revolution:

> They will no longer have to be counterfeited, since they are going to be produced all at once on a gigantic scale. The problem of their uniqueness, or their origin, is no longer a matter of concern; their origin is technique, and the only sense they possess is in the dimension of the industrial simulacrum. (1983b, p. 96)

The rhetoric of 'simulacra' is explained by the mass repetition of artefacts; Baudrillard argues that 'in a series, objects become undefined simulacra one of the other', this entails 'the obliteration of the original reference' (1983, p. 97). Returning to the arguments made in his earlier publications (1981, 1983a), Baudrillard argues that the 'serial repetition' of technically produced artefacts is more significant than their equivalence because of the mediating processes that generate them (1983b, p. 99). From this we arrive at an understanding of the ideological implications of mass production.

Baudrillard argues that mass production replicates the mediating code of technical processes, issuing with their millions of instances the 'form and principle of a whole new generation of sense' (1983b, p. 99). Baudrillard therefore argues that the technique of production dominates the 'message' of the artefact; he argues that this has profound ideological implications once serial reproduction eventually becomes the 'generation by means of models' (1983b, p. 100). Therefore, whereas Benjamin identified the capability of mechanical processes to produce unique artworks in their own right, Baudrillard observes the progression towards the 'reversal of origin and finality', whereby all works are now 'diffracted from a generating nucleus' (1983b, p. 100). [42] On the balance of this, one might argue the ideology of production is perpetuated by mechanically reproduced media. In later works, Baudrillard describes how moving image artefacts have created and distributed social and political realities; he does so provocatively in *The Gulf War did not take place* (1995), where he analyses the 'deterrence of the real by the virtual' in relation to the television transmission of the first Gulf War (1990-1991) to argue that we 'are all hostages of media intoxication' (pp. 25-27).

Baudrillard's polemic has informed a host of assumptions on the moving image in the discourse of contemporary mediatized culture; more often these theorists draw on his theories in relation to the television or advertising rather than the cinema (Auslander, 1992); (Bolin,

---

[42] Baudrillard argues that at this stage of production 'we are in the third-order of simulacra' (1983, p. 100). Later in this chapter I will demonstrate Baudrillard's rhetoric and arguments in further detail in relation to Auslander's thesis on theatre's liveness.

2004); (Auslander, 2008). The mesmerism of the moving image as an ideological tool in relation to consumerism has recently been described in Maurya Wickstrom's monograph *Performing Consumers* (2006), which draws on Baudrillard in her striking description of a video presentation at a Nike sportswear store which shows montages of athletes:

> The screen event is clearly the techno-heart of the store, pumping its blood on a rhythmic schedule. (2006, p. 16)

Borrowing Baudrillard's rhetoric of the 'faculty of pleasure', Wickstrom describes 'the brandscape' created by the store architects to induce pleasure through moving image representations leading her to state that 'On my body, in my body, Nike feels essential' (2006, p. 25).[43] This response is not described in relation to the content of the image, but the ideological code of participating with it as a consumer. Tied to ideology, it is perhaps not surprising that these concerns regarding the moving image artefact have been evoked by a number of theatre scholars. For example, Auslander locates 'the power of the media' in their 'form', and not 'their ability to transmit content' (1992, p. 16). Birringer also draws on Baudrillard's logic to state that 'our perception of historical change is hallucinatory and vertinous', arguing that 'our view of the world is shaped by the media':

> If the fall of the Berlin Wall was a simulation (in the sense in which Jean Baudrillard argued that "the Gulf War did not take place"), must we not also assume that the conversion and interchangeability of all images of war, projected onto "Sarajevo" or anywhere else, now constitute the very conditions of our technologized commodity culture, in which distinctions between sign and referent, nature and culture, human and machine, truth and falsehood, real and representation appear to be collapsing? Must we abandon our claims to know or experience existence and consciousness of life in the same manner in which we cannot presume that there is a "real world" that somehow precedes or exists outside of representation? (1998, p. 4)

This passage demonstrates an anxiety of the ideology of mediatization which is shared by Phelan and Auslander. On the balance of this discourse, it is perhaps not surprising that theatre scholars have clung to the ontological 'liveness' of the theatre in order to escape these

---

[43] Wickstrom's remarks are of interest if one considers the tactile spectatorship of the moving image recently theorised by Jennifer Barker in *The Tactile Eye* (2009). I will demonstrate this in relation to the theatre in Chapter 4.

ideological codes. As such, I would argue that the discourse of 'staging the screen', and the methodology of TIWG, has emerged from a political re-telling of Walter Benjamin's distinction between performance and mechanically reproduced media which has served to place the theatre firmly outside the 'code' of the moving image that Baudrillard describes.

Benjamin's logic of the un-reproducible theatre has been adopted by Phelan and Birringer in order to situate it apart from the contemporary mass media. Their scholarship in the 1990s privileges the theatrical event as a spatial and temporal situation where performance is left unmediated, ephemeral and untouched by the codes of production. Phelan echoes Benjamin's writings on human performance in her model of the 'unmarked' to argue that performance's 'only life is in the present', and that once 'recorded it becomes something other than performance' (1993, p. 146). Phelan asserts that performance - including the theatre - must therefore be regarded outside the 'economy of reproduction', where it 'betrays and lessens the promise of its own ontology' (1993, p. 146). Phelan thus provides an ideological umbrella that shields the theatre from a contemporary context that is saturated with moving-image representations that must be considered as mechanically reproduced commodities:

> Performance in a strict ontological sense is nonreproductive. It is this quality which makes performance the runt of the litter of contemporary art. [...] Performance implicates the real through the presence of living bodies. In performance art spectatorship there is an element of consumption. There are no left-overs, the gazing spectator must try to take everything in. Without a copy, live performance plunges into visibility – in a manically charged present – and disappears into memory, into the realm of invisibility and the unconscious where it eludes regulation and control. (1993, p. 148)

Phelan's rhetoric of 'control' and 'regulation' demonstrates that her thesis establishes performance as a site with no ideological codes of participation comparable to those of the moving image. While Phelan does not specifically engage with multimedia theatre, it is striking that her ontological logic has informed fundamental assumptions on the reflective use of the moving image in the theatre.

Johannes Birringer is widely regarded as a pioneering voice in the discourse of theatre's incorporation of media technologies.[44] It is therefore significant that his thesis is contextualised within a paradigm of ideological mediatization by moving image representations, which he describes in his monograph *Media & Performance* (1998):

> In the context of increasing European and North American integration, global markets, and transnational media industries, theater production as an art form now appears not contemporary but anachronistic. (1998, p. 6)

Birringer presents a narrative history of the theatre that – in a similar vein to Phelan's ontological model - places live performance outside the representational economy of the moving image. Birringer also situates the theatre outside the ideology of mediatized commodities, demonstrating that contemporary political and sociological ideologies have been shaped by moving image representations, but arguing that the theatre was not complicit in the perpetuation of these ideas due to its ontological position outside mechanical reproduction. Therefore he argues that in the United States, 'the theatre played no role in the construction of the political, national space' (1998, p. 7). Birringer's intervention describes live performance as a site in which one can incorporate the moving image artefact in order to stage and scrutinise its ideology. Observing the practice of live video-art, he argues that installations that combine live performance and moving image media - undertaken in the United States by artists such as Nam June Paik and Laurie Anderson - have 'most provocatively challenged the dominant hierarchies of institutional and technological ideologies' (1998, p. 9). Echoing Phelan, Birringer's logic places the performance-event outside a cultural discourse saturated by mechanically reproduced forms.

Birringer's model is contentious, as the rhetoric of 'theatricality' has been employed in studies such as Wickstrom's, which demonstrate the 'theatrical seductions' of consumerism

---

[44] Giesekam describes Birringer's study as one of the first to 'have explored more fully theoretical issues surrounding the position of theatre in a mediatised society and have commented on some broader characteristics and implications of multimedia work' (2007, p. 7). Causey celebrates Birringer's early intervention in this discourse and establishes *Media & Performance* (1998) as a seminal text, alongside Auslander's *Liveness* (2008), in his study *Theatre and Performance in Digital Culture* (2006, p. 5).

(2006). Furthermore, Auslander's monograph *Presence and Resistance* offers an alternative view of American performance art in the 1980s that actively 'eschews' theatrical qualities, such as 'presence', that might be regarded negatively in light of its seductive connotations:

> That left-wing and right-wing spectacle managers (or Abbie Hoffman and Richard Nixon) seemed to have fundamentally the same ideas about the manipulation of presence led to a growing suspicion that to invoke the power of presence through a dramatistic model of political action is to link oneself inextricably with the workings of a repressive status quo [...] (1992, pp. 42-43)[45]

I find Auslander's notion of presence highly questionable, and offer my own exploration of this challenging discourse in Chapter 2. However, it is immediately significant to demonstrate that despite alternative theories, the logic of Phelan and Birringer's ontological privileging of live performance as a pure stage that can resist the moving image's ideology, and thus incorporate it for scrutiny, has been perpetuated within the discourse of intermediality.

While privileging the theatre outside the ideology of the mass media, Birringer's thesis leaves unanswered the question of whether the moving image's ideological paraphernalia are active in the theatrical event when they are placed within it. Giesekam asks this question in *Staging the Screen* (2007):

> The challenge then for theatre practitioners and critics becomes not just whether theatre can provide a counter-site to the limitless seduction of the media, but whether spectators saturated by such reified dramaturgies are able to switch viewing modes when confronted by similar stacks of seemingly incommensurable information and imagery in intermedial work. Is it possible to create work that acknowledges and even exploits the prevalence of electronic media, but does not leave its audience either seduced or overwhelmed, deprived of the capacity for critical thought? (p. 19)

Giesekam's rhetoric of 'seduction' demonstrates an anxiety of mediatization, and therefore it is not surprising that he calls for strategies that can resist the ideology of the moving image in the theatre. His own solution is similar to Birringer's, in that he privileges theatre's 'liveness' to argue that by 'staging the screen', one can 'create opportunities to engage with and critique how

---

[45] Auslander indicates that the 'ecstatic branch of 1960s experimental theater' saw the actor's presence before the audience as the 'essence of theater' and that the 'use any particular theater makes of that presence defines its ideology' (1992, pp. 36-37). Auslander also explores what he perceives as the theatre's redundancy during the Vietnam war (pp. 37-39).

media such as film and television function' (p. 20). He argues that the viewing situation of the theatre disrupts 'generic conventions and modes of viewing film and television' and arrives at a problematic assertion:

> [...] placing film or video material on the stage often draws attention to the conventions of filming, distribution, presentation and reception that are normally occluded when we watch a film in the cinema or a television programme in our homes. (p. 21)

Giesekam's evidence draws on postmodern collage-like productions by companies such as The Wooster Group that explicitly 'stage the screen', and demonstrate the conventions of production that he describes. His analysis is thus only valid to the extent that he observes strategies for commenting on the ideology of the moving image in a specific genre of the theatre; as such his model neither proves nor disproves Birringer's claims regarding the theatre as an ontological site for commenting on mediatized culture. However, the methodological frameworks established by TIWG go further than Giesekam, affirming Birringer's claims that contemporary theatre is a stage for the screen. I would argue that the implication of this theoretical trajectory is a narrow focus on highly specific theatrical events in contemporary scholarship, and the perpetuation of a problematic methodology of regarding the theatre as a 'hypermedium' in which a 'meta-text' can be identified between staged media.

THEATRE AS HYPERMEDIUM

In TIWG's first volume of essays, *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance* (2006), Freda Chapple and Chiel Kattenbelt state that the working group's 'first principle' is that the theatre is a 'hypermedium' which can stage mechanically reproduced media without mediating them (2006, p. 20). Kattenbelt explores this principle in more detail in his essay 'Theatre as the art of the performer and the stage of intermediality' (2006), where he contextualises the 'hypermedium' within a 'long tradition of thinking about theatre as a secondary, or 'composite' art' (p. 29). He argues that the theatre is 'the only art capable of incorporating all other arts

without being dependent on one of these in order to be theatre' (p. 32).[46] Kattenbelt explains that 'technology-based media', such as film and video, can 'record and play back everything that is visible and audible, within their specific ranges of sensitivity' (p. 37). Despite this, Kattenbelt argues that these media 'cannot incorporate other media without transforming them under the conditions of the specificity of their own mediality' (p. 37). By this logic, the theatrical event does not subject the moving image to any 'tests', and is thus distinguished from the mechanically reproduced moving image which would alter and disrupt the vital ontologies of performance were it to attempt to duplicate it. On the balance of this assumption, Kattenbelt then argues that, when media are incorporated into the theatrical event, they are 'not just recordings on their own, but at the same time and above all theatrical signs':

> To put it differently: as components of a live performance, film, television and video recordings are not only screened, but also and at the same time staged (which is not necessarily the same as refashioned). Thus, because theatre is the art of staging *pur sang* it becomes pre-eminently a stage of intermediality. (2006, p. 37)

This notion of a 'stage of intermediality' thus informs the 'second principle' of TIWG's conceptual framework: that 'intermediality is an effect performed in-between mediality' (Chapple and Kattenbelt, 2006, p. 20).

It is TIWG's second principle that leads to a privileging of works that 'stage the screen'. According to Chapple and Kattenbelt, intermediality is a meta-text between media that invites analysis of the 'multiple perspectives' between them, and which foregrounds the 'making of meaning by the receivers of the performance' (2006, p. 20). Peter Boensich's contribution to TIWG explores this further in his essay 'Aesthetic Art to Aisthetic Act' (2006), in which he argues that intermediality 'is an effect created in the perception of observers that is triggered by performance – and not simply by the media, machines, projections or computers used in performance' (p. 113). Relying upon Kattenbelt's logic of the hypermedium, Boenisch argues

---

[46] Robin Nelson has suggested that the multimedia computer can also be considered a hypermedium in his essay 'New small screen spaces: a performative phenomenon' (2006).

that the 'multi-mediality of theatrical performance offers a unique and productive potential for *intermedial intervention,* compared to other forms of mediation':

> Intermedial theatrical performances activate the observers, who become invited (some will complain that they are left) to find their own paths through the pluri-focal networks of signs, worlds, messages, and meanings offered by the performances, often without being closed into the single, *unanimous meaning.* (Boenisch, 2006, p. 115)

I would argue that this rhetoric of 'activation' is directly related to assumptions regarding the passive absorption of mediatized codes, as described by Baudrillard (1983a). If viewed in the context of a theoretical trajectory, beginning with Phelan, which posits the theatre as a haven from the ideology of the moving image, one might argue that TIWG's 'meta-text' of intermediality exposes the 'code' and concludes a messianic narrative laid down by Birringer, whereby the anxieties of mediatization can be allayed through a performance of those media. This is certainly suggested by Boenisch's polemical style as he argues that 'media', and 'mainstream culture', have become 'key collaborators' of a 'pre-programmed ideology' (2006, p. 116). He argues that the '*intermedial effects* that any performance may prompt and spark off, offer a vision of theatre's potential future that had been built into its organism from the very first day' (2006, p. 116).

The models of the 'hypermedium' and the meta-text of 'intermediality', as described by Kattenbelt and Boenisch, are questionable solutions for the scrutiny of moving image artefacts in a theatrical event. I would argue that their determined effort to secure the theatre as a medium set-apart from the media they intend to stage has resulted in a self-limiting discourse. The methods employed by TIWG in their readings of performances are thus incompatible with the majority of mainstream instances of merging stage and screen. Furthermore, I do not share the anxieties of mediatization that is evident in the rhetoric of 'seduction' and ideology employed by Birringer (1998) and Giesekam (2007). These anxieties have sustained a messianic narrative that has emplotted the discourse of intermediality as an urgent response to

mediatization, whereas it has in effect sustained its own 'uroboric' genre, by which I mean a self-creating body of scholarship.

INTERMEDIALITY AS A UROBORIC GENRE

I use the rare adjective 'uroboric' here as defined in the *OED* as something 'resembling or suggestive of a uroboros', a noun that describes the symbol 'in the form of a circle, of a snake (or dragon) eating its tail'.[47] The eternal return implied by this image describes the limitations of theoretical models of intermediality. I would argue that the these theories are insufficient in the analysis of the majority of instances where the moving image is incorporated into the theatre, as the methods of analysis employed by TIWG perpetuate highly specialised ways of reading performance. These methods, which include the reading of intermediality as a meta-text, limit analysis to specific performance conditions that are motivated towards the scrutiny of media artefacts that are perceived in a contemporary culture saturated by an implicit ideology of mass production. I would not doubt the validity of TIWG's claim to study the 'theatre', but would instead argue that their body of work is geared towards specialised audiences who participate within its own discourse. Thus, TIWG's 'institutional frame' (Van Maanen, 2006) of the theatrical event has become isolated from wider theatre culture, including mainstream practice. To demonstrate this, it is useful to draw on Ric Knowles' study *Reading the Material Theatre* (2004), which identifies how the material context of a theatrical event affects its reception.

Knowles examines how conditions of production and reception affect the way theatrical events are read in different locations – i.e. when touring internationally – and by different groups of spectators (2004, p. 3).[48] In his study, Knowles focuses on two companies that

---

[47] OED [online] Available at: <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/220549?redirectedFrom=ouroboros#> [Accessed 30 April 2011].
[48] Knowles' primary example is an International touring production of Eugene O'Neil's *The Iceman Cometh,* in which he identifies alternatives receptions in New York and London: 'the somewhat jaded context of European modernism may, in London, have created a range of expectations about a mid-century international realist classic that enabled virtually existentialist readings of O'Neill's play. In New

incorporate the moving image: the work of The Wooster Group, and Canadian director Robert Lepage's company Ex Machina.[49] In particular, Knowles' analysis of *The Wooster Group* demonstrates how their working practices have 'lent themselves to politically radical readings by leading postmodern theatre critics and theorists' (2004, p. 44-45). He demonstrates that 'under the direction of Elizabeth LeCompte', the company 'eschew traditional theatrical practise of character and plot development', instead they concentrate on executing 'specific performative "tasks" that potentially subvert traditional or capitalist meaning-delivery systems' (p. 44-45). Knowles' descriptive rhetoric of subversion and the implied deconstruction of the 'capitalist' ideology of the moving image by The Wooster Group might also be employed in describing the approaches observed by TIWG's case-analysis.

An example of this is Russell Fewster's analysis of his own production of Japanese playwright Takeshi Kawamura's *The Lost Babylon* (Adelaide Fringe Festival, 2006). Fewster nods to the anxiety of mediatized culture that underlies this discourse by stating that performance is 'increasingly influenced by screen cultures'; he adds that theatre 'now regularly incorporates digital media in the form of projection and television screens' (2010, p. 63). In his own production that combines live performers with projected performers, he argues that they 'might each be described as mediums or media with an active play between them' (2010, p. 64). Curiously, Fewster's conclusions demonstrate complex readings of the interactions between these bodies and recordings that fail to scrutinise the 'active play' between them, instead he attaches symbolic meaning to their combination, arguing that his use of the moving image reinforces 'the play's commentary on media effects upon society and the potential for the virtual to become real' (2010, p. 68). This logic, whereby revelations on the ideology of media are read in performance, is repeated in a number of studies such as Turco's analysis of Alexander Scriabin's *The Poem of Ecstasy,* an environmental production based upon the 'carnivalesque

---

York such readings were less than congenial. There, as an *American* classic, the play was more likely to be read as exploring "classic American" themes. (2004, p. 2)

[49] On the work of Robert Lepage he argues that his company Ex Machina attempt to create 'mutlimedia co-productions' that are funded multinationally and 'designed for the international festival and touring marketplace of artistic and diplomatic exchange' (Knowles, 2004, p. 41).

mise-en-scène of a disco party' (Turco, 2010, p. 57). Here, Turco argues that the 'body becomes a symbol that is charged with new denotations and connotations, and generates new associative threads' (p. 60). These analyses provide little insight into the creative motivation of combining the grammars of theatre and the moving image other than to comment upon, or in many cases reveal, the ideology of the image.

Further examples analyse the ideological revelations incited by the combination of the moving image with communication technologies.[50] This includes Wolf-Dieter Ernst's analysis of live art collective Gob Squad's *Room Service* (2003), a 'durational performance' lasting from 10:00pm to 04:00am which could only be watched through 'surveillance cameras on four huge TV monitors'; the audience were able to interact the with company via the 'house-intercom system' (Ernst, 2010, pp. 204-209). This production is analysed for its demonstration of 'principles of connectivity', which leads Ernst to privilege the theatre's ability to offer revelations regarding the media it stages:

> The idea of agency and network can help us to reconsider traditional notions of connection and interaction. (p. 204-205)

Ernst's assumption that the performance is capable of inciting such revelations is not explained, but is understood as a given condition of reception as an example of intermediality. Indeed, this is the case in most studies in TIWG's *oeuvre.* As such, one might argue that the participatory conditions of reading intermediality are highly specialised. They are based on complex scholarly paradigms by Kattenbelt and Boenisch which in turn are contextualised by theoretical work by Phelan and Birringer that privilege the non-reproducible ontology of the theatre; as such legislating it as a site in which media artefacts can be 'staged' for revelatory purposes.

---

[50] Furthermore, many of the instances of intermediality notated in TIWG's work do not exclusively employ the moving image, and instead stage internet technologies in order to invite the analysis of 'telepresence' (Bay-Cheng, 2010b). Telepresence is defined and explained by the recent research project The Presence Project [online] Available at: <http://presence.stanford.edu:3455/Collaboratory/372> [Accessed 30 April 2011].

I must assert that it is with difficulty that one could invalidate the arguments made in the case-analyses of TIWG, as the working group has forged its own 'grammar' of intermediality that is specific to the specialised scholarly audience who participate within it. For this reason, I would describe 'intermediality' as a flawed approach to the moving image in the theatre, as its methodology is inherently reflective and self-limiting. While on occasion there are revelations in the discourse of intermediality that are relevant to my enquiry, I will seek to depart from this prevalent discourse and its assumptions in order to forge an alternative methodology that embraces the moving image for its normative grammars and modes of participation.

A NEW APPROACH

Instead of focussing on performances motivated towards 'staging the screen', I intend to concentrate upon productions that do not splinter from the 'institutional frame' of theatre culture which includes mainstream practice. As such, I intend to demonstrate how the moving image might be incorporated for its normative grammars and modes of viewing in the theatre which in turn mediates it through theatrical codes of participation. However, doing so removes the ontological umbrella provided the theatre by Phelan and Birringer, and entails a consideration of the theatre in conversation with television, cinema, and digital media. I would argue that this is a more valid approach, considering the cross-media realities of professional practice as described by directors, performers, and writers interviewed by Weber (2006). Despite this, the narratives of mediatization demonstrated by Baudrillard, and articulated by scholars such as Auslander, cannot be disregarded. Therefore, considering the combination of a 'marked' theatre with the mechanically produced moving image artefact asks new questions regarding the compelling cultural paraphernalia of the moving image itself.

Philip Auslander has provided the most influential recent scholarship on the relationship between the moving image and live performance that does not imply the specific production and reception conditions of intermediality. While I find his methodology

54

questionable, his influence in the current discourse is such that any enquiry into the relationship between the moving image and the theatre cannot eschew his model. Therefore, in this chapter I put pressure both on Auslander's paradigm of theatre in a mediatized culture, and his methodology regarding the moving image in the theatre. In doing so, I seek an alternative route towards the description of the synthesis of film and theatre's grammars and spectatorship.

3. AUSLANDER AND THE DOMINANCE OF THE MOVING IMAGE

The significance of Auslander's intervention in this discourse has often been located in his deconstruction of Phelan's 'reductive binary opposition of the live and the mediatized' (2008, p. 3).[51] Auslander questions the validity of her approach, promoting instead his own paradigm of 'cultural economy', in doing so he challenges assumptions that place performance in a 'cultural system separate from that of the mass media', instead arguing that 'live forms have become mediatized' (2008, p. 5). On the balance of this, Auslander arrives at conclusions on the moving image in the theatre that diverge considerably from those of Birringer and TIWG. While the discourse of intermediality privileges the theatre as a stage *for* the screen, Auslander instead argues that the normative experience of the moving image dominates live performance, and thus re-frames the experience of the theatrical event through mediatized codes. Auslander's intervention regarding theatre's place in a mediatized culture is useful, but his trajectory towards the cultural dominance of the moving image makes a questionable value judgement that suggests that he does not deconstruct Phelan's binary, but re-balances it in favour of the mediatized artefact.

---

[51] Chapple and Kattenbelt set the discourse of intermediality apart from Auslander's scholarship in their Introduction to *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance.* They argue that 'Auslander puts forward the proposition that theatre must recognise that it is only one element amongst many operating in a mediatized cultureal system' (2006, p. 15); they argue that their 'position is different to that of Auslander', as their 'research indicates a sharper focus on the perception of the audience' (2006, p. 17). Despite this, I have argued that their conceptual audience is highly specialised.

I begin my analysis of Auslander's methodology by introducing his conclusions concerning the moving image in the theatre. I then demonstrate the logic by which he arrives at this situation of dominance, and will put pressure on the assumptions, evidence, and methodology he employs in his most influential monograph *Liveness* (1999, 2008).

AUSLANDER AND THE MOVING IMAGE IN THE THEATRE

In his article 'Liveness, Mediatization, and Intermedial Performance' (2000), Auslander challenges theories concerning 'the possibilities of intermedial hybridization' between theatre and the moving image (2000, p. 1). Auslander asks whether we really 'experience live and mediatized images as distinct species' (2000, p. 1). His contention assumes that the moving image enjoys a cultural status over that of live performance, which he demonstrates in *Liveness* as he engages with the use of video projection in the theatre:

> [...] performances occur now in a cultural context in which the projection is more closely related to the dominant media than is the live body, a fact that undoubtedly has implications for how the audience perceives the whole performance. (2008, p. 43)

Auslander demonstrates this perception through the crude formula 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual' (2008, p. 42).[52] The 'dance' in this formula specifically refers to Canadian company Pps Danse of Montreal's production *Pôles* (1996), which combined 'two live dancers with holographic projections of themselves deployed against a shifting background of digital projections' (2008, p. 42).[53] In *Liveness,* Auslander offers the following interpretation of the production:

> [...] do we see a piece like *Pôles* as a juxtaposition of the live and the digital, a shifting among realms? My feeling is that the answer is no, that we now experience such work as a fusion, not a con-fusion, of realms, a fusion that we see as taking place within a digital

---

[52] Demonstrating a hierarchy of prestige amongst media in his paradigm of cultural economy, Auslander finds symptoms of this in the theatrical event itself; this hierarchy of dominance leads him towards the assertion that in the mixed-media performance elements 'do not interact with one another as equals.' (2005, p. 1)

[53] PPS Danse was formed in 1989 and has produced a number of dance based productions; the company's website states that their works are 'distinguished by their multidisciplinary and multimedia nature with dance remaining the main focus.' (About PPS Danse, n.d.) Their production *Pôles* was produced as a collaborative project between several artists; and was marketed as 'Virtual dance. Never before seen!' (Pôles, n.d.) A video document of the production is available on YouTube [online] Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WNl5iDsyWxY> [Accessed 9th February 2011]

environment that incorporates the live elements as part of its raw material. Rather than a conversation among distinct media, the production presents the assimilation of varied materials to the cultural dominant. In this sense, Dance+Virtual=Virtual. (2008, p. 42)

This is a significant departure from the methodology of TIWG that privileges the theatre as a site that presents media 'unmediated'. One might argue that the 'shifting among realms' Auslander describes could be likened to the meta-text in-between medialities which is scrutinised in the discourse of intermediality. On the balance of this, Auslander's paradigm is useful in its consideration of multimedia theatre as a 'fusion' of grammars. Despite this, Auslander's conclusions of dominance are questionable. In particular, his notion that materials are 'assimilated' into a 'cultural dominant' is highly unlikely if one regards a number of participatory conditions that distinguish the ontology of the theatrical event, such as human agency.

Auslander's thesis is invariably more complex than his ineffective distillation of its effects in the theatre to 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual'. In order to effectively challenge the assumptions that lie behind this model of dominance, it is essential to demonstrate how Auslander's deconstruction of Phelan's ontological umbrella suffers from a problematic understanding of the theatre's own mediality. This is most striking when one reveals the erasures of evidence concerning Auslander's definition of the 'live', a term that is essential to his re-negotiation of Phelan's live/mediatized binary*.

<center>'LIVE'</center>

Auslander's challenge to Phelan's ontological binary in *Liveness* depends upon an historical moment of his own emplotment, which he first published in his article 'Against Ontology: Making Distinctions between the Live and the Mediatized' (1997). Here, Auslander draws on linguistic evidence to argue that the very possibility of recording performance in the early twentieth century allowed - for the first time - the consideration of real events as 'live'. On the basis of this, he describes in *Liveness* an eventual 'implosion' whereby 'the mediatized replaces the live within cultural economy', and where 'the live itself incorporates the mediatized,

<center>57</center>

both technologically and epistemologically' (2008, p. 44). This is a clear departure from Phelan's categorisation of performance as 'representation without reproduction' (1993, p. 3), and relies upon Baudrillard's logic of simulation in order to regard the precession of the mediatized in relation to the 'live'. Despite this, Auslander's deconstruction of Phelan's binary demonstrates an erasure of descriptive rhetoric that alludes to human agency and presence. As such, Auslander's thesis neglects vital participatory components of the theatrical event that lead him towards questionable analysis concerning the theatre's relationship to the media in contemporary culture, and its incorporation of the moving image in performance.

In *Unmarked,* Phelan argues that the 'performative speech act shares with the ontology of performance the inability to be reproduced or repeated' (1993, p. 149).[54] She then argues that human performance, like performative speech, cannot be captured by writing; as a result the performance remains unmarked, and untouched by a reproductive medium. Reproductions are thereby categorised as 'marked' media that have been mediated by process. By this logic, Phelan places performance outside an economy of repetition and thus outside the ideological code of production. In *Liveness,* Auslander reveals his dissatisfaction with this explanation:

> She posits performance as nonreproductive and writing as a form of reproduction, allowing her to conclude that writing (language) cannot capture performance. To the extent, however, that mediatization, the technology of reproduction, is embedded within the language of live performance itself, performance cannot claim linguistic independence from mass reproduction, either. (2008, p. 45)

I am inclined to agree with Auslander that the theatre must be regarded in conversation with its mass media counterparts; however, I consider his argument that the theatre cannot find independence from 'mass production' questionable. Auslander's methodology that draws on the etymologies of the words 'live' in order to enforce Baudrillard's logic of simulation is highly problematic; this can be illustrated by Auslander's argument that 'live' is 'an effect of mediatization, not the other way around':

---

[54] Phelan draws on Austin's *How To Do Things with Words* to distinguish between 'constative' and 'performative' elements of speech. (Austin, 1962)

It was the development of recording technologies that made it possible to perceive existing representations as "live." Prior to the advent of those technologies (e.g., sound recording and motion pictures), there was no such thing as "live" performance, for that category has meaning only in relation to an opposing possibility. (2008, p. 56)

Auslander draws on Baudrillard to assert that 'the very definition of the real is *that of which it is possible to give an equivalent reproduction*'; by this logic, he argues that 'the 'live' can be defined only as '*that which can be recorded*' (2008, p. 56). This is a questionable methodology that relies on a narrow definition of the term 'live'; this is particularly evident in Auslander's assertion that the 'ancient Greek theatre' was 'not live' as there was ' no possibility of recording it' (2008, p. 56). I would argue that Auslander's rhetoric of 'liveness' neglects theatrical codes of participation, and in particular the qualities of human agency that might also be described as 'live'.

Auslander bases his assertions on data gathered from the *Oxford English Dictionary*. He argues that the *OED's* 'earliest examples of the use of the word 'live' in reference to performance come from 1934, well after the advent of sound-recording technologies in the 1890s and the development of broadcasting systems in the 1920s' (2008, p. 58). However, my own examination of the *OED* suggests that Auslander must have narrowed his focus onto selected word-histories for 'live' as an adjective that is defined in either of the following two ways:

a. Of a performance, event, etc.: heard or watched at the time of its occurrence; *esp.* (of a radio or television broadcast, etc.) not pre-recorded.

 b. Of a recording, film, etc.: taken from or made at a live performance rather than in a studio. Cf. C.[55]

For definition '**a**', the first example in the *OED's* word history is a BBC Yearbook from 1934. Corroborating Auslander's claims, the usage in this case suggests that 'live' is understood as the opposite of a recorded broadcast:

---

[55] *OED* [online] Available at:
<http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50134416?query_type=word&queryword=live&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&search_id=P0ue-cJAFdf-2350&result_place=2> [Accessed 29 July 2009]

> Listeners have..complained of the fact that recorded material was too liberally used..but..transmitting hours to the Canadian and Australasian zones are inconvenient for broadcasting 'live' material.

It is striking that the examples for definition '**a**' attach a value judgment to the 'live' broadcast compared to recorded programmes; this can be gleaned from an example from 1937 which indicates that 'People do not like 'canned' entertainment when they can obtain 'live' entertainment just as easily.' Another example of this from 1944 suggests that attendance at concerts, and listening to 'live' performances, was more worthy than listening to a recording; furthermore, a 1989 entry argues that: 'As any concert goer knows, live is best.' The value judgments in these adjective uses of 'live' seem almost incompatible with those presented in the *OED* to support '**b**', which describes recorded artefacts of 'live' performances:

> **1947** - It would be interesting to hear how a wide range live recording might sound.
>
> **1977** - His live album, recorded at the Montreux Jazz Festival in 1974.
>
> **1985** - The Sex Pistols have another live album coming out next week.
>
> **1990** - Live recording or not, muddled enthusiasm cannot rescue the Corale Amerina from some approximate tuning and lack of ensemble.
>
> **2007** - The purpose of the shoot was to get concert footage for their upcoming live music video.

These instances of the term 'live' are distinct from those found for definition '**a**'. The very idea of a 'live music video' or a 'live recording' seem incompatible with the notion of 'canned entertainment', and the statement 'live is best', expressed in the first definition. However, both might suggest - to the advantage of Auslander's paradigm - that the 'live' is both an effect (**a**) and product (**b**) of the possibility and practice of mechanical reproduction. Auslander takes advantage of these selected word histories in order to emplot an historical narrative that sustains his model of mediatized liveness:

> If this word history is complete [...] then the concept of live performance came into being not at the appearance of the basic recording technologies that made the concept possible but only with the maturation of mediatized society itself. (2008, p. 58)

Despite the apparent elegance of this logic, Auslander neglects to provide a complete word history of the term 'live'; his analysis therefore suffers an erasure of definitions that do not qualify his Baudrillard-inspired model.

Of the omitted *OED* definitions in Auslander's study, we find descriptions and uses of the term 'live' that fit aspects of performance that cannot be captured by processes of reproduction; for example, the American-English slang definition: 'Of a person: full of energy and alertness; active, up to date.' This description evokes human agency and a sense of being literally 'present' with the person; both of these qualities of theatrical performance are neglected by Auslander in *Liveness.* It is therefore also significant that Auslander avoids definitions that might be used to describe the charisma of the stage performer; for example, the term 'energy' in the above definition might reflect the hyperbolised rhetoric of 'energy flows' (Power, 2008, p. 104) to describe presence in the theatre. Another example I have located in the *OED,* cited from a document from 1830, provides a first-person description of an energetic labourer: 'I saw a live man at work renewing a part of Henry the Seventh's chapel.' Also of note is an 1857 example where a 'bath-house' is 'kept by a live Yankee of the name of Martin', and an advertisement from 1925 which indicates that 'Live men can earn £10 week'; a later example from 1960 describes the Hawks baseball team as 'live guys'. Another curious omission from Auslander's analysis is the definition of 'live' in relation to electrical activity. The *OED* contains a definition for 'live' as a 'rail, wire, etc.: connected to a source of electrical potential', and also as an 'electrical apparatus'. These are significant omissions if one regards the use of electrical metaphors to describe the compelling activity of the human performer, as described in Jane Goodall's monograph *Stage Presence* (2008).[56]

On the balance of Auslander's selective word-histories, it might be argued that his thesis purposefully neglects the notion of 'presence'. The *OED* evidence he overlooks frequently

---

[56] Goodall provides a description of the 18th century stage actor Garrick which mentions an 'electrical fire' that 'shoots through veins, marrow, bones and all, of every spectator'; Goodhall argues that this rhetoric for describing 'stage presence' reflects 18th century fascination with 'electricity in bodies' (2008, p. 74).

suggests a compelling human agency that provokes and responds to a viewer's gaze; one might distil this into a performer/spectator relationship that many would argue could establish conditions for a theatrical event (see Brook 1990; Kennedy, 2009). Auslander's claim that theatre has entered the realm of mechanical reproduction is thus flawed. No analogue device can record the 'energy' of live bodies as described in the *OED* definitions that Auslander omits, neither can any representational artefact be diffracted from digital code to create a reproduction that evokes similar qualities.[57] By eschewing human agency and presence, Auslander's definition of the theatre is extremely narrow, eventually leading him to problematic conclusions on its status within a cultural economy and the moving image's dominance in the theatrical event.

Auslander's trajectory towards dominance represents the logical conclusion of a flawed narrative of television's remediation of the theatre.[58] Drawing on Benjamin's logic of mechanical reproduction, Auslander argues that this remediation has resulted in a mediatized 'live' in its own right. On the balance of his narrow definition of the 'live', these arguments must be regarded as erroneous. Indeed, his narrow conception of the theatre relies on highly selective evidence, and neglects its un-reproducible qualities of agency and presence.

THEATRE AND 'LIVENESS'

Auslander describes how, in its early development, television's 'essence was seen in its ability to transmit events as they occur, not in a filmic capacity to record events for later viewing' (2008, p. 12). In Auslander's model, television's capacity for live broadcast - coupled with its pictorial representation - allowed it to mechanically reproduce the ontological characteristics of the theatre (2008, p. 13). This is highly questionable, and one must imagine that he makes this claim by disregarding the literal presence implied by the theatrical event, and the agency of the spectators and performers who participate within it. Despite this, Auslander argues that via the

---

[57] However, one might digitally programme an artificial intelligence to express these qualities; in this instance I would consider the activity as an authentic performance and not as a reproduction of one, as would Auslander (see Auslander, 2002; Auslander, 2006a).

[58] Auslander's logic of remediation derives from Bolter and Grusin's *Remediation* (1999).

serial reception of television's 'liveness', the moving-image representation of live events has now become the normative experience of performances themselves. Regarding this remediation in a number of performance genres, including stand-up comedy and sporting events, Auslander also argues that televisual liveness now precedes that of the contemporary theatre which, he argues, now remediates its mediatized counterpart:

> [...] whereas television initially sought to replicate and, implicitly, to replace live theatre, live performance itself has developed since that time toward the replication of the discourse of mediatization. (2008, p. 24)[59]

This is an interesting notion in regard to my enquiry into multimedia theatre; it raises the question whether the grammars of the moving image, and its modes of spectatorship, have become compatible with the codes of participating in the theatrical event. However, Auslander's narrative of remediation is tied to his rhetoric of contamination, thus leading him towards a model wherein the moving image not only dominates, but re-frames the theatrical event. In order to negotiate my own paradigm through which to observe the normative grammars of the moving image in the theatre, it is essential to put pressure on Auslander's argument that the theatre's remediation of televisual 'liveness' has resulted in the economic and cultural subordination of the stage to the screen.

Auslander emplots a problematic historical narrative, that is both selective and deterministic, which demonstrates how a mediatized 'liveness' has dominated and obscured the 'authentic' characteristics of its theatrical referent. This begins with a limited history of television in relation to the theatre:

> Television was imagined *as theatre*, not just in the sense that it could convey theatrical events to the viewer, but in that it offered to replicate the visual and experiential discourse of theatre in the antiseptic space of the suburban home theatre. Television, as parasite, strangled its host by offering itself not as an extension of the theatrical experience but as an equivalent *replacement* for that experience. (Auslander, 2008, p. 22)

---

[59] Auslander uses Bolter and Grusin's concept of 'remediation' (1996, pp. 339) as 'the representation of one medium in another'. (Auslander, 2008, p. 6)

No doubt there are a countless historical erasures in this emplotment, yet it is perhaps obvious that the live television could not reproduce and replace the 'present' experience of the theatre. Auslander's evidence to support this assertion is problematic; he explains that there was a consensus by early television critics that 'television's essential properties as a medium are *immediacy* and *intimacy*' (2008, p. 14). He demonstrates that the earliest incarnations of television broadcast provided events as-they-occurred, be they real or fictional; Auslander adds that pre-recorded programming was less desirable, indicating that 'the capacity for rebroadcasting was seen then as ancillary to television's essence as a live medium' (2008, p. 15). Surprisingly, it is on the balance of these narrow examples that Auslander narrates the mechanical reproduction of the theatre as televisual 'liveness'.

Auslander argues that 'television production techniques themselves evolved in a conscious effort to reproduce the theatrical image' (2008, p. 18). His evidence for this relies on an observation of the use of multiple cameras in live television broadcast, which he argues was intended to 'recreate the perceptual continuity of the theatre', with the 'television director' mediating the 'effect of the theatre spectator's wandering eye' (2008, p. 19).[60] I would argue that this argument is only valid to the extent that multi-camera coverage simulates - albeit poorly - the theatre spectator's experience of focussing on compelling elements of the *mise-en-scène*; despite this, Auslander does not provide any evidence regarding theatre spectatorship, nor does he relate the editing of multi-camera footage to the spatial illusions engendered by the prevalent 'continuity style' of film grammar.[61] Furthermore, Auslander consistently neglects the non-reproducible human agency, as described by Walter Benjamin, which is inevitably lost through reproduction. Despite this, Auslander attempts to argue that these qualities became irrelevant

---

[60] Auslander argues that the television experience was viewed as an improvement upon the theatrical performance; he demonstrates how the home viewing of television became incorporated in 'the discourse of antiseptic electric space' that emerged 'in the context of the growing suburbanization of the postwar period' (2008, p. 16). Auslander argues that 'the goal of televised drama was not merely to convey a theatrical event to the viewer, but to recreate the theatrical experience for the home viewer through televisual discourse and, thus, to replace live performance' (2008, p. 18).

[61] I will demonstrate the conventions of film and television editing in Chapter 2; I will analyse spectatorship in Chapter 4.

following the serial reproduction of televisual 'liveness', which developed into a less theatrical - and more cinematic - system of representation.

Auslander argues that with improved technology the 'televisual discourse aspired less to the theatrical and more to the cinematic' (2008, p. 20). Again, Auslander fails to explain this or provide explanations of the grammars and spectatorship of the cinematic moving image. Curiously, he concentrates on television's incorporation of pre-recorded programmes into its schedules, providing highly selective examples to argue that these broadcasts, despite being reproductions, 'still represented themselves as theatre, but through the use of dramatic convention rather than by using the camera to replicate the perceptual experience of the theatre spectator' (2008, p. 22). This is a questionable conclusion, and Auslander's evidence is narrow; for example, he argues that the naming of television programs cited their theatrical referents, offering the examples of *Playhouse 90* (1956-1961), a CBS anthology of ninety-minute plays, and NBC anthology series *The Philco TV Playhouse* (1948-1955). Auslander's choices certainly highlight that the televisual medium was used to broadcast 'plays', but these programme-titles do not provide evidence that the content of these programs replaced, or effectively reproduced, the theatrical experience.[62]

Auslander's historical emplotment is of questionable validity, and it is therefore telling that this paradigm of remediation and dominance informs his descriptions of performances that combine the moving image with the live performer. For example, Auslander's analysis of Robert Blossom's 1960s *Filmstage* performances reveals his problematic assumptions regarding the relationship between the theatre and the moving image as a cultural artefact.[63] Auslander argues that Blossom's multimedia performances involved 'competition between the actor's live bodies and the filmed images', indicating that this competition was 'intrinsically unfair because the

---

[62] Indeed, the television was not the only place where moving image representations of plays could - and can - be found. Experiments with cinematic broadcast have been undertaken since the mid-twentieth century, and the recent success of NT Live demonstrates that this is an ongoing practice that is in no-way restricted to the television.

[63] Auslander describes *Filmstage* as 'one of many intermedia experiments undertaken in the mid-1960s by theatre, film, and performance artists. Carolee Schneeman and Robert Whitman, for instance, both staged "Happenings" that juxtaposed live performers with filmed images' (2008, p. 41n).

filmed images were inevitably more compelling' (2008, p. 41); he reveals that Blossom noted this problem himself:

> [...] in comparison with the films, the actors appeared as "fifty-watt bulbs waiting to be screwed into their source and to shine with the light that is perpetual (behind them, around them) but which they can only reflect at fifty watts". (2008, p. 42)

Auslander contextualises Blossom's statement as a comment on 'psychic economy'; explaining this to mean that 'physical existence is only ever a pale reflection of the consciousness underlying it' (2008, p. 42). Auslander then re-positions Blossom's logic in terms of his own 'cultural economy'; on the balance of this, he argues that the physical existence of the performer is a reflection of its cultural context, thus concluding that 'live actors are only pale reflections of the mediatized representations that dominate the cultural landscape' (2008, p. 42). There are problems and opportunities implicit in Auslander's statement. Based upon Baudrillard's narrative of mediatization, Auslander contextualises the human performer and theatrical space within a simulation model whereby they themselves become diffracted from the ideological codes of production. However, Auslander takes this too far to argue that the theatre is dominated by the moving image. While I would question the validity of Auslander's supporting narrative of 'liveness', and his conclusions on dominance, his notion of the theatre's absorption of its mediatized context is important if one is to regard the normative experience of moving image media and in the theatrical event.

Recent scholarship has demonstrated that the saturation of moving image representations in contemporary culture has had a profound effect on the way theatre is made and received. Alison Oddey and Christine White, in their volume *The Potential of Spaces* (2006) argue that audience members 'learn to read the messages of theatre space' as they do 'any related architectural and urban codes' (2006, p. 17). Crucially, they argue that contemporary theatrical experiences are more richly complicated because 'never before in history has a public had available for its consideration, paintings, music, or drama, from so wide range of cultures and historical periods' (2006, p. 17). As such, theatrical representation must be regarded as a

reflection of a culture that is in a large part sustained by the mass media. Furthermore, the moving image representation has become ever more visible in contemporary digital culture. Dennis Kennedy's recent monograph *The Spectator and the Spectacle* (2009) refers to 'dispersed spectators in media-saturated societies who are continually surrounded by representations' (2009, p. 7). It is significant that Kennedy, writing after the publication of the second edition of *Liveness,* argues that the 'situation is larger' than Auslander describes:

> If in the West and other so-called first world countries we have reached a state where communications, entertainments and other electronic interactions are so pervasive and incessant that we cannot avoid them, and do not wish to, then perhaps we have moved into a new phase of human life, one in which it does not much matter whether an event occurs live before us or distantly in some simulated, recorded or heavily mediated form. (Kennedy, 2009, p. 7)

I would argue that Kennedy's statement, and Auslander's thesis, go too far in their description of theatre in a mediatized culture. Auslander forces his analysis towards historical closures that emulate Baudrillard's models of 'simulation' and the 'precession of simulacra'. I would argue, on the other hand, that the theatre does not fit these models due to participatory conditions of the theatre that Auslander neglects in his is own methodology. As such, the performer's fate is not sealed in regard to their co-habitation with the moving image in the theatre*.*

<p style="text-align:center">SIMULATION AND 'LIVENESS'</p>

Auslander frequently employs Baudrillard's rhetoric in *Liveness.* For example, in his analysis of the music industry he presents the example of the television programme *MTV Unplugged* (1989), which featured established musicians performing acoustic renditions of their well-known recordings in front of a live studio audience. Auslander draws on Baudrillard to argue that this programme reflects the 'artificial resuscitation of rock ideology' under the 'sign of the simulacrum' (2008, p. 112). Auslander claims that by televising 'unplugged' and 'stripped down' performances of songs that were initially the product of studio production processes, an ideology of authenticity is imposed. He notes that this became even more curious when the

programme featured rap and hip-hop performers whose work relied upon digital sampling and 'other simulationist technologies' (2008, p. 112). This example demonstrates how Auslander's use of Baudrillard's thesis in *Liveness* is undertaken in relation to recorded music. What is striking is that he then uses these conclusions regarding music when engaging with the theatre. As such, his eventual model of theatre's dominance by the moving image is based on a logic of cultural economy that is forged in regard to his description of simulation in the commercial music industry.

Describing the reproduction of 'liveness' in the rock-music industry, Auslander introduces Baudrillard's logic of the 'precession of simulacra':

> The historical progression of technologies of musical reproduction exactly recapitulates the three orders of simulacra and the three stages of the image Baudrillard identifies in the general movement from the dominance of reproduction to that of simulation.
> (2008, p. 116)

The 'orders' and 'stages' that Auslander refers to are outlined in two essays by Baudrillard contained in the published volume *Simulations* (1983b). The first essay is entitled 'The Precession of Simulacra'; here Baudrillard demonstrates how mechanically reproduced representations no longer possess a 'referential being or a substance'; instead, they have become 'the generation by models of a real without origin or reality' (1983b, p. 2). He argues that the mediated representation of the 'real' by technical apparatus has now itself become the precedence for its own representation; this masks a past referent - or absence thereof - from the relationship altogether and leads Baudrillard to pronounce his maxim that 'it is the map that precedes the territory' (1983b, p. 2). Baudrillard demonstrates this phenomenon by identifying four 'successive phases of the image':

> - it is the reflection of a basic reality
> - it masks and perverts a basic reality
> - it masks the *absence* of a basic reality
> - it bears no relation to any reality whatever: it is its own pure simulacrum.
> (1983, p. 11)

Baudrillard offers an explanation for each phase: the first image is a '*good appearance*'; the second is an *'evil* appearance'; the third '*plays at being* an appearance'; and the fourth 'is no longer in the order of appearance at all, but of simulation' (1983b, p. 12).[64] Baudrillard offers historical justification for these orders, finding a 'decisive turning point' in the 'transition from signs which dissimulate something' (e.g. an icon that claims to be the thing itself) to signs 'which dissimulate that there is nothing' (1983b, p. 12). Regarding the closures of Auslander's historical narrative in comparison to Baudrillard's logic, one reveals his assumption that the contemporary implications of television's remediation of theatre's liveness would fall into the final phase of the image, whereby it now bears no relation to any authentic live performance. The eventual implications of this are revealed through a reading of Baudrillard's second essay in *Simulations,* 'The Orders of Simulacra'.

Baudrillard outlines the three orders of the simulacra that Auslander describes in *Liveness* (2008, p. 116)*.* Setting these in a chronological order, Baudrillard argues that *Counterfeit* is 'the dominant scheme of the "classical" period, from the Renaissance to the industrial revolution'; *Production* 'is the dominant scheme of the industrial era'; and *Simulation* is the 'reigning scheme of the current phase that is controlled by the code' (1983b, p. 83). It is helpful to view these three orders as extensions of Benjamin's essay on mechanical reproduction: the notion of 'counterfeit' relies on an authentic referent, reminding us of Benjamin's claim that traditional art works could always be imitated. In the second order, 'production', the repetition of a real work by mechanical means no longer degrades its authenticity, yet becomes a work of art in its own right: the 'real' has been mediated into a reproducible representation, e.g. a photograph or moving image artefact. When it comes to the third order, 'simulation', Baudrillard leads us to consider the overall effect of these meditative

---

[64] Baudrillard's use of words such as 'evil' develops from his historical idea of the phases of the image. He uses the examples of religious icons to demonstrate ideologies of representation: 'It can be seen that the iconoclasts, who are often accused of despising and denying images, were in fact the ones who accorded them their actual worth, unlike the iconolaters, who saw in them only reflections and were content to venerate God at one remove' (1983b, p. 9).

apparatus following sustained serial reproduction on a massive scale; this logic eventually leads Auslander to his own claims on the mediatization of live performance.

It is significant that Auslander offers his own examples for each of Baudrillard's orders. Into first order simulacra he places objects that defer 'to the human being as the referent of the real', indicating that the 'player piano' and internet 'chatterbot' fit into this category (2008, p. 117).[65] Auslander argues that an artefact in this order 'counterfeits a human performance but clearly is not human' (2008, p. 117). Into 'production' he places 'a mass-produced object whose reference back to an original artifact has been rendered irrelevant' (2008, p. 117). Auslander places recorded music into this category, indicating that record albums are 'associated with an industrial economy' in which mass production 'ultimately obliterates the unique object from which they were generated' (2008, p. 117). Auslander then formulates an interpretation of the third-order, which he terms the 'simulation proper', where he draws on Baudrillard's third phase of the image to argue that contemporary works possess no referent and are instead diffracted from a single model. Auslander states that this model is the 'binary code that defines all products of digital technology':

> [...]since digital code is reproduced through a process of "cloning", the information on all compact discs and their sources is identical: all are "originals"; there is neither an originary referent nor a first in the series. (2008, p. 117-8)

In Auslander's interpretation, all digitally produced works are, as Baudrillard would put it, 'diffracted' from the model of production. Auslander regards the third order of simulacra as a significant phenomenon in relation to live performance, due to the implied absence of any referent that would authenticate representations generated from this code. Furthermore, the selective evidence and erasures that sustain Auslander's deterministic historical narratives in *Liveness* are contrived in order to place the 'live' itself within the third order of simulacra to

---

[65] Auslander has recently written at length on the performance of the Internet chatter-bot; in the 2008 edition of *Liveness*, he argues that the 'chatterbot undermines the idea that live performance is a specifically human activity; it subverts the centrality of the live, organic presence of human beings to the experience of live performance; and it casts into doubt the existential significance attributed to live performance' (2008, p.72). Auslander returns to the subject of the chatterbot and internet liveness in his various articles (2002), (2009).

challenge the 'traditional assumption that the live precedes the mediatized' (2008, p. 11).[66] I would argue that the selective examples that Auslander draws upon in order to argue for a 'mediatized theatre' are designed to fit a simulation model that he liberally applies to all live events in general, including music performance and sporting events. One can therefore reveal Auslander's narrative of theatre's remediation alongside Baudrillard's rhetorical paradigm of the phases of the image.

If the early television - with its possibility of producing immediate experiences – did indeed model itself on the 'liveness' of the theatre, then it can be placed in the first phase of the image: it offers the representation of a 'basic reality', in this case the live performance. The continuing development of the television, as outlined by Auslander, sees a movement towards the second phase: where the television masks and perverts the original theatrical experience by broadcasting pre-recorded programmes, and utilising moving image conventions found in the non-live cinema in order to mediate televisual events. If we follow Baudrillard's logic - as Auslander does - then we must observe the television passing into the third phase where it masks the *absence* of a referent, bearing 'no relation to any reality whatever'; thus becoming 'its own pure simulacrum' (1983, p. 11). Auslander's arguments concerning the theatre and television do indeed follow this model to its logical end, even if he does not state it in relation to Baudrillard. This logic has two key implications for the theatre that Auslander assumes: the first is that the theatrical event becomes an artificial referent for mediatized representations that have become their own pure simulacra; the second is that the theatrical event itself emulates the serially produced 'liveness' that has become dominated by a televisual discourse, and which is itself generated from the dominant mediatized model. By revealing this logical assumption in Auslander's work, one can expose weaknesses in his arguments regarding the theatre, as he

---

[66] While I make it clear that the rhetoric and assumptions of Benjamin's 'mechanical reproduction' and Baudrillard's 'simulation' inform much of the discourse on the mediatized context of incorporating the moving image into the theatrical event. It is essential to note that I do not seek to intervene in either the ontological arguments put forward by Benjamin or the cultural theory of Baudrillard; rather I have introduced their frameworks in order to better identify how existing theories on the theatre have often forced selective examples into models that they do not necessarily fit. However, I would argue that Baudrillard's polemical writings offer an essential context of mediatization that must be taken into account regarding the contemporary theatre.

silently relies on this model in order to demonstrate the economic and cultural domination of the moving image which he eventually locates in the moment of the theatrical event itself.

Using Baudrillard's logic of the 'precession of simulacra', Auslander is successful in revealing simulation in live music and sporting events that have clear economic ties with a reproducible product; despite this, I would argue that no such mechanically produced referent can be identified in the majority of theatre productions. Despite this, Auslander observes economic connections between recordings and 'live' events across all performance genres:

> Live performance exists within the economy of repetition largely either to promote mass-produced cultural objects—such as the CDs and DVDs always available at performances by Cirque du Soleil or Blue Man Group—or to serve as raw material for mediatization, as when live theatre productions are staged in order to be reproduced on television. (2008, p. 28)

Auslander's evidence of this relationship in the mainstream theatre is unconvincing, and too conveniently manipulated to fit his logic of the precession of simulacra. For example, Auslander argues that since the 1950s television dramas have been re-imagined as live events; his examples are Broadway theatre-adaptations of the films *Twelve Angry Men* (1957) and *Visit to a Small Planet* (1960). Auslander also presents the example of live re-creations of popular television series; his example is a live version of the television show *The Brady Bunch* (1969-1974), which informed the stage-show *The Real Live Brady Bunch.* Auslander argues that this practice has 'accelerated in recent times', citing the adaptation of 'animated films as stage musicals (Disney's *Beauty and the Beast*), and music videos as concerts' (2008, p. 34). These selections suffer a glaring erasure of the variety of contemporary theatre-culture, and disregard a plethora of plays that share no moving image referent.

Equating the theatrical adaptation of an animated film with the MTV music video is to equate the Broadway show with the promotional concert tour, the implication being that the theatrical event has been presented as a referent to promote and authenticate the original film

72

or television program, a work that was already of the second order of simulacrum: a reproduction in itself. Auslander may be correct to assume this relationship in individual cases, but the narrow focus of Auslander's lens cannot justify such a conclusion for the theatre. A frequent case-study in Auslander's study is the work of Disney Theatrical Productions, and in particular their re-staging of Disney's animated film *Beauty and the Beast* (1991). He argues that Disney created the company 'specifically to repurpose their film properties as live performances alongside the home videos, sound recordings, toys, and so on produced from the same materials (2008, p. 28).[67] Originally performed in Houston, *Beauty and the Beast* became the sixth longest running show on Broadway (over 5461 performances) and has subsequently been re-produced in major cities worldwide (Hernandez, 2010). Walt Disney Theatrical Productions have since produced a number of stage shows based on films and characters in Disney's cinematic and televisual repertoire, including *The Lion King* (1997), *Mary* Poppins (2004), *High School Musical* (2007), and *The Little Mermaid* (2007). The success of these theatrical ventures is outlined in Disney's 2008 Annual Investor Report:

> As Disney Theatrical Group gets ready to celebrate its 15th anniversary, it can proudly look back on a year of record attendance in 2008 with more than 20 million people attending one of its live stage shows around the world. The Lion King entered its 12th triumphant year on Broadway, and the stage hit continues to roar across the globe with current productions in London, Paris, Tokyo and Hamburg, as well as the ongoing smash U.S. tour. (The Walt Disney Company 2008 Annual Report. n.d.)

Observing the reproduction of these theatrical events in multiple locales, Auslander argues that it 'makes little sense to ask which of the many identical productions of [...] Disney's *Beauty and the Beast* is the "authentic" one' (2008, p. 55). Auslander thus interprets Disney's endeavours as evidence of the theatre's entry into an economy of repetition, marking a clear departure from the cultural situation described by Phelan (1993) and Birringer (1998). Auslander arrives at the conclusion that this 'situation represents the historical triumph of mechanical (and electronic) reproduction (what I am calling mediatization) that Benjamin implies' (2008, p. 55). Despite the

---

[67] Wickstrom (2006) is cited for her exploration of the 'articulation of live performance to consumer culture'.

convenience of Disney Theatrical Productions as evidence to support Auslander's logic of the precession of simulacra and cultural economy, these productions do not account for the theatre industry as a whole.

Mainstream Broadway productions based in North America cannot account for the range of possible encounters in Western theatre; Auslander neglects a host of plays produced both on and off-Broadway - and in the United Kingdom and Europe - that share no relationship with a mechanically produced artefact. Auslander's model of cultural economy therefore suffers an erasure, relying upon a narrow category of theatre production that neatly permits the closures of his historical and cultural narrative. Auslander is therefore unsuccessful in demonstrating the theatre as the artificial referent for mechanically reproduced artefacts. An animated film such as *Beauty and the Beast* does not require authentication by live performance in the same way the rock-music recording - with its ideology of authenticity - might; moreover, there is no pretence that the cinema provides a document of a live performance. The experience of the moving image is organised through mechanical methods such as editing and cinematography, these 'tests' - to re-evoke Benjamin - do not represent an experience of theatrical performance in any way comparable to the live re-creation of an audio recording by musicians and sound engineers in a live rock-concert. On the balance of this, I would argue that - despite his achievement in relation to the music industry - Auslander's evidence is insufficient to place the theatre either in the second or third orders of simulacra.

By revealing the selective evidence that sustains Auslander's problematic thesis, I would argue that his methodology conceals crucial ontological barriers that would otherwise prohibit his classification of the theatre within a cultural economy. Returning to Phelan, who exempts the theatre from the economy of reproduction, we find the compelling argument that the presence and evanescence of the theatrical event are inevitable obstacles to its reproduction (1993, p. 146). She argues that performance 'occurs over a time which will not be repeated'; she accepts that a play 'can be performed again' but argues that each 'repetition itself marks it as "different"

(p. 146). In Phelan's model, every one of the five-hundred and sixty-one performances of *Beauty and the Beast* on Broadway must be regarded as individual - and authentic - works of art. More recently, Noel Carroll has made similar comparisons between the theatre and moving image representations in his essay 'Philosophy and Drama' (2006). Carroll explicitly rejects Auslander's ontological arguments (Carroll, 2006, p. 105), arguing instead that performances are 'tokens' that allow access to a work of dramatic art (p. 113). He argues that human agency is essential to the generation of a token theatrical performance that offers access to an artwork (the production); demonstrating that this requires the presence of performers, technicians, and practitioners whose mental and physical activities generate the event (p. 118). Carroll thus distinguishes the token performances of the theatre from exhibitions that offer access to moving image productions; he argues that while a screening allows access to a film such as *Finding Neverland* (2004)*,* it is not - like the theatre - an artwork in its own right 'because it would be mindless' (p. 119).

In Carroll's model, the token performance is considered an artwork in itself, which co-exists with the production it generates, which is also a work of art. By this logic, one might argue that a single performance of *Beauty and the Beast* would generate a production that is reproduced; however, the thousands of international token performances that allow access to this are also unique artworks. Carroll's argument allows one to demonstrate that even highly commercial theatre productions that are simultaneously staged in more than one location cannot be regarded within an economy of reproduction. These instances preserve their own ontology by relying on human agency to generate the required tokens to point to the only potentially reproducible element, which is the design and organisation of the production itself.

Auslander's placement of the theatre within his Baudrillard-inspired model of cultural economy is flawed, and therefore one must question his assertions on the dominance of the moving image over the theatre. Particularly problematic is Auslander's claim that when the moving image artefact is combined with the live theatre, 'audience perception may inevitably be

drawn to a screen even when there are human beings also present' (2008, p. 40). On the balance of the problems I have identified in his supporting argument, I would argue that Auslander's methodology is not a useful alternative to that of intermediality. As such, I will proceed to outline an alternative methodology that challenges Auslander's assertion that the moving image - when placed in the theatre - re-frames the performance due to 'the cultural dominance of the screened image at this historical moment' (2005, p. 1).

4. A NEW METHODOLOGY

After presenting his formula on the use of technology in the theatre - 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual' - in the first edition of *Liveness* (1999), Auslander was challenged to an explanation in an interview for *Performance Paradigm* in March 2005. Defending his rhetoric, Auslander insisted that the formula be understood in context, and advised that it was located in a section devoted to 'how different media interact in multimedia performances' (2005, p. 1).[68] In the interview, Auslander explains that a hierarchy of prestige amongst media in a cultural economy of reproductions extends into the theatrical event itself; this is based on his model of cultural dominance which, as I have already argued, is flawed. Nonetheless, this paradigm of cultural economy leads Auslander to assert that in a mixed-media performance, elements 'do not interact with one another as equals' (2005, p. 1). On the balance of my analysis of Auslander's simulation model, one can already invalidate these claims by demonstrating that the theatre is not placed in an order of simulacra where it defers to the image, and that human agency remains a compelling quality of the theatrical event. However, this makes urgent the task of finding an alternative methodology through which to observe how the normative experience of the moving image synthesises with that of the theatre. It is thus relevant for my enquiry that Auslander's

---

[68] In *Liveness*, Auslander explains his meaning in describing 'mixed-media performances' as 'events combining live and mediatized representations: live actors with film, video, or digital projections, for instance' (2008, p. 40n).

interview in *Performance Paradigm* reveals the extent to which his formula relies on the scholarship of sociologist Erving Goffman in order to describe the normative experiences of media as normative 'frames'.

On the balance of this revelation, I would argue that Auslander relies on a narrow reading of Goffman's *Frame Analysis* (1986) in order to justify his formula 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual'. In particular, he relies upon Goffman's model of the 'primary frame' to argue that when moving image technology is employed in the theatre, the dominant media will re-frame the performance:

> [...] because video and digital media currently possess greater cultural presence than live bodies, they become the framing elements of any performance that incorporates both. The live elements will be perceived through the frame – they will be seen in terms of the video or digital media, not the other way around. (Auslander, 2005, p. 1)

Whilst Auslander acknowledges that a viewer's attention can oscillate between the human body and the moving image throughout the distribution of time in a performance, he asserts that the event will be read through its primary frame, which he argues would be the culturally dominant media (2005, p. 2). This is a highly questionable assertion that reveals how Auslander's reading of Goffman neglects essential arguments contained in *Frame Analysis.* However, these neglected arguments are essential to my own methodology that also considers the moving image as a mediatized cultural artefact whose grammars and modes of consumption can synthesise with those of the theatrical event.

NORMATIVE FRAMES

Goffman argues that when 'an individual in our Western society recognizes a particular event, he tends, whatever else he does, to imply in his response [...] one or more frameworks of schemata of interpretation of a kind that can be called primary' (1986, p. 21). I would argue that the normative experience - or frame - of the moving image in the theatre would, as Goffman describes, render 'what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful' (1986, p. 21). The meaning acquired from the moving image in the theatre's

mise-en-scène would rely on its culturally ingrained codes of participation, which would be understood in relation to experiences of cinema, television, and interactive media. Despite this, Auslander's logic of dominance complicates Goffman's theory by asserting that the theatre is itself re-framed by the moving image. I would argue that Auslander's is not an acceptable conclusion, and would argue instead that the normative frame of the moving image is an essential element of its creative use in the theatre.

In *Frame Analysis,* Goffman argues that the individual participant in an event can be "wrong" in his interpretations', but that in most cases the 'individual in our society is effective' (1986, p. 26). Goffman indicates that we must therefore allow for interpretations that are 'misguided, out of touch, inappropriate, and so forth' (1986, p. 26). I would argue that on the balance of the flawed arguments that sustain Auslander's logic of dominance, his model of the moving image in the theatrical event must be regarded as one such anomalous reading. I would argue that by resisting human agency Auslander overlooks the compelling normative frame of the theatre itself, which includes grammars of theatrical space, human presence, and complex modes of spectatorship. To borrow Goffman's own musical analogy, Auslander ignores the vital key signature that demarcates the theatrical event socially, spatially, and temporally. I would argue that the theatre must be considered a clef that signposts the desire, expectation, and reading of a particular set of activities. I will therefore endeavour to establish a new methodology that takes into consideration both the normative experiences of the moving image as a cultural artefact, and the compelling normative frame of the theatre in order to ask new questions of their combination.

THE THEATRICAL KEY

Goffman's chapter on 'keying' in *Frame Analysis* is a notable omission from Auslander's reading. This chapter observes human activities in various 'keys', within which accepted circumstances act as key signatures for the behaviour in question. I would argue that this model

78

provides a useful starting-point for regarding the moving image in the theatre. Furthermore, I would argue that the notion of the theatrical 'key' provides a more effective framework than the 'hypermedium' promoted by Chapple, Kattenbelt and Boenisch, as it allows for a number of mediating tests that are considered 'theatrical', and which considerably alter the experience of the moving image whilst simultaneously allowing the normative frame of the projected film or video to alter the experience of the theatre itself. Rather than producing a meta-text for scrutiny, a theatrical 'key' invites scholarly focus on the synthesis of the traditional distribution of time and space in the experience of both theatre and moving image media. In relation to Auslander's model of framing, the notion of a theatrical 'key' resists the dominance of the mediatized moving image whilst continuing to incorporate its cultural paraphernalia.

Explaining the experience of 'keys', Goffman indicates that the body is 'too constantly present as a resource to be managed in accordance with only one primary framework' (1986, p. 37). He proposes that we observe 'keys' in various activities:

> I refer here to the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else. This process of transcription can be called keying. (1986, p. 43-44)

A useful example posited by Goffman is the stage fight - or play fighting - where we observe an activity that might regarded as violent and unacceptable within the key of 'play' or 'make-believe', thus rendering it harmless (p. 45). As such, Goffman describes 'brackets in time', and also 'spatial brackets', which demarcate the boundaries of numerous keys in which all human activities are framed (p. 45). He demonstrates that the distribution of time in an event is inevitably too complex to observe a single primary frame or key, as Auslander does in his formula 'Dance+Virtual=Virtual'. Goffman uses the example of a game of draughts that might be described by a statement such as 'They're playing checkers'; Goffman indicates that such a phrase might 'override what it is that is happening now in regard to the strategic situations of the two players' (1986, p. 47). In the same way, the frame of a theatrical experience might seem

fixed but, taking 'keying' into consideration, becomes malleable within its own distribution of time. As such, the moving image can be accommodated within the theatre as a cultural - and mediatized - artefact without re-framing the perception of the theatrical event; instead I would argue that the multimedia theatre presents a moving image frame in the key of theatre.

Goffman offers his own analysis of theatre, arguing that performances 'can be distinguished according to their purity, that is, according to the exclusiveness of the claim of the watchers on the activity they watch' (1986, p. 125). In this sense, the 'theatrical' is sustained and dependent upon the agency of the viewers and performers who form a communion. Goffman also argues that the theatre-goer must sustain 'untheatrical activity' during the performance (p. 129). Making a distinction between an individual's behaviour as a 'theatregoer' and 'onlooker', Goffman demonstrates that a number of activities involved in the participation in a theatrical event sustain its key signature (1986, p. 131). A variety of conventions such as purchasing tickets, travelling to a specific location, depositing articles in a cloakroom, ordering interval drinks, and finding one's seats all serve - amongst other things - to define an experience as 'theatrical'. On the balance of this, I would argue that in multimedia theatre, the moving image's frame is presented within a theatrical key that is sustained by the activities of the 'theatregoer'. At the same time, in their simultaneous capacity as an 'onlooker', the viewer might oscillate between a number of strategies of spectatorship for consuming both mediatized and live frames.[69] These strategies reflect the viewer's participation not only in theatre culture, but in a

---

[69] It is important to note that I am not the first to adopt Goffman's notion of keying in relation to the theatre. Gay McAuley has done so in her study *Space in Performance* (1999), where she draws on Goffman's model that, she argues, defines 'the situation' of the theatre and enables ' us to make sense of what is occurring' (1999, p. 39). McAuley also draws on the idea of 'keying' in order to argue that 'Theatre in Western society has traditionally been very strongly keyed and framed': 'The behaviour of actors onstage is marked; spectators know that it is to be interpreted differently from apparently identical behaviours occurring in other places. Spectators in the theatre both believe and disbelieve, they play a game in which they permit themselves to believe to a certain extent what is occurring, they can even be moved to tears by this, but at the same time they know that it is not real, or rather, that it is both not real (a fiction) and real (the actors are really present, "in the flesh," the common phrase insisting onthe materiality of physical presence)' (1999, pp. 39-40). Despite McAuley's citation of Goffman in her study of the theatrical event, the notion of keying has not been adapted to the study of the moving image in the theatre.

mediatized culture where the codes of participation, and the grammars of the moving image, are learnt.

NEW QUESTIONS

It is relevant that Goffman argues that all 'frames involve expectations of a normative kind as to how deeply and fully the individual is to be carried into the activity organized by the frames' (1986, p. 345). This statement raises questions as to how the onlooker participates within the frame of the moving image, or that of the theatre, when combined in a theatrical key. Exploring these frames must take into consideration the relationship between the spectator and the performer in marking and mediating the material reality of the theatre. McAuley demonstrates this relationship, arguing that theatre 'consists of human beings in a defined space watched by other human beings'; adding that this 'constitutes the basic apparatus of theatre' (1999, p. 245). This rhetoric harks back to Peter Brook's maxim: that a 'man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged' (Brook, 1990, p. 11). Kennedy has questioned the simplicity of Brook's statement, arguing that if this were indeed 'all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged', then 'any observation anywhere of one person by another would qualify' (Kennedy, 2009, p. 5). This is perhaps an unfair scrutiny, as Brook himself writes that 'to use two hours of public time is a fine art' (Brook, 1990, p. 35). Brook's indication that the theatre is a 'fine art' is too often overlooked in studies of the multimedia theatre which often focus on the activity of the moving image at the expense of the normative grammars of the theatrical frame. It is too easily forgotten that the multimedia theatre is as much part of theatre culture as media-culture, and as such I will endeavour to describe the normative language of the stage in relation to that of the moving image frame.

CHAPTER 2:
THE CLASH OF KEYS AND LANGUAGES

1. THEATRE AND FILM LANGUAGE

Both the moving image and the theatre can be considered as primary frames in the multimedia *mise-en-scène*. Despite their independent systems of communication, I have demonstrated that in theatre they are both encompassed within a 'key' which is always theatrical. It is useful to re-iterate Erving Goffman's definition of the 'primary frame', which he describes as the perception of 'what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful' (1986, p. 21). In regards to the moving image in the theatre, I would argue that the 'meaning' of the frames contained within the theatrical key operate through communicative languages. This is a clear departure from Auslander who explicitly argues - via his flawed model of cultural economy - that film and theatre cannot be read as 'equally compelling languages' (2008, p. 40). I will use this chapter to interrogate the extent to which the 'grammars' of theatre and film language might be synthesised.

On the balance of my analysis so far, I will assume that the 'meaning' of the primary frame of the moving image is read in relation to its normative experience, which is a representational illusion of continuous space and time engendered by a grammar of editing (Orpen, 2003); (Dancyger, 2007). However, while the cinema has often been regarded both creatively and theoretically as a 'language', this definition has been more elusive in regards to the theatre. Gay McAuley has questioned the worth of describing theatre as a 'language' at all, understanding it instead as a 'dynamic process of communication in which the spectators are vitally implicated:

> [...] one that forms part of a series of interconnected processes of socially situated signification and communication, for theatre exists within a culture that it helps to construct, and it is the product of a specific work process. (McAuley, 1999, p. 7)

I would argue that the reciprocity of communication implicit in McAuley's statement does qualify as a creative 'grammar' of the theatre; however, I approach this cautiously, and intend to describe theatrical codes rather than define them. Approaches using the scientific methodology of semiotics have encountered various challenges that would distract from my enquiry.

Linguistic approaches to the multimedia theatre have been challenged when negotiating the separate frames of theatre and moving image; for example, Steve Dixon argues that the 'inclusion of media screens or digital projections introduces yet another coded sign system to the stage space, which further stimulates and complicates the decoding activity of the spectator' (2007, p. 336). This is further complicated as he argues that 'semioticians have long noted that theatrical performance constitutes one of the most complex forms of communication; tying together numerous elements' (2007, p. 336). While I would not disagree with this statement, I remain wary of Dixon's argument. My own enquiry seeks to understand the theatre's synthesis with the grammars of the moving image's primary frame; however, Dixon employs the scientific rhetoric of semiotics to describe an amalgamation of these frames:

> The semiotic relationship and tension between screen imagery, which we could call *A,* and the live performers, *B,* is most commonly interpreted as either formulating a *dialogic* relationship (*A* versus/in relation to *B*), or as establishing an *additive* combination which engenders something entirely new, namely *C,* (*A* + *B* = *C*).
> (Dixon, 2007, p. 336)

Dixon's argument implies that the moving image is a sign that is read as part of theatre's semiology to create relational or *'additive'* meaning. I would argue that these formulas are insufficient for my analysis, as they do not take into account the way the moving image might be read as a primary frame through its own normative grammars. Dixon's formulae may be valid in productions where the moving image is used as a scenic element, such as *The Coast of Utopia* and *Time and the Conways,* where it amalgamates with the theatre's visual cues to engender illusion. However, these instances do not describe instances where the primary frame of the moving image is employed to produce its own meaning; for example, where its representational cues create a separate spatial 'frame' in the theatrical event which is more cinematic.

I would argue that the synthesis of stage and screen is better served by descriptive models of theatre language. In doing so, one can describe the operation of theatrical space and the human performer in relation to the spatial grammars of editing and *mise-en-scène* in the moving image frame. Dixon's terminology, which is ultimately diffracted from a linguistic discourse, does not describe effectively the creative grammars of the stage and screen. As such, his formulae cannot account for the creative motivation of such a synthesis. Despite this, the semiotic approach favoured by Dixon has often been employed in the pursuit of theatre's 'language'. It is therefore important to introduce studies that indicate how theatrical space and 'presence' operate as compelling elements of stage grammar, but also to contextualise these within a discourse that has, at times, tended towards scientific analysis.

THEATRE AS A LANGUAGE

In *Languages of the Stage* (1982), Patrice Pavis argues that despite the scientific rhetoric employed in the semiologies of the theatre - such as 'sciences du spectacle' or '*Theaterwissenschaft*' – they can 'by no means claim a scientific status comparable to that of linguistics' (p. 25). However, he distinguishes and promotes semiotic approaches above '*Interpretative criticism*' which he argues is a '"wild" semiology' which reacts to 'performance as a receiver who judges only what is perceived' (p. 26). I do not wish to admit to a 'wild' methodology, but am more interested in approaches such as McAuley's *Space in Performance* (1999), which demonstrate how - for example - spatial configurations of the theatre function creatively. As such, I intend to demonstrate the moving image alongside a grammar of the theatrical frame that can be notated through a descriptive vocabulary similar to those that notate the editing conventions that produce meaning and illusion in film. Despite this, I would argue that the descriptions of meaning one encounters in the current discourse on theatrical space and presence must be described in the context of a central tenet of theatre semiology, which is a dualism between the material reality of the theatre and the 'text' which is activated within it (Pavis, 1982, p. 29); (De Toro, 1995, p. 3); (Ubersfeld, 1999, p. 3).

In *Reading Theatre* (1999), Anne Ubersfeld negotiates the 'highly refined textual creation' of the theatre, whilst contending with the problem of notating a 'practice whose strokes are broad, whose signs are vast, and in which redundancies are of the essence' (p. 3). Her methodology is the exploration of a *'text-performance opposition',* which explores the relationship between the material reality of the theatre and the text it represents in performance; she argues that 'the same tools are not used for the analysis of both' (pp. 4-5). But this dualism is a crucial component of the stage's 'grammar'; both Ubersfeld's study, and Fernando De Toro's *Theatre Semiotics* (1995), have demonstrated how communication in the theatre relies upon the indexing of theatre's reality as text.[70] According to De Toro, this communication is mediated by '*rules* of theatre production in the achievement of fiction' (1995, p. 55). He demonstrates that 'each scene depends very much on the index to spatialize and temporalize the discourse and dramatic situations' (p. 82). This is a useful approach, and I will continue to use the term 'index' to describe how real spaces are marked by the participatory conditions of the theatre. Despite this, De Toro's statements seem to privilege the textual creation of dramatic fiction in the theatre; this is a limited view of the stage's grammar if one considers recent paradigms of 'postdramatic' performance that do not presume to engender a fictional world (Lehemann, 2007). As such, I seek explanations of stage activity that activate its material spaces as compelling objects of focus and interest, as well as fictional ones. With no pretence of scientific accuracy, I explore the material/text dualism encountered in theatre semiology in order to consider the grammar of the stage as a creative solution to the 'marking' of the theatre's material reality. However, this is inevitably complicated by a number of factors outside the creative grammar of the stage including the connotations and history of theatre's buildings and modes of production (McAuley, 1999, pp. 24-25); (Knowles, 2004); (McAuley, 2006); (Hill & Paris, 2006).

---

[70] De Toro's own semiotic study of the theatre also puts emphasis on the audience's participation in this 'dual function', identifying 'literary practice' and 'performance practice' as separate dimensions of the 'theatre object' (1995, p. 3).

In this chapter I will draw upon a number of studies that offer revelations that assist in the notation of the language of mediating the theatre's spaces and performers to create the meaning of the theatrical frame. In doing so I will relate these paradigms of indexing the stage and performers to the prevalent 'continuity grammar' of the moving image (Orpen, 2003); (Dancyger, 2007). A key text for my enquiry is Gay McAuley's *Space in Performance* (1999), which intervenes within the difficult discourse of theatre's semiology in order to define a more stable and effective grammar of theatrical space without recourse to linguistic terminology. Her work is therefore significant in defining a new vocabulary for the effective notation of theatrical spaces:

> Given the centrality of space in the performance experience, it is perhaps somewhat surprising to find that critics do not have a precise, widely shared vocabulary to enable them to name and to talk about the multiple dimensions of the way space functions in performance. (1999, p. 17)

While over a decade has passed since its publication, McAuley's vocabulary remains influential. Oddey and White's more recent volume *The Potentials of Spaces* (2006) draws on McAuley's model in their definition of the 'Performing Space' in the theatrical event; in doing so they also touch upon the reality/text dualism of theatre's grammar to argue that 'theatre is a place where fiction and reality come together to promote each other'(2006, p. 15). Again, however, one finds rhetoric that privileges the representational use of the stage; therefore I will examine the complex discourse of 'presence' in order to determine how theatrical spaces might be activated by the activities of the human performer. To do so I will draw on variety of texts on stage on presence, which reflect the difficulty found in defining it as a tangible element of the theatre. These include descriptive accounts of the actor's compelling stage 'presence', as described by Joseph Chaikin (1991) and more recently by Jane Goodall (2008). I will contextualise these against the most important recent interventions in this discourse: Cormac Power's monograph *Presence in Play* (2008), and *The Presence Project*. [71] In doing so, I will demonstrate how selected

---

[71] *The Presence Project* was a research group managed by Gabriella Giannachi, Nick Kaye, Mel Slater, and Michael Shanks. - has provided a compilation of resources - now available via an online archive. The

revelations in these studies are interesting in regard to McAuley's taxonomy of theatrical space; I will therefore explore the implications of a grammar of presence and space in relation to the compelling language of the moving image. At times I draw on examples where the moving image has been used in performance; the vocabularies and paradigms I interrogate in this chapter will be continued in a close-analysis of Katie Mitchell's *Waves* in Chapter 3, and my notation of the moving image's expressive effects in Chapter 4. However, in this chapter I do not focus on a single case-study, but instead draw upon instances of the combination of stage and screen that I provide as illustrative examples through which to describe and examine combinations of these grammars. These are taken from my own work as a video designer for Out of the Blue's productions of *Mad Forest* (2007) and of *Celebrity* (2008), both staged at the York Theatre Royal Studio. I will not cite complex examples in this chapter, but selected basic situations of the combination of stage and screen in order to demonstrate how the normative grammars of theatre and film might be synthesised. However, to do so requires a demonstration of the way meaning is made in moving image media; therefore I will proceed by outlining the more widely notated discourse of film grammar.

FILM GRAMMAR

My exploration of theatre's grammar focuses on the ways in which theatrical space becomes activated as fictional and aesthetic spaces that might be considered a 'text'. It is therefore significant that the prevalent grammar of the moving image is motivated towards creating an illusion of a textual - and three-dimensional - space within a two-dimensional plane. This grammar has been described variously as 'classical continuity', 'continuity grammar', and the 'classical Hollywood' style in a number of studies (Arijon, 1976); (Orpen, 2003). This grammar has been explored in textbooks and manuals aimed at professional and casual

---

Presence Project included performance work by Tim Etchells, Bella Merlin, Vaya Naidu, Mike Pearson, Mike Brookes, Fiona Templeton, and Philip Zarrilli. The group presented two exercises at UCL's CAVE, and created an archive of Lyn Hersham's virtual performances in Second Life entitled 'Life to the Second Power'. An international conference 'Performing Presence: From the Live to the Simulated' was held in Exeter in 2009.

readerships (Spottiswoode, 1950); (Reisz and Millar, 1967); (Crittenden, 1981); (Katz, 1991); (Holmes 2004); (Chandler, 2009). Scholarly engagement with film language has also privileged this grammar as the normative experience of making meaning using the moving image (Metz; 1974); (Wyver, 1989); (Hedges, 1991); (Wollen, 1998); (Lothe, 2000); (Fairservice, 2001); (Dancyger, 2007); (Bordwell, 2002); (Orpen, 2003); (Baudry & Cohen, 2004); (Enticknap, 2005).

In the scholarly discourse of film language, Christian Metz has remained an influential voice in locating the language of cinema in editing practices.[72] Though providing a semiotic analysis of the moving image, Metz interrogates the validity of this methodology, arguing that, unlike everyday speech, 'the cinema has no *distinctive* units':

> It does not have anything corresponding to the phoneme or to the relevant phonic feature on the level of expression, nor, on the level of content, does it have anything equivalent to the seme in Algirdas Julien Greimas's sense, or in Bernard Pottier's sense.'
> (Metz, 1973, p. 75)

Metz considers the individual shot as a 'sentence', and not a single word; he argues that editing combines these sentences into a 'discourse that constitutes the whole film', and which 'takes on a value greater than its own and is increased by the additional meaning it receives' (Metz, 1973, p. 75). The combination of shots to establish spatial continuity in narrative film is thus based upon this principle; however, the practice and development of 'continuity grammar' pre-dates these attempts to notate it, and has evolved into a sophisticated language of the moving image throughout the twentieth century since its methods were first utilised in the silent cinema (Dancyger, 2007). Ken Dancyger's history of editing locates the origins of this language in the work of early twentieth century directors Edwin S. Porter and D. W. Griffith (Dancyger, 2007, pp. 4-5). He credits Porter with the discovery of the shot as the 'basic building block of the film'

---

[72] Metz has been credited as invoking semiotics in film theory, and rejecting claims that film language could be comparable to 'natural language'; Baudry and Cohen argue that for 'Metz film does not simply reveal reality; it describes it in a language' (Baudry and Cohen, 2004, p. 4).

(p. 4). [73] Since these early experiments, 'classical continuity' has become the predominant grammar of editing in Western cinema and television.[74]

Of interest to my enquiry into the normative frame of the moving image in theatrical space, is the way 'classical continuity' is motivated towards an illusion of fictional space. Therefore a significant quality of continuity grammar is the effort made to conceal the process that sustains it. This has been explained in Valerie Orpen's recent study *Film Editing: The Art of the Expressive* (2003), in which she argues that continuity grammar is a 'connective process' that involves 'the joining of shots to form a whole' (Orpen, 2003. p. 1). She argues that the goal of continuity style is to conceal the technique of editing, rendering it invisible:

> Since classical cinema's main purpose is supposedly to tell a story coherently and without distractions, it follows that continuity editing is not intended to be noticed, or rather, should never be obtrusive without good reason. (Orpen, 2003, p. 16)

As an invisible component of the normative frame of the moving image, one must consider editing as a process for establishing indexes between individual shots in order to sustain an illusion of spatial and temporal continuity. It is therefore essential to demonstrate this process, which has been outlined in detail in Karl Reisz and Gavin Millar's classic textbook *The Technique of Film Editing* (1967).[75]

Reisz and Millar outline the process of assembling an edited sequence in the continuity style. They reveal that the editor should first assemble 'a rough cut in which the order of shots

---

[73] Dancyger provides *The Life of an American Fireman* (1903) and *The Great Train Robbery* (1903) as examples of Porter's pioneering editing techniques. However, Valerie Orpen has argued an alternative origin whereby continuity grammar emerged from 'the first newsreels': '[...] seemingly disjointed events would appear to follow a narrative structure, disorder would became ordered and would acquire meaning. Continuity editing was subsequently adopted in fiction films to allow the narrative to flow coherently and to enhance narrative comprehension' (2003, p. 17).

[74] Orpen argues that while 'continuity editing' is equated with Hollywood cinema, 'all Western national cinemas, particularly commercial or popular, rely on it to a large extent' (2003, p. 16).

[75] Dancyger introduces his history of film editing with an account of Karel Reisz *The Technique of Film Editing*, which he describes was written in collaboration with a British Film Academy committee (Dancyger, 2007, p. xvii). Dancyger argues that 'Reisz's strategic decision to sidestep the theoretical debate on the role of editing in the art of film allowed him to explore creative achievements'; he argues that by doing so, 'he provided the professional and student with a vital guide to the creative options that editing offers' (p. xvii). Dancyger argues that the book was unique in being written from a 'filmmaker's point of view', and it has widely influenced discourse and practice in 'France and the United States' (p. xvii). Dancyger relates his own book 'in spirit', to 'the Reisz-Millar classic' (p. xvii).

makes film sense', following this, they dictate that the editor should refine the 'continuity of the rough cut in such a way that it becomes dramatically as well as physically appropriate' (1967, p. 216). For Reisz and Millar, the desirable edit between shots is 'mechanically smooth'; they describe this in detail:

> Making a smooth cut means joining two shots in such a way that the transition does not create a noticeable jerk and the spectator's illusion of seeing a continuous piece of action is not interrupted. (p. 216)

Reisz and Millar argue that the 'mechanically smooth' joining of shots is the 'most elementary requirement' of continuity (p. 216). They argue that achieving this requires a careful 'matching' of shots which, crucially, sustains a spatial index between them; they identify a number of factors that might complicate this task, stating that the 'action and movement shown in consecutive shots' should be 'accurately continuous':

> If an actor starts a movement - say he is half way through opening a door - in one shot, then that movement must be continued in the next from the precise moment it was left. If the editor cuts the two strips of film together in such a way that a part of the action is duplicated in the two shots the effect will appear unnatural. Equally, if he skips a piece of action - say he cuts from the shot where the door is half open to another where it is already closed - there will be a noticeable jump in the continuity and the cut will not be smooth. (p. 217)[76]

Reisz and Millar also describe effective continuity being contingent on the smooth matching of art direction, cinematography, and lighting in each shot; they warn that the 'sheer physical difference in the light and shade values' of shots that are carelessly lit 'will draw the spectator's attention to the transition and result in a harsh cut' (1967, p. 226).

A sequence in the classical continuity style is successful if the spatial indexes engendered by the editing sustain a convincing illusion of a fictional space; however, Reisz and Millar demonstrate the added complication of indexing the people and objects photographed by

---

[76] This has been described more recently by Bordwell, who argues that 'Establishing and re-establishing shots situate the actors in the locale. An axis of action governs the actors' orientations and eyelines, and the shots, however different in angle, are taken from one side of that axis. The actors' movements are matched across cuts, and as the scene develops the shots get closer to the performers, carrying us to the heart of the drama' (Bordwell, 2002, p. 16).

the camera within this fictional space. Their solution demonstrates conventions on the selection and ordering of individual 'shots':

> In general, it is true to say that a sequence which introduces a new locale should start by establishing the topographical relationship between the players and the background. After this, the various close shots, in which individual characters and objects are singled out for closer inspection, will be seen by the spectator as part of the larger surroundings which have already been shown. (Reisz and Millar, 1967, p. 225)[77]

In addition to these conventions of spatial continuity, there are a number of more complex conventions that apply to editing dialogue sequences. Orpen has provided a recent explanation of the '180° rule' of classical continuity, which requires that the placement of the camera must not be perceived to 'cross an imaginary line' called 'the axis of action' or the 'centre line' (Orpen, 2003, p. 17).[78] She demonstrates how this convention establishes continuity in an edited dialogue sequence:

> Temporal continuity is conveyed through *eye-line matches* and *matches on action* which confirm that action or movement in two distinct shots was continuous or simultaneous. These matches are extremely effective because our eye and attention are sufficiently held by the action or gaze for the cut to be successfully camouflaged. (2003, p. 17)

On the balance of these descriptions, one might argue that the continuity style creates a compelling three-dimensional space within the two-dimensional plane of the moving image if these strict rules are adhered to. However, recent studies of the ongoing development of this normative grammar of the moving image demonstrate a reduced requirement for spatial indexing, to the extent that less information is now required to engender a fictional film space.

---

[77] There are, of course, exceptions to this rule that are often a desirable disruption of this grammar. Reisz and Millar demonstrate that a 'director will deliberately *start* a sequence on a close shot of a detail and only later reveal it in relation to the larger setting' (p. 225). Furthermore, the role of sound editing is of profound importance, as continuous sound over problematic cuts can improve the illusion of continuity. (1967, p. 227)

[78] In my own training as a director the notion of 'crossing the line' is enforced in a number of texts, including the comprehensive grammar of camerawork demonstrated in the 12-volume DVD series 'Hollywood Camera Work' by Per Holmes. Orpen argues that crossing the line 'happens quite frequently and is not the result of incompetence, but is intentional (2003, p. 17). Orpen describes how 'Japanese classical cinema, used different conventions which did not consider the 180° demarcation line as problematic for spatial comprehension (p. 16).

Reisz and Millar insist that for the purposes of clarity and continuity 'it is still necessary that each shot should remain on the screen long enough to be intelligible (1967, p. 242). However, it is striking that in recent decades these necessities have become less important, and that even abridged forms of continuity style result in acceptable sequences that can be read as compelling spaces. David Bordwell has recently described how the rate of cutting in continuity sequences has become increasingly fast since the 1990s (Bordwell, 2002). [79] These developments have led him to question whether 'rapid cutting' has led to a '"post-classical" breakdown of spatial continuity?' (2002, p. 17)[80] However, Bordwell finds that the opposite is actually true, and identifies practices in films post-1990 that often omit shots that might previously have been perceived as vital for a successful continuity sequence. He argues that these edits rely on the missing information being 'filled-in' by the spectator, naming the style 'intensified continuity':

> Far from rejecting traditional continuity in the name of fragmentation and incoherence, the new style amounts to an *intensification* of established techniques. Intensified continuity is traditional continuity amped up, raised to a higher pitch of emphasis. It is the dominant style of American mass-audience films today. (Bordwell, 2002, p. 16)

Bordwell argues that 'virtually every contemporary mainstream production will exhibit' these qualities (2002, p. 20).[81] This demonstrates how ingrained the normative experience of the moving image has become, that its spatial indexing has become less a result of its editing, but an inherent quality of its frame. As such, one might argue that the moving image in the theatrical

---

[79] Bordwell measures the number of shots in Hollywood feature films throughout the twentieth century: 'Between 1930 and 1960, most Hollywood feature films, of whatever length, contained between 300 and 700 shots, so the average shot length (ASL) hovered around eight to eleven seconds' (2002, p. 16). 'In the mid- and late 1960s, several American and British filmmakers were experimenting with faster cutting rates' (p. 17). 'At the close of the 1980s, many films boasted 1500 shots or more. There soon followed movies containing 2000-3000 shots, such as *JFK* (1991)(p. 17). 'By century's end, the 3000-4000 shot movie had arrived (*Armageddon*, 1998; *Any Given Sunday,* 1999)' (p. 17). 'Today, most films are cut more rapidly than at any other time in U. S. studio filmmaking. Indeed, editing rates may soon hit a wall; it's hard to imagine a feature-length narrative movie averaging less than 1.5 seconds per shot' (p. 17).
[80] Bordwell uses the term 'classical continuity' to describe the 'ways in which today's films represent space' (2002, p. 16).
[81] Bordwell argues that while the facets of this style have often 'irritated critics', these detractors have not appreciated how techniques of camera-work and editing 'work together to constitute a distinct set of choices' (2002, p. 16). Bordwell identifies the combination of a fast 'cutting rate', and the choice of shots that acquired using extreme 'lens lengths', adding that the use of tight close-up shots is one of 'the most pervasive features of intensified continuity' (2002, p. 20).

event always engenders a 'film space' regardless of whether editing techniques are used to acheive this.

It is significant that Bordwell identifies a relationship between the 'intensified continuity' style and the development of digital editing workflows in 1990s. He argues that editing 'very brief shots on celluloid is labor-intensive and complicated, since trims only a few frames long can easily go astray'; by editing digitally, editors 'can easily shave shots frame by frame, a process known as "frame-fucking"' (2002, p. 23). The implication of the increased precision has revealed that continuity grammar has become sophisticated to the point that it remains comprehensible and effective in establishing spatial indexes even when skipping entire 'sentences' in a sequence:

> At any moment, stylistic tactics may come forward, but viewers remain in the grip of the action. The mannerism of today's cinema would seem to ask its spectators to take a high degree of narrational overness for granted, to let a few familiar devices amplify each point, to revel in still more flamboyant displays of technique – all the while surrendering to the story's expressive undertow. (Bordwell, 2002, p. 25)

Bordwell's article demonstrates the extent to which spatial and narrative indexes can be sustained with what one might describe as an 'abbreviated' grammar. On the balance of these recent developments, and the descriptions of spatial indexing provided by Reisz and Millar's classical text, I would argue that – in relation to the theatre - the moving image must be regarded not only as an artefact within theatrical space, but as a space – or a number of spaces – itself. This raises urgent questions regarding the way this normative experience of film space might create meaning alongside theatrical space.

2. THEATRE SPACE AND THE MOVING IMAGE

My identification of a film space in the theatre is not the first attempt to do so; Steve Dixon has argued that in 'live multimedia theater, projection screens or video monitors frame additional spaces' (2007, p. 335). This is a valid statement that highlights a key question

regarding the combination of the stage and screen's normative frames. The theatre takes place in a single material space, whereas the moving image – as demonstrated by the conventions of continuity grammar – is not restricted by its two-dimensional plane and can engender any number of fictional spaces. This leads Dixon to argue that, 'despite the flatness of the screen frame, projected media' can 'offer more spatial possibilities than three-dimensional theater space' (2007, p. 335). Implicit in this statement is an assumption that the text represented by theatre's material space is representational, and therefore restricted in comparison to the locales that might be engendered by the screen. I would argue that this fails to take into consideration the variety of ways theatre space can be activated by its inhabitants. While Dixon is correct to argue that the spatial grammars of the moving image allow instantaneous changes of place in a representational capacity, the activity of space in the theatre is more complex he allows here.[82] I will therefore demonstrate how Dixon's intermedial approach to film and theatre spaces is questionable in light of the current discourse of spatiality. In doing so I will set upon a close-reading of McAuly's taxonomy of theatrical space, and use this vocabulary to ask questions of the combination of stage and screen grammars.

SPACE IN THE THEATRE

The study of theatre's spaces has generated a considerable discourse, yet many of the scholarly trajectories taken in these studies do not fall within the province of this thesis. For example, the vocabularies that I will present in this chapter cannot comprehensively solve the problems of notating the sheer variety and history of theatrical spaces; these have been explored in far more detail in a number of studies that – while do not form part of this thesis - have informed my approach (Leacroft, 1973); (Leacroft and Leacroft, 1984); (Reid, 1998); (Jackson, 2004); (McAuley, 2006). I must also concede that the changing culture of theatrical space, and its relation to the sociological codes of space in general, do not form the focus of my

---

[82] Dixon's *Digital Performance* (2007) devotes a section to 'Space', which is less useful to my study as it focuses more upon virtual and 'telematic' performances than mainstream live theatre practice.

study. The assumptions that I bring to my own analysis are based on a number of studies on the ecology of space in society and its relation to the theatre (Kern, 1983); (Schivelbusch, 1986); (Augè, 1995); (Couldry and McCarthy, 2004); (Bulson, 2007). A key omission from my thesis is the discourse of stage design, which would complicate the focus of my study. My assumptions on the history and practice of scenography are informed by a number of works (Jones and Macgowan, 1923); (Fuerst and Hume, 1928); (Cole, 1963); (Craig, 1968); (Kirby, 1969); (Kirby, 1969b); (Burian, 1971); (Dietrich, 1972); (Hodge, 1972); (Tidworth, 1973); (Burian, 1984); (Goodwin, 1989); (Svoboda, 1993); (Reid, 1998); (Watt, 1998); (Baugh, 2005); (Dixon, 2007); (McKinney and Butterworth, 2009). Rather than intervening in these discourses of theatre space, I will concentrate on revelations on the way space communicates in the theatrical event.

I have already introduced McAuley's *Space in Performance* (1999) as major text for my enquiry, and a study that remains relevant to contemporary discourse. Also drawing on Goffman's notion of the primary frame (see Chapter 1), she states that the theatre is a 'social event, occurring in the auditorium as well as on the stage'; crucially, McAuley argues that the 'primary signifiers' of the theatre are 'physical and even spatial in nature' (1999, p. 5). I would argue that film space must be regarded alongside the physical and textual spaces that McAuley describes. However, recent scholarship drawing on the assumptions of intermediality has used McAuley's study as a foundation to observe an '*intermedial stage'* that engenders spaces between media (Wiens, 2010b, p. 91). I have already demonstrated that the assumptions which lie behind this discourse render it questionable in relation to wider theatre culture; therefore I would challenge arguments that regard an 'intermedial space' between theatre and film.

INTERMEDIAL SPACE

Birgit Wiens' brief essay on 'Spatiality' (2010b), published in TIWG's most recent volume, cites McAuley's study to establish that 'space is now seen to function as an "active agent" and co-player in theatre events' (p. 91). After briefly laying out McAuley's model -

whereby the theatre must be read as a series of interactions between the architectural, scenic, performative, and dramatic spaces within it – Wiens adds that 'digital media and global communication networks' have 'heralded a new spatial turn' (2010b, p. 91). While it is certainly valid to re-contextualise McAuley's study in light of cultural changes in the first decade of the twentieth century, I would argue that Wiens' conclusion, that one now encounters an *'intermedial stage'*, is problematic. The assumption behind this is the 'meta-text' perceived between medialities as described by Boenish (2006) and Dixon (2007). Indeed, one finds a similar argument concerning the moving image in the theatre in Dixon's *Digital Performance* (2007), where he argues that the 'conjunction of live performance and digital imagery can produce a particular, hybrid form', in which he describes a 'sense of *in-between-ness*':

> […] a liminal space operating between the screen images and live performers - is often the essential kernel, what one might even call the "metatext" of digital theater production. (2007, p. 337)

On the balance of my previous arguments concerning the discourse of intermediality (see Chapter 1), I strongly doubt the validity of Dixon's assumption that a 'meta-text' becomes the object of interest in a combination of theatre space and film space.[83] The notation of this 'meta-text' between the spaces of film and theatre are motivated towards ideological and philosophical revelations on contemporary media culture that rely on a highly specialised participation in theatrical events (see Chapter 1). For example, Wiens' essay asks new questions of 'media spaces' as areas of revelation:

> The challenge is really to understand the interpenetration of differently constructed spaces and the concepts engaged within them: connectivity; presence; telepresence and absence; perception and teleperception; and new performance

---

[83] Indeed, Dixon's examples in his study privilege productions that explicitly explore the 'meta-text'; his examples include the 'Postmodern Theatrical Spectacle' of theatre-company 'The Builders Association' (pp. 343-351). However, his analysis of 'George Coates Performance Works' video designs, and the work of Robert Lepage provides a more mainstream theatrical consideration of space. Dixon's analysis of the work of George Coates Performance Works is useful, but demonstrates how projection technology has been utilised to execute tricks and trompe l'oeil effects (p. 339). Dixon positions their work in the tradition of Svoboda's Laterna Magika and the discourse of *Gesamtkunstwerk* that stems from Wagner's writings on opera as the convergence of art forms (p. 341). Despite this contextualisation, Dixon does not attempt to describe how moving image grammars combine with the communicative media of theatre space.

modalities. The performativity of the intermedial theatron, in this respect, has to be analysed as a complex, heterogeneous and relational phenomenon. (2010b, p. 96)

I would argue that it is unhelpful to assume that the normative frames of stage and screen could engage the viewer to debate the 'concepts' that Wiens lists here. Only a specialised spectator participating in intermediality's narrow institutional frame of contemporary theatre culture could read these revelations in the theatrical event. However, an essay by Sigrid Merx in TIWG's first volume (2006) is striking in its examination of an 'intermedial space' in a production which does not 'stage the screen' in order to scrutinise its ideology as a cultural artefact, but in order to engender an accessible reflective experience that requires little specialisation. Despite this, the logic of an 'intermedial space' in Merx's account is still questionable.

Merx presents an account of Flemish director Guy Cassiers' production *Swann's way,* a theatrical adaptation of Marcel Proust's series of novels *A la recherché du temps perdu* (1913-1927)*.* Merx's essay seeks to observe 'the way time and memory are staged through the use of digital video technology' (2006, p. 67). Despite Merx's departure from the archive of postmodern works that explore mediatization - which make up the bulk of instances examined by TIWG - her analysis is eventually problematic in its reliance on the logic of intermediality:

> Quite literally, the *intermedial* is the empty space in which the invisible can become manifest. Instead of using this space for an explicit media critique, which of course would have been possible, Cassiers tries his best to leave the space empty, or should we say full with possibilities. (2006, p. 79)

Merx argues that the 'representation of memory and the process of remembering calls for an intermedial approach' (p. 67). Exploring this, Merx identifies the activation of a meta-text in an intermedial space she perceives between the theatre and moving image media used in Cassiers' production:

> Cassiers creates a sensory inner world, which electrifies the imagination and memories of the audience. By opposing live video to the physical present actor, the negative space in-between the image and the process of creating that image – the intermedial – is located. (Merx, 2006, p. 67)

97

Obeying the working group's principles of observing a text 'in-between' media, Merx's analysis perpetuates limiting assumptions on the theatre as a 'stage' for the screen. Merx argues that the 'empty' intermedial space in *Swann's Way* 'functions as a platform' in the theatre 'on which the individual experiences of all participants' can be "staged"' (2006, p. 67). Merx's study is not a revelation of the moving image's ideological codes, but the mediality of the specific ontologies of theatre and the moving image. This is a highly questionable methodology that fetishises the ontology of performance, and that of the mechanically reproduced artefact, to create a complex meaning.

Merx argues that 'video and theatre each have their own possibilities of representing time and creating time experiences as a result of their ontological differences' (2006, p. 71). Demonstrating this, Merx establishes the theatre as 'a live performance in which actor and audience are simultaneously physically present', and defines video as an 'electronic device, which can record and play' (2006, p. 71). As many of the video images she notates in Cassiers' production are created live onstage using cameras, she puts pressure on these ontological distinctions and concludes that the moving image 'can take place in the absolute now, but not in the absolute here of actor and audience' (2006, p. 71). Merx thus identifies these ontologies as part of the mediality of stage and screen, therefore finding them 'staged' in an intermedial space which she argues 'draws the attention to the relationship between the physically present and the mediatized' (2006, p. 72). By this logic, she argues that the 'most important result of the interaction between live video and the physical present actor', is the connection 'established between the past and the present' (2006, p. 78). Merx's conclusion fetishises the ontologies of the media combined, attaching the creative motivation of their synthesis to the clash of their specific medialities:

> It seems to me that the greatest potential of live video, not only in this performance but in every live performance, is to install in us an awareness of the liveness of theatre. Live video in live performance can remind us of the fact that 'this is live'. 'this is now'. Live video can make us remember that we are in the theatre. (2006, p. 78)

This is an intriguing statement, but one that offers insufficient explanation of the 'awareness of liveness'; Merx's argument works on assumptions that the theatre is a 'hypermedium' that can stage the screen without mediating it, and that an 'intermedial' space can be activated between media. I would argue that a more valid approach would eschew the 'intermedial space', which is not part of the normative spatial experience of the theatrical event. As such, Merx's spatial logic is only valid in the institutional frame of intermedia theatre where the incorporation of the moving image is motivated and received within accepted principles of intermediality.

Rather than fetishise media for their specific ontologies - and instead of scrutinising 'intermedial spaces' between them - I would argue that the combination of stage and screen might be better understood by outlining how 'space' and 'presence' function as grammars of the theatre. The descriptive vocabularies offered by these two discourses - combined with those that describe the moving image's normative frame - can better describe how action, meaning and interest can be creatively manipulated by makers of multimedia theatre for the purposes of narrative, dramatic action and pleasure.

METHODOLOGY

My methodology for interrogating the synthesis of stage and screen's spatial grammars does not seek the intermedial spaces described by Wiens, Dixon and Merx. Instead I argue that a grammar of activation and indexing operates in the multimedia theatre. I propose that theatre spaces are activated by stage and spectator activities, which in turn index the moving image frame within a theatrical key. The spatial indexes of the moving image are thus able to operate through their own normative system, inviting the spectator to consume these cues as film language. However, one must also then regard the moving image's activity in relation to theatre's spaces, only then can the multimedia theatrical event be regarded as a complete text. This route of exchange gives credence to both languages of stage and screen, furthermore it appreciates the normative implications of consuming these media's grammars, thus allowing a

comprehension of meaning that is compatible with both a mediatized culture, and a theatre culture that is more accessible than the specialised institutional frame of intermediality. To explore this activation model, I lay-out McAuley's useful taxonomy of theatrical spaces, and explore her revelations in situations where theatre and moving image media are combined.

3. THE MOVING IMAGE AND MCAULEY'S TAXONOMY OF THEATRE SPACES

This section will explore McAuley's taxonomy of theatrical space in order to raise new questions regarding the synthesis of theatre's spaces with the moving image. McAuley's terminology describes the dualism between material reality and text in theatrical communication; her study was motivated by her perceived deficiency of descriptive vocabulary regarding space in theatre. She argues, for instance, that there is no term 'comparable to *character*, for the fictional place':

> [...] nor are there terms that will enable us to distinguish neatly between the fictional places represented onstage, those that are evoked through the offstage connection to the onstage and those that are referred to in the dialogue and which form part of the dramatic geography of the play [...] (1999, p. 17)

McAuley's statement begs the question of how the normative frame of the moving image – with its own spatial indexes – might form part of the theatrical event's 'dramatic geography'. This has been under-explored in contemporary scholarship, and studies of the theatre and technology that have embraced McAuley's model have - as I have examined previously - observed intermedial spaces, the reading of which is of limited validity. Here I outline McAuley's taxonomy of material and textual spaces that may be discerned in the theatrical event, and consider the implications of these for the moving image in the theatre.

THEATRE SPACE

McAuley begins with the architectural spaces of performance, defining these under the umbrella-term '*Theatre Space*'; while these spaces represent a material reality that is not

necessarily part of the 'text' of performance, it is significant that McAuley argues that they can index the reading of stage activity through their history and associations (1999, p. 24-25).[84] However, McAuley does not suggest how moving image technology in the theatre might be indexed by the associations of 'theatre space'. I would argue that the 'marking' of the moving image through the connotations of 'theatre space' is quite tangible, as the cultural context of a particular environment might engender alternative readings of the screen. This can be illustrated in the use of television monitors in Richard Norton-Taylor's *Called to Account: The Indictment of Anthony Charles Lynton Blair For the Crime of Aggression Against Iraq - A Hearing* (2007, London: Tricycle Theatre). This verbatim play presented edited transcripts of recorded proceedings of UK barristers Philippe Sands QC and Julian Knowles who 'tested the evidence of the grounds for an indictment ' of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair 'for the crime of aggression against Iraq' (Called to Account, Tricycle Theatre website, n.d.).[85] The testimonies and arguments for the prosecution and defence were compiled and edited into a play by Richard Norton-Taylor. A number of key witnesses and government figures were interviewed, and transcripts of these were performed by actors.[86] This play's use of video monitors must be perceived in relation to the associations of its 'theatre space' and what Knowles would describe as its 'cultural politics of location', 'production' and 'reception' (2004, p. 2).

One must consider *Called to Account* in the context of a number of verbatim plays written by Richard Norton Taylor and directed by Nicholas Kent which have been presented at the

---

[84] Ric Knowles makes similar arguments in his *Reading the Material Theatre* (2004).

[85] Verbatim theatre describes an English genre where plays are written from transcripts, often of interviews conducted by the theatre practitioner. The practice was first documented by Derek Paget in his essay 'Verbatim Theatre: Oral History and Documentary Techniques' (1987). See also (Bottoms, 2006); (Martin, 2006). In *Called to Account,* Kent and Norton-Taylor departed from using existing transcripts and established the investigation themselves to produce the material (De Jongh, 2007). This is also described in Susannah Clapp's review for *The Observer,* which mentions that 'Called to Account is not reconstruction but construction: it sets up its own trial - with lawyers from Cherie Blair's Matrix Chambers - to test the proposition that Tony Blair should be indicted for the crime of aggression against Iraq' (2007).

[86] The witnesses examined, and represented in this play included Sir Michael Quinlan - former Permanent Under-Secretary at the Ministry of Defence; Ex-Cabinet Minister Clare Short; Dean Kishore Mahbubani - Singaporean Ambassador to the U.N. Security Council in 2002; and Arms inspector Scott Ritter.

Tricycle Theatre.[87] These include *The Colour of Justice* (1999), which presents transcripts of the MacPherson inquiry which scrutinised the police investigation into the murder of black British teenager Stephen Lawrence in 1993, and *Justifying War: Scenes from the Hutton Inquiry* (2003), which presents a judicial inquiry that investigated the death of UN weapons expert David Kelly in 2003. These plays have led to the Tricycle Theatre's association with verbatim plays, and thus the political interventions that they seek to make.[88] Situated on Kilburn High Road in the London Borough of Brent, the theatre is geographically separated from the commercial and mainstream theatre's of London's West-End, and also from the subsidised activities of the Royal National Theatre.[89] The associations of The Tricycle Theatre's recent history and its location might, then, index activity within its theatrical events as a form of political intervention.[90] As such, one might argue that what McAuley identifies as 'theatre space' indexes the moving image in *Called to Account.* Six video monitors were distributed around the intimate 240-seat auditorium at easy-reading distance for the audience.[91] These displayed the articles of evidence presented in the enquiry as they were discussed and presented by the onstage characters. On the balance of critical responses to the production, one finds an assumed experience of political intervention. For example, Ian Shuttleworth argues that *Called to Account* 'is theatre both as

---

[87] Richard Norton Taylor practices as a journalist, and is currently security editor for *The Guardian* newspaper.

[88] This is reflected in press reactions to these plays; Chris Wiegand writing for *The Guardian* indicates that in 'recent years, the Tricycle in Kilburn has pioneered a potent style of verbatim, tribunal theatre, staging inquiries based on spoken evidence of such atrocities as Nuremberg, Srebrenica and Guantanamo (2007). Mark Brown states that 'Nicolas Kent and *Guardian* journalist Richard Norton-Taylor are well known for their powerful plays based on tribunal hearings' in an article on *Called to Account* written for online newspaper *Socialist Review* (2007)*.* Striking is the international reputation of the Tricycle theatre for verbatim plays; Alan Riding in *The New York Times* states that the 'public and critical response to many of these tribunal and verbatim plays seems to have vindicated the theater's approach' (April 26, 2007).

[89] Michael Coveney argues that Nicolas Kent's work at the Tricycle Theatre 'means that the theatre can be seens as a natural place to debate the nation's sense of itself' (2008, p. 181). Interestingly, Coveney argues that the National theatre has also become a place for political debate, which has put it at 'odds with the political certaities that fuelled' its initial "patrioric" concept when it was originally conceived (p. 181).

[90] This is particularly pertinent in this instance, where the production instigated the investigation into Tony Blair itself. In *The Guardian* newspaper, Michael Billington contextualised this against the Tricycle Theatre's previous work: 'The wheel comes full circle. Having initiated its own form of tribunal theatre in 1994 with the Scott Arms to Iraq inquiry, the Tricycle now asks whether Tony Blair should be indicted for the crime of aggression against Iraq'(2007).

[91] The number of monitors is verified in Tim Walker's review for the *Sunday Telegraph*; however, he mistakenly refers to them as 'overhead projectors'. Interestingly, he indicates that they were used to 'highlight key passages of text', but derides this rationale arguing that it made 'the actors seem all but superfluous' (2007).

confected sensation and as direct civic engagement' (2007); Susannah Clapp states that the 'tirbunal plays of the Tricycle' have 'tapped audiences directly into political events' (2007). Taking these assumptions into account, one might then also regard the video monitors in the Tricycle's theatre space as part of its implied intervention, offering new ways of involving the audience in the enquiry delivered onstage.[92] On the balance of this example, one could argue that the material conditions of the theatrical space, and its history and associations, can index the way the moving image is read in performance.

PRACTITIONER SPACE

Within the architectural space of the theatre, McAuley also identifies *'Practitioner space'*, which describes the area inhabited by the performers and stage crew who use its apparatus to generate a performance; this encompasses backstage areas, prop areas, and designated spaces for technical operators (1999, p. 26). It is significant that McAuley argues that 'practitioner space is significantly the least documented, least analyzed, least theorized area of theatre space' (1999, p. 26). McAuley does not demonstrate how moving image media might impact this area. I would argue that 'practitioner space' is significantly affected by the technical apparatus required in order to screen or project video or film. However, one cannot generalise on how the moving image encroaches on this area as each production is inevitably specific in its use of media technologies. Despite this, one might examine how 'practitioner space' incorporates the apparatus required for moving image production and projection, and how behaviour within this space is affected by media.

---

[92] Brown's article for *Socialist Review* includes interesting remarks on the engagement of the theatrical event in *Called to Account:* 'If the "liveness" of theatre creates a sense of tension and public debate which television can't achieve, perhaps that suggests that the theatre is closer to the courtroom than people might think' (2007). Despite this, these uses of video might also be regarded as a manipulative tactic. Many reviews question the validity of the politics of *Called to Account,* such as Benedict Nightingale's review that finds this play possessing 'less authority than its predecessors' (2007). Ian Shuttleworth claims that 'what we hear seems immensely one-sided' (2007). Siobham Murphy indicates that as a devised tribunal, 'there is no public record to check Norton-Taylor's editing against', she adds that participants who 'agreed to offer testimony often clearly had an agenda to pursue - raising the question of balance' (2007). Both Paul Taylor (2007) and John Nathan (2007) posit the problem of the theatre's lack of powers of subpoena. Nathan concludes that 'without the power to compel witnesses to attend, the theatre is a poor and possibly dangerously deceptive substitute for a courtroom' (2007).

The practitioner space indexes the moving image and sets it apart from its normative exhibition in the cinema, or on television, due to the human agency required to deliver it to the theatrical event. A number of publications aimed at technical operators have described the practicalities of incorporating moving image technology in the theatrical event (McCandles, 1939); (Wilfred, 1965); (Bellman, 1977); (Cadena, 2002); (Carver, 2009). In a technically sophisticated theatrical event, one must ask to what extent practitioners are subordinated to the necessities of exhibiting the moving image in the theatre. Furthermore, their roles might come to reflect similar professional practices in moving image production. For example, the deputy stage manager for Katie Mitchell's production *Some Trace of Her,* Mary O'Hanlon, was tasked with cueing and playing the moving images in performance; in an interview for the National Theatre website she states that 'my job in the show is more like a television vision mixer' (2010).[93] Katie Mitchell's productions are particularly interesting in relation to practitioner space, as this area is often made visible and becomes part of the performance (Figure 1). In productions such as *Waves* (2006) and *Attempts on Her Life* (2007), one might also argue that the scripted activities required of the moving image might dominate the tasks of performers and technical crew, who must co-ordinate their use of props, set, and lighting while depending on the video-cues with which they must synthesise their work (see Chapter 3).

On the balance of these brief backstage - and onstage - examples of practitioner space and the moving image, one must allow for an awareness in the theatrical event that the moving image - even if it is pre-recorded - has been placed 'live' within the *mise-en-scène* by practitioners. Practitioner space remains part of the theatre's material reality even when it is concealed, and one might argue that an awareness of the live generation of the performance by its professionals is an integral part of the theatrical key, which can affect the reception of the moving image within it. As such, a spectator viewing a technically sophisticated performance

---

[93] An example is an archived 'cue sheet' for Tom Stoppard's *Coast of Utopia: Voyage* (2002), which features numerous video cues for the nine hours of moving image backdrops created for this production by William Dudley. *Coast of Utopia Cue Sheet.* RNT/SM/1/481C. National Theatre Archives. NT Studio. London.

FIGURE 1 - ATTEMPTS ON HER LIFE (LYTTELTON THEATRE, LONDON, 2007) DIRECTOR: KATIE MITCHELL, VIDEO DESIGN: '59 PRODUCTIONS'

might take pleasure in considering the activities of the concealed practitioner whose agency delivers and co-ordinates the moving image.[94]

REHEARSAL SPACE

The third architectural space in McAuley's taxonomy is *'Rehearsal space',* which is not traditionally visible in - or indeed regarded as part of - the theatrical event itself. While the process of rehearsal takes place outside performance, I would argue that the use of moving image technology in 'rehearsal space' is relevant to my enquiry. Few studies have explored how a theatre production has rehearsed the incorporation of the moving image into performance; this gap in the discourse has been highlighted by Scott Palmer in his essay 'A Place to Play: Experimentation and Interactions Between Technology and Performance' (2006). Palmer

---

[94] My notion of an active and imaginative spectator derives from recent scholarship by Read (2008) and Rancière (2009), which I describe in more detail in Chapter 4.

criticises the rehearsal practices of multimedia productions 'which do not seek to embrace the technology through the devising and rehearsal process, but rather apply it as a 'bolt-on' accessory relatively late in the production process' (2006, p. 106).[95] While I agree with Palmer that an increased focus on the rehearsal of a multimedia production would be useful, I would question his implicit annoyance that productions are accessorised with media technologies; instead I am interested in exploring the process of incorporating the moving image where its synthesis with the theatrical event is a considered artistic decision. While the 'rehearsal space' is not visible in performance, the activities that occur within it do index the moving image in performance as its considered incorporation marks it with a creative motivation that is of interest to my enquiry. One might, for example, ask to what extent the use of the moving image in the theatre is motivated by the advantages of its normative grammars and modes of viewing. I will return to this query of 'rehearsal space' in Chapter 3, where I draw upon my interviews with the cast of Katie Mitchell's *Waves* to examine their own motivations for using the moving image in their devising and rehearsal process. However, in order to do so it is essential to establish how theatre's 'textual' spaces might operate alongside the film space. By describing basic situations in this chapter, I provide a logic of activation that will serve my analysis of the far more complex challenges presented by Mitchell's *Waves* in Chapter 3.

TEXTUAL SPACES AND THE MOVING IMAGE

Having outlined the material spaces in McAuley's taxonomy, I now concentrate on the texts that might be activated in 'theatre space'. These textual spaces become increasingly complex when regarded in relation to a film space, yet as descriptions of the way the theatre is marked through a spatial grammar they are essential for my enquiry. For McAuley, the theatrical event is itself seen to originate from a '*Performance space*', which she locates 'between

---

[95] It is interesting that Palmer sees the flawed rehearsal process as a cause of the negative reception of these technologies in some performances: 'Partially, this mistrust is borne out of a basic misunderstanding. Technology frustrates, it baffles and it is often surrounded by mystery and its own jargon, which alienates those who do not speak the language' (2006, p. 106).

auditorium and stage', where 'two constitutive groups (performers and spectators) meet and work together to create the performance experience' (1999, p. 26). As such, participation is an essential precursor to establishing a theatrical key in which the moving image might be placed. It is therefore essential to demonstrate that McAuley regards 'performance space' as 'fundamental to, even constitutive of, theatre':

> It is the performance space that is, in reality, the first spatial fact, and the theatre space, though commonly present throughout history, should perhaps be seen as an optional extra.' (1999, p. 26-27)

McAuley's identification of this space is crucial in demarcating the areas of the theatre where attention and meanings are engendered by the grammatical activation of material spaces, objects and performers. This asks questions of the incorporation of a film space, which might engender alternative participatory behaviours in the theatrical event.[96] I would argue that significant for my enquiry is McAuley's identification of a sub-category of 'performance space' which she terms 'presentational space' (1999, p. 29).[97] I would argue that this is a revelation of McAuley's taxonomy, and would argue that 'presentational space' might - on most occasions - be considered the textual space where the moving image is situated within the theatre's spatial paradigm.

'PRESENTATIONAL SPACE' AND FICTIONAL SPACES

McAuley argues that the material reality of 'theatre space' is activated as a text by the 'mere physical presence of actors', which transforms it into a 'presentational space'; as such one might describe this as a textual space that *precedes* fictional representation (p. 29). McAuley describes 'presentational space' as a 'threshold stage', where 'the fictional world has usually not yet been activated' (pp. 42-43). By this logic, the presentational space that has already been indexed by human activity must be also be indexed a second time if it is to represent a fictional

---

[96] This enquiry inevitably touches upon notions of theatre and film spectatorship, which I outline in my arguments in Chapter 4.
[97] McAuley also identifies '*Stage Space'* as 'the physical space of the stage, extended by the performers in any given production by temporary or permanent incursions into the auditorium' (1999, p. 29).

'text'. I would argue that it is useful to consider the moving image within this 'presentational space', as the image artefact cannot be marked as part of theatre space's fictional text unless it is expressly employed as a scenic device or features as a prop. However, this complicates the notation of interactions between stage and screen in the theatrical event. To explore this further, it is essential to outline the many fictional texts that McAuley argues can be activated in the material theatre.

McAuley identifies *'Fictional place'* as the 'place or places presented, represented, or evoked onstage and off'; she argues that the onstage physical activity and dialogue of the performers might activate these (p. 29-32). While the material reality of the stage might be indexed to represent a fictional location, McAuley also examines the activating of 'offstage' spaces; she also identifies how the material – but invisible – spaces of the theatre building might be regarded as fictional spaces in performance (p. 32).[98] Furthermore, McAuley shows the activation of fictional spaces that have no material reality in the theatre building, but which are 'contiguous with those onstage', such as 'Moscow' in Anton Chekhov's *Three Sisters* (p. 31). Curiously, it is only offstage spaces that McAuley speculates upon in relation to the moving image, suggesting that video projection might activate them by displaying images of locations. I do not doubt this, but would like to take further the potential for media-led activation that her taxonomy provides. A straightforward activation of fictional texts by the moving image would be its scenic use; one can observe examples of this as early as the 1890s, and more recently in the work of scenographer William Dudley who has employed video projected scenery in productions such as *The Coast of Utopia* (2002).[99] Despite this, I would argue that when not used as a prop or as scenery, the moving image interacts with theatre's spatial grammars in surprisingly complex ways. A relatively simple synthesis of stage and screen might, for example, have a fictional film space interacting with a fictional stage space. An instance of this is evident in Out of the Blue's *Mad Forest,* where a scene portrayed a Romanian priest speaking with an

---

[98] McAuley also demonstrates the potential activation of the audience area as a fictional space, citing the example of 'that bog' described in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (p. 31).
[99] See Waltz (2006).

Angel figure who was presented via a projected image (Figure 2). This seemingly obvious communication between stage and screen represents a more complex logic of activation, as one cannot say that the moving image is a material theatre space activated as a 'fictional space', as this would mark the screen itself as a prop. Instead one must regard the moving image's own normative frame at work in presenting the fiction of the Angel character. As such, it becomes difficult to identify the grammar of interaction between stage and screen.

In the scene in question, the priest character stood downstage and faced the audience while they conversed with pre-recorded video footage of the Angel, which was projected onto a gauze set-up against the back wall of the studio space. Seemingly in dialogue with the moving image, the actor timed his verbal responses with the recording. In this instance, one cannot say that the moving image is part of the same fictional space as the performer, nor can one say that the co-habitation of these characters was optically accurate. No attempt was made to disguise the frame of the moving image, and the Angel was presented in extreme close-up in an open-framing which cut-off the image at the edges of the screen.[100] Neither was any attempt made to synthesise the depth cues of stage and screen, nor was this required, as the interaction between the image and performer was effective and not confusing.[101] Frustratingly, one can easily identify the moving image in this instance as part of the fictional text of the 'discourse' of the theatrical event as a whole, but not as a fictional element of theatre's space. This raises a curious question: in which of the theatrical key's spaces must one logically place the moving image for effective notation? In order to solve this conundrum, I would like to posit that the 'presentational' and 'threshold' spaces described by McAuley are more relevant to the notation of the moving image's placement in the theatrical key than its fictional ones. However, I would

---

[100] I describe 'open framing' in detail in Chapter 3; see also Katz (1991).

[101] A hypothetical situation such as this is described by Arnold Aronson in his collected essays on scenography *Looking Into The Abyss* (2005). He argues that unless 'the projected image is painstakingly captured in the exact proportion to the stage and performers, and in perfect alignment with the sightlines of the spectators - something nearly impossible to achieve - the audience experiences the disjunction of perceiving a different world' (p. 88). Aronson places this into a wider argument that 'projected scenery, and especially film and video, does not work - does not function - on the stage' (p. 86). However, the Angel/Priest scenario I have identified in *Mad Forest* caused no such disjunction, asking questions of the way the normative experience of the moving image as a representational system can synthesise with that of the theatre.

also argue that to interrogate this further requires an understanding of how the complex quality of 'presence' operates as part of theatre's language, as it is this that activates the 'threshold stage' of 'presentational space'.

FIGURE 2 - MAD FOREST (YORK THEATRE ROYAL STUDIO, YORK, 2007) DIRECTOR: MARY LUCKHURST, VIDEO DESIGN: NIKOLAUS MORRIS

4. PRESENCE AND THE MOVING IMAGE

It is significant that McAuley's rhetoric often employs pseudo-scientific terms such as 'energy' and 'magnetism' to describe the compelling experience of theatrical space. In Chapter 1 I identified similar electrical terminology in definitions of the term 'live', and introduced Goodall's monograph *Stage Presence* (2008) which demonstrates how these terms have been employed regularly to describe the human performer. McAuley argues that for both practitioners and spectators, the stage exerts a 'magnetic force on everyone entering the

building (1999, p. 74). If linked with the 'presentational space' that McAuley describes in her taxonomy, one might ask questions of the effects of presence on the moving image, which I would argue is placed within this space. In order to explore this, and to solve the conundrum of fictional synthesis of film and theatre spaces presented by the Angel/Priest sequence in *Mad Forest,* I investigate how presence might also be regarded as a grammar of the stage that mediates the moving image when it is placed in the theatrical key.

THE DISCOURSE OF PRESENCE

The presence of the human performer is a vital component in McAuley's model of the activation of theatre's material spaces as texts; she argues that it is 'through the agency of the actor that objects are brought to the attention of the audience':

> [...] and it is the actor who creates mobility that is characteristic of the theatrical function of the object: the actor can, with a gesture or an act, transform a walking stick into a machine gun, a bundle of rags into a baby, a chair on a table into a mountain. The set conveys a limited amount of information in the absence of the actor, as has just been stated, but becomes a powerfully expressive instrument when occupied and activated by actors. (McAuley, 1999, p. 91)

McAuley's argument suggests that real spaces only become textual spaces, or compelling areas of interest, in 'relation to the human presence' (1999, p. 91). However, she does not describe this process in relation to instances where the moving image is incorporated into the *mise-en-scène*; as such, I will outline the recent discourse of stage presence in order to question how the activities of the performer, and the 'presence' of theatrical space, operate in relation to their synthesis with the moving image.

Immediately striking in the discourse of presence is the lack of a comparable taxonomy to McAuley's identification of theatrical spaces. This is despite the recent compilation of a 'Presence Dictionary' edited by Laura Cull, Stefanie Kuhn, Gabriella Giannachi, and Nick Kaye, which has been published online as an *ABC of Presence* by the research group *The Presence Project.* The terms presented in this dictionary do not present presence as a grammar of the

theatre, but instead identify a theoretical glossary that includes terms such as 'virtual reality' and 'CAVE', which describes a 'surround screen and sound systen that creates the sensation of immersion through the projection of 3D computer graphics into a 10'x10'x10 cube composed of display screens that surround the viewer' (The Presence Project, n.d.). Despite this, there are a number of useful descriptive terms that might aid in the notation of the way human presence might be organised during performance; however, their definitions are often unsatisfying. For example, the term 'absence' might evoke the idea that presence is a desirable expectation of participation in a theatrical event; as such, one might argue that a director or performer could consciously manipulate this 'absence' for dramatic or visceral effect. However, the dictionary's definition offers a single descriptive use by performance-artist STELARC who states that we 'mostly operate as Absent Bodies' because 'A BODY IS DESIGNED TO INTERFACE WITH ITS ENVIRONMENT' (Stelarc as cited in Bell and Kennedy, 2001, p. 562, original emphasis). This is an obscure and confusing definition, which demonstrates that this compilation is less a dictionary, and more a catalogue of scholarly themes that respond to human presence. This glossary is eventually unhelpful in describing how human activity activates theatrical space, and how it subsequently might mark the moving image in performance. This reflects an ongoing obstacle in this discourse, which is the elusive difficulty of notating presence; a quality often regarded for its evanescence and its resistance to definition.

Despite the difficulties inherent in engaging with presence, TIWG has provided its own recent definition of the term.[102] This is presented by Russell Fewster in a brief statement published in the group's most recent volume (2010). Here, he indicates that presence 'describes the temporal and spatial proximity between performer and audience' (2010b, p. 46). Fewster

---

[102] However, my enquiries exclude a number of studies of the body in intermedial and digital performance from this section, as they often follow trajectories into cyborg and virtual performances that are not in the province of my analysis which concerns only moving image technology. For example, Dixon's *Digital Performance* devotes a chapter to Virtual Bodies, exploring the interaction between dancers and their video-projected counterparts in Paul Sermon's installation *Telematic Dreaming* (1992) (pp. 216-220); the digital dissection of executed American prison inmate Joseph Paul Jernigan for the National Library of Medicine's *Visible Human Project* (1994) (pp. 220-224); and theatre productions such as Dumb Type's *OR* (1997-99), which engages with the 'virtual body's relationship to medical science' as a theme (p. 226 - 230).

argues that digital media 'complicate such presumptions of live presence', arguing that screen technologies 'construct a liveness and media presence beyond physical proximity' (p. 46).[103] Taking McAuley's analysis of the activation of theatrical space into account, Fewster's consideration of presence as a distance is too narrow a definition to effectively account for the ways the human performer might index the moving image, or be indexed by it, in the theatre.[104] While Fewster's description of presence privileges the literal distance between spectator and performer in the theatrical event, and how this might be disrupted by moving image technology, recent scholarship has provided more complex models that are far more suitable for my analysis. The discourse of presence concerns more than matters of distance and liveness. The term is also used to identify the presence of the trained actor, their embodiment of character or text, and is also employed in more complex descriptions of the performer's autonomous and aesthetic effects as a body in the theatrical event.

Elinor Fuchs makes a strong case for viewing presence itself as the 'text' of the theatrical event (1985). She argues that theatrical presence has been continuously undermined as a result of 'traditional models that regard dramatic structure in writing' (Fuchs, 1985, p. 163). Her departure from these literary approaches leads her to divide presence into 'two fundamental components', these are the 'unique self-completion of the world of the spectacle' (one might describe this in relation to McAuley's model of activating fictional spaces), and the 'circle of heightened awareness flowing from actor to spectator and back that sustains the world (one might view this in relation to McAuley's threshold stage of 'presentational space'). It is therefore relevant that Fuchs argues that her second definition covers the 'magnetism that a particular performer may exude' or 'what we mean when we say a performer has "presence"' (1985, p.

---

[103] Fewster also defines *telepresence* in live television, and *virtual presence* to describe 'the sense of the self in a simulated environment' (2010b, p. 46-47).
[104] *The Presence Project* provide an etymology of the word 'presence' that might seem to privilege Fewster's description of the quality: 'Fundamentally, the noun presence indicates that which is prae (before) sens (sum: I am), i.e., 'before I am – in front of me – in view of me'. Sens is present participle of esse (to be) and indicates 'that which is; that which exists, is true'; this is limited if one takes into account Power's recent scholarship on the three modes of presence (2008).

163).[105] It is curious that Fuchs uses the term 'magnetism' to describe qualities of the human performer. Writing in the same year as Fuchs, Joseph Roach provides similar descriptions of the way a human performer compels on the stage; however, his rhetoric is more explicit in explaining this 'magnetic' activity as a communicative grammar of the theatre. He asserts that when 'an actor takes his place on a stage', the 'audience begin to respond to his performance':

> [...] together they concentrate the complex values of a culture with an intensity that less immediate transactions cannot rival. They embody its shared language of spoken words and expressive gestures, its social expectations and psychological commonplaces, its conventions [...] (Roach, 1985, p. 11)

This statement suggests that the presentation and reception of presence is conceived as a reciprocal grammar in which both spectator and performer participate. Despite this, Roach lacks an efficient vocabulary with which to interpret this 'energy' of presence; he therefore turns attention to historical moments where new interpretive vocabularies emerged from the 'modernization of the physical sciences', allowing new ways of describing 'stage presence'.

Citing the example of English actor David Garrick (1717-1779), Roach argues that scientific terminology allowed critics 'for the first time to interpret the actor's emotion from outside the framework of classical rhetoric' (1985, p. 12). This vocabulary has been re-visited and elaborated by Goodall in her monograph *Stage Presence* (2008), where she explains that the analysis of presence has become couched in 'orientalist' terms 'in order to connect with the larger energies of theatre':

> One of the reasons for this is that the quest for an understanding of presence is often associated with the quest for unbroken indigenous traditions, which seem set apart from the comprehensively modernised cultures of urban modernity in the west. (2008, p. 3)

---

[105] It is vital to note that Fuchs' division regards presence as a communicative element of the theatre, and not a measure of distance in relation to being present in the theatre; therefore one might argue that if presence is the theatre's text, then participation in the communication structure of the theatrical event sustains it.

Goodall demonstrates that when notating presence, the descriptive language used is often hyperbolised and often alludes to magical and scientific terminology. Like Roach, she offers an historical analysis of the rhetoric used to describe this experience of stage presence:

> In the late eighteenth century, it was impossible to separate the occult, pseudo-science of mesmerism from the legitimate science behind electricity and magnetism. The vocabulary and imagery associated with stage presence are drawn from all these areas of experiment. (Goodall, 2008, p. 13)

For Goodall, stage presence is exclusively the preserve of the human performer, and she thus asserts that 'two models of human presence remain at the core of the western theatrical tradition' (2008, p. 8). The first of these involves 'regimes of training and technical prowess: elocution and vocal technique, deportment, and aesthetics of gesture and facial expression' (2008, p. 8). Goodall's second model is 'suggested in the more mysterious qualities of magnetism and mesmerism, a sense of inner power being radiated outwards' (2008, p. 8). The significance of both models is the implied participatory recognition of the proficiency of the human performer, which I would argue constitutes a grammar of the theatre.

Goodall argues that it is command 'over the time and space of performance' which 'marks out the actor with presence' (2008, p. 15). This is a crucial statement which implies that the spectator recognises presence in the activity of a performer. Goodall argues that stage presence, 'with its hieratic and archaic resonances is a phenomenon that exists through the eyes of the beholder' (2008, p. 2). On the balance of this, one might argue that presence is not generated by the accomplished human performer, but it is rather bestowed upon them by participants in a theatre culture. One might then argue that presence is aesthetically conceived, a notion which leads Goodall to ask 'whether it may be trained or cultivated, and to what extend it may be enhanced by the perceptions and expectations of those who witness it (2008, p. 3).[106] To this end, the discourse of presence has explored methods of actor training and has observed the human body onstage, in order to describe how an aesthetically conceived presence might be

---

[106] Goodall notes that the diversification of actor training, and its cross-cultural conversations, have propelled theoretical analysis of this phenomenon (2008, p. 3).

cultivated. I would argue this interrogation of presence is of specific relevance to the study of the moving image in the theatre, as it offers entry to the scrutiny of the image's relation to the 'threshold stage' of presentational space that McAuley identifies in her taxonomy.

THE THREE MODES OF PRESENCE

I have already demonstrated that McAuley privileges the human body as the instigator of the textual readings in theatrical space. However, her conception of 'presence' covers a variety of qualities that suggest the term is being used too broadly. McAuley argues that the movement of the performer in 'presentational space is an important theatrical signifier':

> [...] it functions always to draw attention to the performer, and it is the means whereby the performance space is fully activated. (1999, p. 105)

However, she also alludes to the performer's cultivation of presence for a specific theatre culture, arguing that actors and theatre practitioners 'gain a great deal of intuitive knowledge about audience response through their years of performance practice' (1999, p. 238). In addition, she also presents an argument that considers the aesthetic qualities of the actor onstage, arguing that the 'moving body is, of course, an object of fascination in itself', alluding to theatre productions that place emphasis on 'the body of the performer rather than on character or dramatic fiction' (1999, p. 104). In light of recent scholarship by Cormac Power, I contend that these statements reflect three distinct types of presence: one that activates text in the material reality of the theatre, another that is an aesthetic and cultural presence, and another as a material and spatial measure of distance. This critical confusion has, arguably, been solved by Power's recent monograph *Presence in Play* (2008), which provides a much needed intervention in this discourse.

Power re-considers the all-encompassing use of the term 'presence' as three distinct modes: fictional presence, auratic presence, and literal presence (2008). Power's identification of three types of presence is revelatory, with as-yet unexplored implications for the moving

116

image in the theatre. Much like McAuley's identification of fictional spaces activated by the performer, Power argues that sustained activities by participants in a theatrical event bestow textual meaning on objects, spaces, and bodies.[107] By this logic, Power identifies the 'fictional' mode of presence, which refers to theatre's 'ability to "make-present" fictional propositions' (2008, p. 97). An aesthetically conceived presence is covered by Power's second mode, 'auratic presence', which encompasses the performer's charisma, agency, and proficiency. Power distinguishes this from the 'fictional mode' by arguing that while 'one mode of theatrical presence can be understood in terms of the *making-present* there is a further sense in which theatre is seen as *having-presence*' (2008, p. 45).[108] It is significant that Power also identifies 'auratic' presence emanating from the reputation of performers and companies; the implications for the moving image are therefore similar here to those of the 'theatre space' identified by McAuley, where the associations and history of a company might also index its activity.[109] Power's third mode is 'literal presence', which describes the 'sense in which *spectators* are present in the theatre with the actors and with other spectators.' (Power, 2008, p. 87) This mode describes the need to be 'present' at a performance in order to engender a theatrical key or event, and also encompasses the spatial qualities of the human performer on-stage. A measure of distance, 'literal presence' is the mode that Fewster narrowly employs in his definition of 'presence' for TIWG (Fewster, 2010b); the 'auratic' and 'fictional' are thus eschewed in his problematic definition.

---

[107] Rayner has also assessed this facet of presence, arguing that theatre 'habitually situates abstractions in material realities (2006, p. 180). She attempts to explore how theatre 'puts objects of perception (be they machines, human bodies, or things) into the play of perception between presence and absence, meaning and materiality' (p. 180). She concludes that like 'the things laid out on the prop table, the building gathers together objects that are suspended between an origin and a destiny, between function and pure materiality: the between that characterizes the poetic object thrown out of the context of usefulness' (p. 198).

[108] Power's choice of the term 'aura' evokes Benjamin, and he argues that 'the notion of aura is inextricably linked to that of authenticity'; he adds: 'In terms of the actor, aura in theatre is much more complex and potentially dynamic than that of a painting or a statue. The actor's (auratic) presence can be constructed through his manipulation of space and materials, including his own body and posture, as well as the way in which the actor confronts his audience and engaged their attention' (2008, p. 49).

[109] Power argues that one 'manifestation of aura is that which is constructed through the fame or reputation of the actor, playwright or artwork, along with the knowledge and expectations that spectators may carry with them into the experience' (2008, p. 47). This would certainly be the case when observing the work of established multimedia companies such as The Wooster Group and Forced Entertainment who 'stage the screen'.

On the balance of these three distinct modes, Power concludes that theatrical presence can 'be seen as a much more dynamic and unstable concept than hitherto envisaged by many theatre theorists.' (2008, p. 145) Power's paradigm is – I would argue – essential to an analysis of ambitious uses of the moving image in the theatre, as its three distinct modes provide a useful negotiation of the various identifiable qualities of presence that might interact with the spaces of performance and activate it in various ways. Power argues that presence 'need not be seen as a romanticised and out-dated notion':

> Instead, we can look at presence in theatre as an activity of signification, a constant dynamic process of disclosure and one of the most compelling elements of theatrical experience. (2008,p. 198)

To date, there has been no significant adaptation of Power's three modes of presence to the study of the moving image in the theatre. As such, the implications of this new paradigm have not been sufficiently tested in relation to the combination of presence with the mechanically produced moving image artefact. It is significant that Power himself asks questions of the implications of using media technologies in the theatre:

> How do we analyse the complex convergence of presences in theatre? How do we approach the new experiential possibilities opened up by the interaction of media technology and stage performers? How do we understand theatre's potential to critique and expose the illusions of "full" presence without losing sight of theatre's medium specificity? (2008, pp. 206-207)

Power's three modes allow a more coherent description of the way performers and moving images co-habit in the spaces of the theatrical key. In particular, his distinction of 'auratic' presence from the 'fictional' and the 'literal' modes offers a useful route to observe the aesthetically conceived grammar of presence in the theatrical event separate from the performer's additional function providing in a fictional index for theatre space.

It is with difficulty that theorists and practitioners have described the aesthetic presence of the performer. An influential attempt is Joseph Chaikin's in *The Presence of the Actor* (1972, 1991), which describes a 'quality that makes you feel as though you're standing right next to the actor, no matter where you're sitting in the theater' (Chaikin, 1991, p. 20). This description suggests that the presence of the performer is a vital convention for drawing focus in theatrical space, it is useful to observe his description by which the performer achieves this:

> Just before a performance the actor usually has additional energy, like an electric field. It's a free-heightened space in which the actor stands. If the actor becomes at all tense, he is applying this unused energy by holding on – the way one holds onto a suitcase. The tension will form in the body of the actor as well as in the mind. (Chaikin, 1991, p. 22)

While dependent on the scientific vocabulary identified by Roach and Goodall, Chaikin's description of 'tension' suggests a basis of neutrality from which the performer consciously expresses their aesthetically conceived presence to participants who recognise and receive it. This describes a component of theatre's grammar which demonstrates that the material reality of the stage can be activated as a 'presentational space' that is not necessarily a fictional 'text', but a compelling object of interest nonetheless. I would argue that the moving image in the theatre is indexed by this grammar of the stage, to do so I will outline recent studies that expand upon Chaikin's observations and describe what Power would term 'auratic' presence.

The presence of the human performer has been considered a 'value' of live performance in Simon Shepherd's monograph *Theatre, Body and Pleasure* (2006). Here, Shepherd argues that the 'theatre is, and has always been, a place which exhibits what a human body is, what it does, what it is capable of':

> Theatre requires special things of bodies, and makes demands on audience as much as performer. It generates and manipulates pleasure in relation to bodies. [...] Theatre is a practice in which societies negotiate around what the body is and means. (2006, p. 1)

Shepherd demonstrates an autonomous effect of the body onstage by assigning it a culturally ascribed 'value', arguing that this positive position became apparent in the 'increasingly mechanized, mediated and repressive' society of the 1960s when 'the body was given value on the basis of its naturalness, the thing humanity had in common' (2006, p. 2). On the assumption of this ideological significance, Shepherd argues that 'performance' became prioritized 'as a place where people could experience liberation from the everyday repressions which constrained and distorted their bodies' (2006, p. 2).[110] Shepherd therefore argues that the human body is mediated by the theatre into a compelling presence, and that bodies are already conditioned by their cultural context to the extent that training is not a prerequisite for the bestowal of this 'value'.[111] For example, he asserts that as 'an artform theatre consciously exhibits the body', adding that a 'body that is exhibited to others is almost always prepared for it, however informally' (2006, p. 5). On the balance of this, Shepherd conceives of what 'remains common' in viewing the body onstage; his conclusion is to regard it as a spatial boundary, describing it is a 'living entity that occupies a finite amount of space and has its own mass, energy and motor capacity.' (2006, p. 6)

In a theatrical event combining the human body with the moving image, Shepherd seems to privilege the human performer over the screen; their activities might ultimately be more compelling than the larger and brighter media artefact. However, this seems unlikely when one takes into account descriptions of multimedia practice from those who have experienced its obstacles, as Dutch theatre director Teunkie van der Sluijs describes:

> One of the biggest problems you're facing when you're working with video as a practitioner is it's very big and it's very light. That sounds very banal but that's simply the reality of it. If there's an actor onstage and a video screen behind them or above them: that's where the audience attention goes. [...] Even if you make it smaller it will

---

[110] Power also finds historical origins for this value in 1960s performance-art. Power argues that in this period the "poor" actor, 'stripped of the affectations of theatrical pretence, took on an aura of spiritual authenticity before an audience' (2008, p. 74).

[111] Colette Conroy has also examined the implications of actor training on the body in *Theatre & the Body* (2010). Observing the performances and writings of Sarah Berhardt, Conroy observes in these writings that her 'opinion appears to emerge from a wish to see skilled performance on stage and from the notion that unintended acts are meaningless' (p. 2).

always be as bright, or brighter than an actor will ever be. (2010)

Despite this, I would neither argue that the moving image dominates the performer, nor that the performer's value as a body challenges the projection. I want to assert that the auratic presence of the performer mediates the moving image by placing it into 'presentational space', this is not so much an effect of the body's cultural value, but of the performer's cultivated agency. This has been described recently by Suzanne Jaeger, who argues that presence 'can be defined as an active configuring and reconfiguring of one's intentional grasp in response to an environment' (2006, p. 122). As such, the performer is not celebrated for their 'perfect repetition of a familiar and well-rehearsed pattern of behaviour', but for their awareness of 'the uniqueness of a particular audience and of certain features of a theatrical event' (2006, p. 122). Erickson has also described this sense of agency, but places more emphasis on its aesthetic qualities by demonstrating 'presence as an aim of practice':

> [...] it [presence] could probably be found in two interdependent aims: that of directing and focusing the audience's attention in as strong a fashion as possible, and, as a performer engaged in performance, remaining as present as possible in one's concentration and being. (Erickson, 2006, p. 147)[112]

This notion of using presence to designate areas of interest in theatre's spaces is vital in relation to the 'presentational space' identified by McAuley. I would argue that if an aesthetic presence can activate a 'text' within 'presentational space', then one can consider the moving image itself placed not only within the key of theatre, but within a textual presence that mediates its activity. To demonstrate this, I will consider this auratic activation of 'presentational space' as a solution to the conundrum of the moving image's notation in the Angel/Priest sequence I have described in *Mad Forest.*

Regarding McAuley's taxonomy of theatrical space in relation to film space, I posited a logical problem regarding the notation of the human performer's conversation with a pre-recorded video image*.* In this sequence between a live-Priest and a video-Angel it is simple to

---

[112] Interestingly, Erickson doubts that presence is limited to 'co-present "live" performance', arguing that one 'can detect an individual's presence on film and in television' (Erickson, 2006, p. 148).

regard the *mise-en-scène* as a fictional text, but difficult to describe the spatial-grammars that sustain this; this is because the fictional space of the moving image is not part of the fictional space of the stage.[113] The solution lies in the examination of the 'auratic' presence of the performer, whose agency activates the 'threshold stage' of 'presentational space' which *precedes* its activation as a fictional space.[114] If one considers the moving image situated within 'presentational space', then it is mediated by the performer's aesthetic presence and thus indexed in relation to their agency. Therefore, because the performer engenders an illusion of communicating with the pre-recorded image, this is not confusing for the viewer who reads the moving image in auratic relation to the performer.

While this instance from *Mad Forest* is a basic situation concerning the moving image in the theatre, it is a useful moment in which to observe the satisfactory operation of the normative frames of the moving image and the theatre in synthesis. This relationship demonstrates that the medialities of stage and screen can function together without the need to observe their 'intermediality', thus validating my methodology that sees the multimedia theatre in terms of grammars and frames in a theatrical key. Furthermore, the mediation of the image by the auratic presence of the performer in this instance demonstrates an important implication of my paradigm whereby the moving image is presented in the 'key' of theatre. If the onstage body - even when not representing a character or activating a fictional space - can mediate the moving image through auratic presence, then one can ask questions of the resonance of this presence in instances where the moving image is the only object of interest in a theatrical *mise-en-scène.* This logic can be demonstrated in the analysis of a sequence from Out of the Blue's *Celebrity* (York Theatre Royal Studio, 2008) where the moving image was, at times, delivered as a standalone 'film' without any interaction with the spaces of the stage.

In a scene entitled 'In the Limelight', where award-winning 'celebrities' delivered acceptance speeches to the audience, certain monologues were delivered through projected

---

[113] If it were, then the moving image would be considered a 'prop'.
[114] In this fictional space, the actor is indexed as the Priest character.

video alone. The acceptance speech of a beauty pageant winner, a 'Businesswoman of the year', and the inaugural speech of a new UN Secretary General were each presented as stand-alone film segments projected onto a white gauze hung at the back of a bare studio stage. Despite their isolated delivery, these moving images must be regarded as having been mediated by the activation of 'presentational space' by the auratic presence of the live performers' whose speeches between these videos continued to resonate throughout the scene. Despite the absence of the performers during these filmed segments, this resonance can be described by the sustained activation of the 'threshold stage'. I would argue that this relies upon the audience's continued expectation of the presence they have already bestowed upon the performers on recognising their theatrical activity. The result is therefore not a synthesis of visual cues, but the placement of the moving image within an area activated by presence. This effect occurred on a number of occasions in *Celebrity,* including one scene presented entirely through the moving image, where a suicide-cult member delivered a video-taped farewell speech to his family. Again, the moving image may have been the only designated object of attention within the scene at this moment, but the 'presentational space' in which it was exhibited had been activated by an aesthetic presence. As such, one might describe the expectation of presence, and the 'absence' of presence in this instance in relation to the moving image; in doing so one can argue that the moving image is firmly mediated by the theatrical key.

NEW QUESTIONS

While the instances I have described in *Mad Forest* and *Celebrity* have allowed the examination of the basic logic of the moving image's mediation by theatre's normative grammars, they represent only a fraction of the complexity of potential interactions between stage and screen. For example, the complex spatial grammar of 'classical continuity' I have described in this chapter is often used in Katie Mitchell's multimedia productions alongside stage activity; situations such as this complicate inexorably the task of notating spaces and presences. However, in approaching these situations, the descriptive vocabularies I have

identified in this chapter offer only a paradigm through which to understand the moving image as presented in the key of theatre. To deconstruct a multimedia production into its component grammatical relationships would be akin to viewing a classical Hollywood film in order to observe the editing that it strives to conceal. As such, I will use the vocabularies of McAuley and Power as tools through which to examine the creative synthesis of stage and screen as I attempt a close-study of Katie Mitchell's production *Waves.* My goal is to reveal the creative motivation for incorporating mediatized grammars of the moving image in the contemporary theatrical key. In doing so, it is important to ask questions of the 'rehearsal space', as well as performance space, in order to assess the extent to which the use of the moving image is motivated by its normative grammars and modes of viewing in a mediatized culture.

CHAPTER 3:
THE MOVING IMAGE IN KATIE MITCHELL'S *WAVES* (2006)

1. QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

Continuing my enquiry into the combination of cinematic and theatrical languages in multimedia productions, in this chapter I will pursue a case-analysis demonstrating the curious extent to which media-derived epistemology was employed in Katie Mitchell's *Waves* (Cottesloe, London, 2006). My decision to focus on this production is motivated by its sophisticated use of the moving image; furthermore, as a National Theatre and international touring production, *Waves* falls within the institutional frame of commercial mainstream theatre, and thus offers an example of multimedia work hitherto omitted from this discourse by the narrow lens of theatre culture surveyed in the discourse of intermediality (See Chapter 1). Of interest to my enquiry is how Mitchell and her company explicitly took creative advantage of the moving image's normative grammars to stage the challenging 'stream of consciousness' technique of Virginia Woolf's novel *The Waves* (1931). This case-study therefore provides a departure from productions described in TIWG's volumes that legislate for readings of 'intermedial space', and which interrogate the ideology of the screen through paradigms of mediatization outlined by Phelan (1993), Birringer (1998) and Auslander (2008). Mitchell's *Waves* does not engender ideological or ontological revelations on the crossing of media, but instead demonstrates a synthesis of theatrical and cinematic codes to create a unique artwork. All narrative and meaning is thus left to the already established grammars of stage and screen – as described in Chapter 2 – and does not require the reading of 'intermedial' spaces or institutionally-narrow grammars into its performance.

In this production the moving image was arguably fundamental to the theatrical event. Eight performers created live video images and sound effects throughout the performance.

Curiously, these amplified sound effects and continuous video projections presented the diegesis of Woolf's novel, possibly dominating the interest of the spectator. The stage itself was organised as a film and radio studio where the actors accomplished various tasks in order to execute the audiovisual content. *Waves* thus rendered visible the apparatus of moving image and audio production used throughout as the performers inhabited a stage filled with equipment for acquiring images and sound. Using this apparatus they created video images that were then projected live onto a screen placed centrally above the stage.

The equipment used in *Waves* could be divided into acquisition tools – for capturing images - and delivery tools for making them visible and audible in performance.[115] The image acquisition equipment included two Sony HDR FX1e cameras placed on movable tripods (a spare was kept offstage in case of equipment failure). In addition, a Sony EVID70P PTZ camera was rigged overhead to offer aerial shots of the stage. Also visible in this space were designated areas for acquiring sound through Foley techniques; in these areas, the performers worked with specialised props, such as wine glasses and cutlery, and used trays of gravel and paving stones to create both a diegetic and extra-diegetic soundtrack to accompany the moving images.[116] Once images and sound were acquired by performers using these onstage tools, they were manipulated by additional stage crew who were not visible onstage, but located in what McAuley would term 'practitioner space'.[117] In these concealed areas for technical operation, the assistant stage manager operated a video desk and chose – based on a scripted cue-sheet – the camera images for delivery to the projection screen via two Panasonic PF-D5600E Projectors

---

[115] This data is compiled from the *Waves Production Folder.* NT Production Office Show Folder, *WAVES* at the National Theatre Archives. At the time of consulting these materials this archive folder had no reference number.

[116] The history and practice of Foley art are described in David Lewis Yewdall's *Practical Art of Motion Picture Sound* (2007, pp. 403-439).

[117] A number of components required for the filmed segments were organised offstage, these include eight backdrops stored near the stage along with a variety of props and tools. An additional cohort of musicians created both a diegetic and extra-diegetic soundtrack during performance, however, the musicians were kept invisible until the curtain call at the end of the performance.

rigged on stands; this dual-setup allowed the simultaneous projection of two independent images.[118]

With the exception of brief segments that showed pre-recorded photographs of the phases of the rising-and-setting sun, every shot and sound acquired and delivered by the above apparatus was created live by the eight performers. This unique format is interesting in regard to the 'languages' of stage and screen I identified in the previous chapter.[119] The extensive use of cinematic grammars drew remarks from critic Paul Taylor, writing for *The Independent*, who stated that 'Mitchell's production deliberately bangs its brow against the limitations of the theatre of permanent long-shot and crisply defined roles' (Taylor, 2006). Interesting in this response is how Taylor privileges the language of the moving image, and in particular that of the 'close-up', as liberating the theatre from its material restrictions of real spaces and 'present' performers; he seems to suggest that the moving image offered Mitchell a representational system that is arguably better suited to the realization of the action in Woolf's novel.[120] In what follows I show how Mitchell's company utilised film's continuity grammar, acting styles, and production techniques as they attempted a transposition of Woolf's novel to the stage.

MEDIATIZATION OR SYNTHESIS?

The extent to which media technologies and grammars were used in *Waves* raises interesting questions in relation to the theoretical context of the moving image in the theatre I interrogated in Chapter 1. One could argue that the saturation of media grammars in *Waves*

---

[118] Despite the division of an onstage and offstage space for technical operation, it could be argued that the stage itself could be categorised as 'practitioner space' under McAuley's taxonomy. Despite this, the compelling activities of performers who operated this equipment problematizes the notation of this area.
[119] The amalgamation of the spatial indexing of theatrical space with film's continuity grammar in this production drew comments from critics that both celebrated and derided it as a challenging and unique experience. The production received negative responses to its multimedia staging, notably Michael Billington, writing for *The Guardian,* who described the production as a 'celebration of technical ingenuity that leaves the heart untouched' (2006). I would contend this, finding worth in the expressive effects of the synthesised use of the image in this production. I will explore this in detail at the end of this chapter.
[120] This was expressed in my interview with *Waves* actress Kate Duchene: 'I don't think you could've done the novel as a straight piece of theatre because of it being interior monologue. It would have destroyed the sense of the novel' (2010).

might qualify the anxieties of media dominance expressed by scholars such as Philip Auslander (2008). Here I demonstrate how the moving image was fundamental to *Waves* not only as a technology, but as a cultural artefact with implicit associations such as a representational grammar based on editing (Reisz and Millar, 1968), realism (Dayan, 1974); (Allen, 1997), production techniques including storyboarding and framing conventions (Katz, 1991), and approaches to acting (Churcher, 2003). Despite this, I maintain my cautious position in regards to Auslander's cultural economy, and stress that the moving image – whilst saturating this production – remains mediated by the theatrical key. This does, however, raise the question of why the production was presented as a theatrical event at all when it relied so heavily upon the moving image artefact. To solve this conundrum I pursue a methodology that observes the creative motivation for the multimedia staging of *Waves.*

I explore the extent to which Mitchell and her company conceived of *Waves* cinematically by analysing decisions made in their rehearsal and devising process. To do so I have conducted interviews with *Waves* cast members Michael Gould, Kate Duchene, and Paul Ready who worked with Mitchell to devise the production from its first experimental workshops at the National Theatre Studio in 2006, and who performed in its subsequent international tour in 2008. For my research I have consulted archive materials relating to the technical specification of the production, and located published interviews with Katie Mitchell taken from a number of newspapers and theatre websites.[121] Interestingly, scrutiny of the process of making *Waves* reveals how moving image grammars made possible a realist transposition of the complex 'stream-of-consciousness' style of Woolf's novel to the projection screen, leaving the stage as an 'anonymous' space where performers created media elements. Woolf's construction of fluid character and simulated thought was certainly emulated in Mitchell's production. This is reflected in critical responses that often describe the action as a 'stream of consciousness'. Taylor states that in the source text, Virginia Woolf 'puts her emphasis on consciousness rather

---

[121] In addition, I quote from video materials available on the National Theatre website that include interviews with cast and crew members on their work on *Waves*, and on Mitchell's subsequent multimedia productions *Attempts on Her Life* and *...Some Trace of Her* which share a similar format.

than plot', arguing that *The Waves* is an 'exploration of group consciousness' (2006). In *The Daily Telegraph*, Charles Spencer describes the narrative portraying the 'streams of consciousness of six friends as they progress from childhood to middle age' (2006). Despite the validity of this phrase as an interpretation of the style of Woolf's novel, and Mitchell's subsequent theatre production, its legitimacy as a descriptive term is questionable. The scholarship of Robert Humphrey (1954), Shiv Kumar (1963) and more recently Anne Fernihough (2007) has demonstrated that 'stream of consciousness' as a genre of literary fiction is an artistic construction rather than an accurate representation. Their scrutiny of this style reveals that Woolf's 'stream of consciousness' is a product of technique, and cannot be said to be a representation of the mind's activity. Despite this, I have often encountered this rhetoric in descriptions of the rehearsal process of *Waves*. Whilst problematic, I would posit that the 'stream of consciousness' style identified by Kumar, Humphrey and Fernihough offers an opportunity for my own analysis of Mitchell's multimedia staging, as their realist portrayal of this technique depends upon the grammars of the moving image. As such, I will begin by introducing Woolf's novel, and draw from useful scholarship on its 'stream of consciousness' elements before embarking on my own analysis of the process and performance of Mitchell's *Waves*.

THE WAVES AND 'STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS' TECHNIQUE

Virginia Woolf's novel *The Waves* (published in 1931), features a complex narrative spoken by six characters: Bernard, Susan, Rhoda, Neville, Jinny, and Louis; in addition one is frequently also aware of the unseen presence of a seventh character named Percival. [122]

---

[122] Mitchell's *Waves* presented a heavily abridged version of Woolf's novel, cutting it from 228 pages to 40 (Mitchell, *The Guardian,* 2006). The internal monologues of the book were spoken onstage, and the visual motifs described in these speeches made visible via the moving image. In my interviews with the cast I asked about the rationale of what to cut from the novel when preparing the performance text. Paul Ready suggests that Mitchell's decision to cut passages from the novel was motivated by a rationale that sought the staging of action, and not monologue: 'that's just reflection; you need to go from actually what's happening' (2010). Gould expanded on this, his remarks suggest that only material which could be communicated theatrically was kept: 'When you look at a novel you can look at a paragraph and just see that there's so much in it which theatre time doesn't allow you to tell.' I discussed with Gould the challenge of presenting descriptive passages whilst avoiding extensive voiceover; both of us presumed

Structured around the phases of the rising and setting sun, the novel inhabits the minds of the

six characters through childhood to old age, detailing their anxieties and obsessions, linking the

six individuals by their memories and traumas. In particular, the sudden and surprising death of

Percival traumatises the interior worlds presented in the novel, and this - amongst other

significant recollections - scars the memories of the characters for the rest of their lives. The

book provides a literary impression of fluid memory; recent scholarship by Clifford Wulfman

(2007) has demonstrated how these repeating emotions and recollections represent the action

of Woolf's novel, 'where her formal experiments attempt to convey the dynamics of psychic

trauma mimetically' (p. 161):

> [...] her fiction traces the pattern the atom-showers make on the mind. Thus the
> *narrative*, the line, is not plot, but association – the trace of the reverberations an atom-
> impact creates in the mind of a character. (p. 176)

These dynamic conceptions of character may have been driven by Woolf's own desires to create

a literary construction of human experience, an endeavour outlined in her diary as she embarks

on the novel in 1929 when it was initially to be entitled *The Moths*:

> However, I now begin to see *The Moths* rather too clearly; or at least strenuously, for my
> comfort. I think it will begin like this: lawn; the shells on a beach; I don't know – voices
> of cock and nightingale; and then all the children at a long table – lessons; the beginning.
> Could one not get the waves to be heard all through? Or the farmyard noises? Some odd
> irrelevant noises. Well all this is of course the 'real' life; and nothingness only comes in
> the absence of this. Everything becomes green and vivified in me when I begin to think

---

that presenting action onstage would be more effective than being told about it by a narrator. Gould affirmed this, arguing that the company were 'constantly aware of that risk – the show and tell risk – it's a conversation often had in a theatre context as well as a film context', he added that it 'is vaguely fatal' (2010). Gould revealed that this anxiety lay behind the cutting of the novel's final segment, where Bernard describes the fates of the characters. He identified this section as a contrast to others in the novel where past events are re-visited as present experiences in the minds of the characters. Bernard's recollections would therefore be inconsistent with the 'present' sequences shown through video projection in the play: 'We didn't do the last forty pages; which is more or less all his [Bernard's] voice, I think. Katie was particularly interested, I think, in Rhoda and it would have become unbalanced in the end; in the novel it became Bernard's reflections' (2010). This is affirmed in an interview for *The Guardian* newspaper, where Katie Mitchell described why the final chapter was cut: 'This leisurely recapping of events by the last surviving friend, now an old man, draws the novel to a glorious close, but would send a theatre audience gently to sleep' (2006). In addition to this, it is significant that during our discussion Gould remarked that 'you actually limit your tools by using just theatrical tools'(2010). The concerns highlighted in this discussion might be best explored by negotiating the existing discourse of adaptation studies. This is not in the province of my thesis, yet I offer these questions as a potential route of further study into Mitchell's multimedia work. An overview of this rich discourse can be found in Sarah Cardwell's *Adaptation Revisited* (2002); (See also: Sanders, 2006).

of *The Moths*. (Woolf, as cited in Bell, 2008, p. 263) [123]

Woolf's implied representation of the operation of thought has led to the frequent classification of *The Waves* in a 'stream of consciousness' genre of literary fiction (Humphrey, 1954); (Kumar, 1962); (Fernihough, 2007). It is therefore not surprising that this trope is reflected in Katie Mitchell's descriptions of her source.

In an interview for *The Guardian* newspaper Mitchell describes the characters' monologues in *Waves* as 'stream-of-consciousness' narratives; she uses similar descriptions in an interview for the National Theatre website, where she indicates that the use of media technologies in *Waves* was driven by a desire to represent the emotional and mental experience of Woolf's novel (2010). Here she argues that 'mainstream theatre' did not represent how she experienced 'relationships or life', stating instead that 'everything was slightly more chaotic': [124]

> [...] so I was looking [...] for something that represented that chaos, but still had all that feeling in it. [...] That's why we started using video/sound and fragmenting the stage picture, [...] combining video output with the live construction. (Mitchell, 2010)

It is significant that the use of video technology is directly related to the representation of experience; furthermore, Mitchell's' rhetoric of 'chaos', 'experience' and 'stream of consciousness' is significant in reflecting the project of early-twentieth century American scene designer Robert Edmond Jones (1887-1954), who described the potentiality of combining film and theatre in his influential work *The Dramatic Imagination* (1941).[125] Here Jones argues that

---

[123] Jane Goldman has recently placed special emphasis on the activity of memory in Woolf's work, however these responses must be read with caution as they provide speculative and romantic readings of the author into their fiction: 'Whatever other events and facts you discover about Woolf's life, whatever your response to her work, her first vital memories become a powerful touchstone. Whatever opinion you come to form of her life or of her writing, bear in mind that she remembers what it was like to sit on her mother's knee and see the colours of her dress, what it was like to lie in bed and hear waves and a window blind moving, the blissful feeling of lying at the centre of a luminous yellow grape. She knows that it is to remember and record such moments during the darkest of times. Her genius lies in seeing that this is the most important kind of communication to make' (2006, p. 3). While a problematic interpretation of the novel, one can identify this romantic rationale in Mitchell's own transition of the novel to the stage.

[124] Mitchell does not specify what she means by 'mainstream theatre'; my assumption is that she refers to naturalistic playwriting driven by Aristotelian dramatic principles.

[125] This also reflects the project of modernists such as August Strindberg (1849-1912), Anthonin Artaud (1896-1948) and Gertrude Stein (1874-1946) who explored ways of representing experience.

in the combination of the 'living actor and the talking picture in the theatre there lies a wholly new theatrical art, whose possibilities are as infinite as those of speech itself' (pp. 15-16). Jones' polemical writings suggest that such an amalgamation allows the 'synthesis of actuality and dream' (p.18). In explaining this, he remarks on the editing of moving image sequences and the potential, therefore, for the representation of the mind's activity:

> Motion pictures are our thoughts made visible and audible. They flow in a swift succession of images, precisely as our thoughts do, and their speed… approximates very closely the speed of our thinking. (p. 16)

Jones' statements are speculative and offer no supporting evidence, yet are significant in their reflection of a number of assumptions regarding 'stream of consciousness' in the early twentieth century.[126] For example, Jones writes that the 'inner self' contains a 'vast dynamic world of impulse and dream'; he also describes a 'stream of images running through our minds, only just beginning to find expression in art' (1941, pp. 13-14). His rhetoric concerning multimedia theatre is interesting in relation to Katie Mitchell's description of *The Waves* as a representation of 'stream of consciousness'. However, these claims regarding the combination of stage and screen are somewhat misguided, since it has been argued that literary 'stream of consciousness' is a product of technique, and not an accurate depiction of mental activity (Humphrey, 1954; Kumar, 1962). For example, Kumar demonstrates the obvious obstacle that no fiction could represent the actual processes of the mind, but demonstrates that literary techniques might demonstrate a character's experiences in flux.[127] Humphrey also argues that these novels in no-way resemble scientific models of the mind, which he maintains would require coverage of the

---

[126] Donald Oenclager has demonstrated that Jones' rhetoric reveals his fascination with early-twentieth century developments in psychoanalysis, and subsequently inform his assumption that literary and visual works were able to represent human psychology (1969, p. 9). This might be explained by Stephen Kern's ambitious study *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918* (1983), which provides a comprehensive examination of the experience of temporality in the early twentieth century.

[127] Kumar argues that an accurate 'psycho-analytical' approach would neglect the presentation of '*la durèe, mèmoire involontaire* and intuition', therefore representing a different aesthetic entirely (1962, p. 3-4). More recently, Stephen Kern has identified the technique as a reflection of early-twentieth century attitudes towards the mind. He argues that perceptions of thought shifted from a 'tranquil passage of discrete ideas' to a 'thunderous action of memories that interlace, permeate, melt into, drag down, and gnaw on present experience' (1982, p. 43). Fernihough also sees Henri Bergson's notion of *durèe* as a major influence on the cultural climate from which the stream-of-consciousness novel emerged (2007, p. 68).

'entire area of mental attention, from preconsciousness on through the levels of the mind up to and including the highest one of rational, communicable awareness' (1954, p. 2). He adds that any attempt to read a psychological model into a novelist's work would be erroneous, demanding 'answers to serious metaphysical questions'.[128] Despite this, while Edmond Jones unknowingly celebrated the representation of an artfully constructed 'stream of consciousness', I argue that his speculations on the use of the moving image to simulate this style are not without worth.

While far removed from the early-twentieth century in which Jones wrote, Mitchell's *Waves* demonstrates the fruition of his hypothesis, where the moving image is indeed employed alongside stage activity with the aim of simulating the literary construction of a 'stream of images running through our minds' (Jones, 1941, pp. 13-14). While this is itself a flawed rationale, it is interesting that Mitchell's production transposed this style using realist conventions of film grammar to represent the activity of the 'stream of consciousness', drawing upon non-representational uses of theatre space and performance to frame and create the moving image. Arguably, this reveals a separation between the cinematic representation of the novel and the seemingly 'anonymous' theatrical medium. To account for this unique format, I will explore Mitchell's process in devising and producing the work, and the actors' reflection on this process and their performances. In doing so I demonstrate the extent to which the representational facets of *Waves* were mediatized. I also scrutinise the apparent dominance of the moving image to explore how its representational illusion was mediated by the theatrical key in this production, thus allaying anxieties of mediatization and demonstrating a synthesis of languages.

---

[128] He argues that the 'fine distinctions' that would concern us were we to consider these impressions as accurate depictions would lead toward erroneous questions such as: "Is, for example, memory a part of mental content or is it a mental process?"(1962, p. 33-7)

The multimedia staging of *Waves* was celebrated in 2006 as a uniquely successful amalgamation of moving image and performance. This was reflected in press responses including Lyn Gardner's praise for the production in *The Guardian* newspaper:

> Katie Mitchell's extraordinary production of Virginia Woolf's experimental novel *The Waves* at the National Theatre is that rarely sighted beast, a performance where theatre and video come together so seamlessly and complement each other so exquisitely it is as if Mitchell, her actors and video artist Leo Warner have created an entirely new art form. (2006)

Gardner's praise suggests that the use of the moving image in *Waves* was a revelation concerning the synthesis of stage and screen; she states that Mitchell and video designer Leo Warner, 'offer a glimpse of how theatre and film can work together in equal partnership, rather than being rivals for our attention' (2006).[129] This rhetoric of rivalry echoes the anxieties of dominance espoused by Auslander in *Liveness,* where he challenges assumptions that 'live and filmed representations can be combined as complementary and equally compelling languages' (2008, p. 40).[130] Despite Gardner's celebration of the multimedia format of *Waves,* one might argue that the grammars of the moving image were more compelling than stage activity in this production. This is evident from the rhetoric and grammar of filmmaking that saturated the language of the production process and the performance of Mitchell's multimedia work.

Actor Ben Wishaw, who performed in Mitchell's later production *...Some Trace of Her* (2008)*,* describes performing in this unique cross-media format as: 'making a film live every night' (2010). This statement begs the question to what extent 'mediatized epistemology' informed Mitchell's staging in *Waves.* I consciously re-iterate Auslander's rhetoric here, where he argues that 'mediatization is not just a question of the employment of media technology, but

---

[129] Gardner adds: 'Until Waves I didn't know that this room was even in theatre's house; Mitchell's achievement is to have made it all her own' (2006).
[130] It is interesting in regards to the 'stream of consciousness' paradigm that I have identified, that Auslander's statement here is a direct challenge to Robert Edmond Jones' writings on the use of the moving image to represent this 'stream'.

a 'matter of what might be called "media epistemology" (2008, p. 36). Auslander argues that

even 'small-scale, intimate live performances can be products of this preformed perception' (p.

36).[131] Despite Auslander's implied notion of dominance, his rhetoric provides a useful way-in

to the analysis of Mitchell's production through a media lens. However, I do not myself view

Waves as evidence of the victory of the moving image over the live; instead, I would posit that

Mitchell and her company took creative advantage of the 'epistemology' available in

contemporary media culture in devising this production. Mitchell's interview on the topic of

Waves for the website 'Whatsonstage.com' is revealing in this respect:

> The world has now changed. A lot of information comes to us in very different
> packaging: internet; cinema; advertising and the tempo and the structure of our lives
> has altered how we receive information and theatre needs to reflect that. (2006)

This statement reveals that the video tools used in *Waves* were incorporated for their

mediatized capability of producing meaning; moreover, Mitchell implies that these grammars

are familiar to audiences. One could draw a comparison between this rationale and Auslander's

reflection on the mediatized context in which contemporary theatre takes place, but whereas he

condemns the assimilation of mediatized epistemology into the theatre as a contamination

(2008, p. 7), I want to resist such value judgments to demonstrate the advantage these

grammars and modes of viewing offer the practitioner as creative tools.

The creative motivation for using media-epistemology in *Waves* appears to be linked to

Mitchell's perhaps misguided attempt to represent the 'stream-of-consciousness' technique of

Woolf's original novel. Mitchell reveals this in an interview for *The Guardian* newspaper, where

she explains the challenges of the source-text that led to the company's decision to 'explore

sound and live video images':

> Any attempt to dramatise a famous novel is perilous. Readers build pictures of
> characters, places and events in their heads while they read. Any alternative
> representation presents them with a different picture that can often disappoint. And

---

[131] Pointing to his analysis in *Presence and Resistance* (1992), Auslander demonstrates that performance artist Laurie Anderson's 'media-saturated performances and Spalding Gray's low-tech, intimate ones can be seen as televisual, even in live presentations'(2008,p. 36); (See also Auslander, 1992, pp. 70-81).

> Woolf's novel poses more obstacles than most when it comes to transposing it to the theatre. First, there is no external narrative; second, the text is comprised only of inner thoughts; and third, it covers an enormous sweep of time. (2006)

Mitchell argues that these 'new tools would enable' the performance to 'jump effortlessly and speedily between different people, times, events and places' (2006).[132] As I will demonstrate in this chapter, the conventions of continuity editing allowed for compelling video representations of the disparate scenes of *The Waves.* Interestingly, however, there is an implicit realism in the use of this representational system, which suggests that the creative motivation for its employment was a realistic portrayal of the 'stream of consciousness' fluidity of Woolf's novel. To explore this further, and demonstrate the extent to which 'media epistemology' informed other facets of this production, I examine the process of devising this production. Through my interviews with actors Kate Duchene, Paul Ready and Michael Gould I have been able to construct a narrative of the process of creating *Waves* that offers insights into the way the moving image was incorporated into what McAuley would term the 'rehearsal space' of this production. These observations shed light on the creative rationale for the combination of the normative frame of the moving image and live performance in the theatrical event.

EARLY WORKSHOPS

A workshop held at the National Theatre Studio in 2006 provided an exploratory and collaborative environment in which to consider approaches for the presentation of a performance based on Woolf's novel.[133] Actor Michael Gould affirms that this 'first engagement' was 'production-free', but reveals that a play based on *The Waves* was being considered (2010).[134] The genesis of the production was in this workshop, and it is interesting that these early experiments did not incorporate the moving image; Duchene verifies that the earliest

---

[132] I would contend Mitchell's argument that these technologies are new. As described by Giesekam, this is far from the case and – as Waltz has demonstrated – these media have been incorporated into the theatre for over a century (Giesekam, 2007); (Waltz).

[133] Actor Kate Duchene revealed that by 2006 Mitchell had intended a stage adaptation of Woolf's novel for 'maybe five years', but had 'no idea how to get it onto a stage' (2010).

[134] Mike Gould explained that 'there was a production of *The Waves* planned but it hadn't been cast and it was very early days when we did this workshop' (2010).

workshops 'weren't multimedia', which she argues 'came in very slowly' (2010). By narrating how the moving image came to be used in this workshop process, one can reveal the earliest motivation for the company's use of mediatized grammars. It is significant therefore that the earliest experiments in representing the novel through performance involved sound, emulating more the radio play than the cinema.[135]

Duchene recalls that in their first workshop the company were provided with microphones 'just to do sound effects and voiceover.' Eventually, these rudimentary aural experiments were developed into more complex uses of sound for performance, as Duchene describes:

> […] we did a few really lovely things but without video. There was one beautiful thing that Stace [actor Anastasia Hill] initiated... of a slow motion walk-down of all six characters... very slow motion... when they meet at Hampton Court holding hands. There was a voiceover and you could see them doing what they were doing and it was very slow and it was really very beautiful. (2010)

This demonstrates that the sound effects and voiceover would be accompanied by onstage imagery, which would eventually develop into video images. However, initial experiments did not involve moving image media. For example, one visual experiment involved painting images during performance in order to demarcate the stages of the Sun that structure the novel. The performers began with a complete image of the Sun against the sky and painted additional layers of horizon over this, thus obscuring the original picture as the narrative progressed. These attempts at visually representing the descriptive passages of the novel became more complex as the company attempted to visualise passages that described the characters' memories in flux. These attempts motivated a number of visual experiments; in one early workshop, the company attempted to represent the character Susan 'baking her memories' by revealing them from underneath a kitchen table. Kate Duchene reflected on these experiments; stating that they produced 'beautiful work' that 'never got in - in the end' (2010). However, it is significant that

---

[135] This radio-play aesthetic remained in parts of the performance; Mitchell commenting on this in her interview for website 'whatsonstage.com', indicating that 'It's like a radio play for a bit, then a section of short film, then tap dancing' (2006).

these experiments, aimed at representing passages of active remembrance and thought from Woolf's novel, eventually led to the incorporation of the moving image into the production. It is also interesting that these non-realist attempts at staging a literary construction of mental activity through metaphor and sound gave way to the photorealism and compelling representational grammar of the video image.

The use of the moving image in *Waves* stemmed from an exercise in which Mitchell asked the performers to notate their own experience of memory. Paul Ready described this process:

> What Katie always does with her work is she identifies the themes of a play, and then you'll maybe find something in your life which is relevant to that theme and then you re-enact that part of your life. (2010)

In these workshops, Mitchell asked the actors to engage with their private experiences in order to explore the novel's thematic engagement with the activity of memories and thought. The cast were asked to represent scenes they could identify from their own memories using visual and aural techniques. Ready describes the recollections he contributed to the workshop:

> There were these old ladies that used to live next to us and I'd remembered a pair of slippers and then a massive grandfather clock - just in my memory - and then something else - and my thought pattern went - 'like that'. They weren't linked particularly, apart from by the old ladies, but the images could've been anything; that's how my memory worked. We started to look at *how* memory worked, as well; for example: the grandfather clock was massive in my memory because when I was a kid it *was* massive; now I'm the same height as it. (2010)

After describing memories such as these, the actors would attempt to perform them. It is pertinent that Kate Duchene uses the term 'stream of consciousness' to describe the results of these exercises, as it was the challenge of representing these thoughts visually which led to the use of the moving image to realise them in the subsequent devising process for a production of *Waves.*

Interestingly counter-intuitive is that the company seem to turn to video to represent the fragmented, fluid and irrational aspects of Woolf's novel; one might argue that the use of the

moving image to do so makes the project more realistic; which Michael Billington criticised in his review for *The Guardian* newspaper:

> [...] images are matched, with daunting literalism, to the word: no sooner has one of the characters, Rhoda, described pressing her foot against the bed-rail to reassure herself of the materiality of existence than you get a close-up of her toe. (2006)[136]

The devising methods whereby video sequences were created to represent passages from Woolf's novel demonstrate how this realist apparatus solved the problem of dramatising the challenging source-material. However, it is worth noting that the rhetoric of film production and that of 'stream-of-consciousness' were often linked in this process. Paul Ready's recollections of the memory-based exercises described above are revealing in this regard, as he describes how the performers would notate their own 'stream of consciousness' in the workshops. I have demonstrated that this is arguably a misguided rationale, as the representation of this 'stream' is more a simulation of technique than an accurate representation. Therefore one must observe not only the role of the moving image in transposing the action of Woolf's novel, but that of the stage. Despite this, the rehearsal process of *Waves* was seemingly media-led, shedding little light on the creative motivation for presenting the screen in a theatrical event.

VIDEO DESIGN PROCESS

Following the workshops at the National Theatre Studio, an eight-week rehearsal process began for the production *Waves* (2010). During this time the performers would work with Mitchell to devise the production. In the second week of this process, video designer Leo Warner – part of National Theatre Associate company '59 Productions' – joined the company. Warner provided technical expertise to facilitate the cast's video-based 'staging solutions' for

---

[136] As the moving image sequences in Waves provide a realist portrayal of the novel's 'stream', I would not argue that the multimedia staging provided a faithful solution to staging the novel. However, it is not the province of this thesis to make value judgments or scrutinise the adaptation of Woolf's text, of more interest to my enquiry is the extent to which the theatrical event was cinematically conceived as realistic visualizations of the novel's action were created during the rehearsal and devising process.

their 40 page version of Wolf's novel.[137] As Duchene recalls, passages from the text were handed to individual performers to realise visually; she asserts that Warner's role was always to assist in the devising process:

> Prescribing doesn't describe the rehearsal process because we all worked on it together. For instance: Katie would say "Could you work on this scene? You work on that scene. You work on that scene". Usually almost always about the character you were looking after. So I go off with a scene about Susan... (2010)

From my interviews with the cast, it is significant that their individual staging solutions were conceived using cinematic rhetoric, processes, and grammar, as this is evident in Paul Ready's description:

> So we'd go away in separate groups and go: "OK, how are we going to represent this bit?" And then we work out what images we'd want to see; basically trying to storyboard it for ourselves. And then with the massive help of Leo - who's amazing - we'd see what we could represent in a very simple setting. (2010)

Immediately pertinent is Ready's use of the term 'storyboarding', which evokes the workflow of film pre-production where linear sequences of shots are planned through the grammar of classical continuity before shooting (see Katz, 1991). Mitchell describes this storyboarding process in an interview for the National Theatre website, where she recalls how the company took photographs and laid them out in sequence. Significantly Mitchell identified her own role in this devising process as the 'keeper of the edit', which she understands as the place 'where the meaning of film lies' (Mitchell, 2010). This is revealing, as the 'meaning' of conventional editing - as described in chapter 2 - is the establishing of realistic spatio-temporal indices to create an illusion of continuity between shots.

The working process whereby the company developed storyboards with video designer Leo Warner reveals how realist conventions of the moving image were embraced as the company developed staging solutions for the images described in Woolf's novel. This became

---

[137] Katie Mitchell uses this term in her interview for *The Guardian* (2006)

evident in my interview with Kate Duchene, who demonstrated how a particular passage from the novel was staged as a moving image sequence created live onstage:

> Katie told me to go off and work on that scene - that section where Susan talks about seeing them [Florrie and a lover] embrace in the garden - and I worked out what I wanted to see in my head but I had no idea how to do it. I wanted a perspective from... I thought maybe I could do it with a cutaway to Susan - feet on the grass - and see them embracing. (2010)

Duchene is describing an early passage from Woolf's novel, in which a young Susan spies two figures kissing in a kitchen garden. Duchene reveals how she worked with Leo Warner in order to realise the storyboarded sequence she had created:

> I didn't know how to do the sky and the perspective and everything. Leo looked at what I'd tried to do and so I'd go away and work on it - probably overnight - and then come back with the ideas on the text and say: "I'd like this cutaway and I'm not quite sure how we'd do this." (2010)

A significant challenge for Warner and Duchene was establishing the scene's outdoor location, as the settings had to be configured live on-stage. Duchene recalls that Warner suggested they create a single shot of a sheet drying in the wind; the lovers' embrace would be seen in silhouette against this. To achieve this, they formulated an on-stage activity that would allow the live creation of this camera-shot:

> So we all worked out what angle everything had to be at; and the sheet endlessly had to be worked out. It had to be exactly the right angle and exactly the right height so that the hands weren't in the shot at all. (2010)

Once the stage configuration was successfully executed, and the shot delivered to the projection screen, the image would be accompanied by a voiceover taken from the abridged version of the novel that the images represented. In this instance, the reading presented a recollection of Susan's childhood memory:

> 'I saw Florrie in the kitchen garden,' said Susan, 'as we came back from our walk, with the washing blown out round her, the pyjamas, the drawers.' 'And Ernest kissed her. He was in his green baize apron and his mouth was sucked like a purse in wrinkles and he seized her with the pyjamas blown out hard between them. (Mitchell, 2008)

While the onstage configuration that allowed Duchene and Warner to achieve this shot remained visible in performance, one could argue that the film space presented a compelling representation of this scene. My argument is that this realistic illusion was sustained due to the normative spatial experience of the moving image, and the convention of 'open framing' frequently used in this production.

The majority of video images in *Waves* were composed as 'open framings'. Steven Katz explains this term in his celebrated textbook *Film Directing: Shot by Shot,* in which he distinguishes between 'open and closed compositions' (1991, p. 259). He argues that 'open framings are compositions of the type usually found in documentaries, where many of the elements in the frame are beyond the filmmaker's control' (p. 259). He demonstrates that in open compositions 'several subjects may be partially cut off by the edge of the frame' (p. 259). This was certainly the case in the video image described by Kate Duchene, where the camera focussed only on the sheet, disregarding the wider visual field which would have revealed the theatre space and the apparatus in its stage configuration. Katz describes how open framing can 'withhold information by revealing only portions of the principal subject' (p. 264), this strategy was used throughout *Waves* in order to sustain an illusion in the film space of the screen by obscuring elements of the subject that would have revealed the fabrication of the image. This posits a crucial question about the extent to which normative grammars of the moving image were successfully used in *Waves,* as it could be argued that the illusion offered by the open framings of the video images were so compelling that the simultaneous visibility of the complete subject onstage did not negate the spatial indexing of screen. Put simply: the illusion of reality in the video image was not disrupted by seeing how it was made. It is therefore significant that a number of moving image sequences in *Waves* made extensive use of continuity editing, with successful results which relied upon complex onstage configurations to produce seemingly effortless on-screen illusions of fictional space.

In an on-screen sequence showing the six characters at a dinner, multiple camera angles provided open framings of individual characters; spatial indexes were established between these shots as they were edited under strict adherence to the 'classical continuity' style of camera position and editing as described in Chapter 2. The scene was first established through a shot of Neville accompanied by a voice-over describing that he has arrived ten minutes early 'in order to taste every moment of anticipation' as he awaits Percival; he is instead joined by a nervous Louis (Mitchell, 2008, pp. 50-51). A film space was soon established as the two simultaneous video images displayed opposite sides of the dinner table. In one shot we observed Louis sitting across the table from Neville, whom we saw in the other frame. While shown simultaneously, a spatial index was established between the two images by adherence to the 180° rule (Katz, 1991, p. 129).[138] Despite this on-screen illusion of spatial continuity, the film space of the restaurant was visibly fabricated onstage where one saw that Neville and Louis were actually sat horizontally apart on separately staged and lit dinner tables. However, a combination of open framing - which obscured elements of the subject that would negate the illusion - and the spatial indexing afforded by continuity grammar sustained a film space even as the staging became increasingly complex.

Susan arrives at the restaurant and sits with Neville, pouring Louis a glass of water from a jug. This small activity seemed effortless on-screen, but was visibly the result of a sophisticated on-stage choreography (Figure 3). Adhering to the 180° rule on the video screen, Susan lifted the jug and poured it into Louis' glass; spatial continuity was established via the combination of shots and the mechanically smooth matching of the images taken from the two camera positions. However, whilst Susan's face was portrayed by actor Kate Duchene, her hand and jug in the

---

[138] Katz describes the 180° rule as a 'line of action', which he describes as an 'imaginary partition running through the space in front of the camera' (p. 129). He argues that it was 'originally devised to make sure that if multiple angles of a scene were shot, they could be cut together without a confusing reversal of left and right screen space. This way, subjects moving through the frame in one shot continue in the same direction in a subsequent shot. (p. 129).

reverse-shot actually belonged to another performer. While often representing characters from the novel when shown on-screen, the performers did not necessarily play them onstage; instead the cast described themselves as 'looking after' the characters (Ready, 2010); (Duchene, 2010). This term recurred frequently in my interviews with the cast, as did a notion that they were not performing with a traditional understanding of psychologically-whole 'character'. Duchene explained that this term emerged as the cast became aware that they 'weren't playing a character in a way'; therefore, individual cast members were given the responsibility of 'looking after' a particular character, and would represent their face on-screen (2010). However, other body parts - and the character's voice - would be represented by different cast members at various times. Despite the visible onstage distance and fragmentation of character, adherence to classical continuity grammar sustained the film space, and thus the realism of the moving image sequence and a seeming continuity in the representation of character. This begins to reveal the compelling activity of the theatre space in this production, as complex onstage choreography was a typical feature of achieving the video images in *Waves,* where the simplest on-screen movements were achieved through sophisticated stage activities. For example, in this same dinner sequence, Bernard shook the hands of Jinny and Neville who were supposedly seated across the dinner table; condiments and glasses were also passed around seamlessly on-screen. Mechanically smooth continuity was often successful in moments because the eye-lines of the performers themselves appeared to match; however, it was clearly visible onstage that the performers were staring into thin air. Eventually, a third camera angle was added to the edited sequences that showed the dinner table, thus increasing the complexity of stage activity. It is striking how compelling the film space remained in spite of the visibility of its mechanisms, yet also of interest were the roles of the performers in this choreography who were collectively responsible for sustaining individual onscreen performances in adherence to moving image grammars and conventions.

FIGURE 3 - *WAVES* (COTTESLOE THEATRE, LONDON, 2006) DIRECTOR: KATIE MITCHELL, VIDEO DESIGN: '59 PRODUCTIONS'

PERFORMANCE APPROACHES

The continuity sustained between shots in the dinner sequence described above demonstrates acting concerns that are more often found in film production. Mel Churcher describes these conventions in her textbook *Acting for Film* (2003), where she argues that continuity is 'not just what you do and when you do it, but the tempo of movements and feeling' (p. 182).[139] An unconventional approach to continuity in *Waves* was the fragmentation of character across multiple performers; as such, the 'matching' that Churcher describes made demands on more than one actor at any moment. Mitchell explains the worth of this approach in an interview for website 'Whatsonstage.com':

> On average four to six actors are representing one character at these moments "so one is doing their thoughts, the other is their face, the other is their hands, the other is the sound of them eating." This liberates the actors so that they are able "to capture more

---

[139] Churcher describes the importance of 'eye lines' continuity, telling the actor that 'We will be able to tell if you cheat on this' (2003, p. 177).

accurately experience, perception and behaviour than a play could." (2006)

This rationale is interesting as it privileges acting in the 'close-up' shot, anatomising performance to show intense emotional detail. Again, one could argue that the 'intensity' - as described by Paul Taylor (2006) - of these shots exhibits a realist rationale to portray the fluid images of the novel.[140] Interestingly, the realist performances in these 'close-up' shots were conceived in terms reflecting a common – yet ill-conceived – rhetoric of 'truthfulness' in describing screen acting. In an interview for the National Theatre, Mitchell reveals that the company were 'looking for images that would crystallise the interior landscape of the characters feelings and thoughts' (Mitchell, 2010). She argues that the actors' on-screen performances were thus extremely detailed in their realism: 'it was a very sort of labour intensive thing because you have to find a very precise image and the behaviour inside it has to be really accurate' (Mitchell, 2010). Mitchell describes her motivation in privileging this style, arguing that the 'camera allows every member of the audience to see very fine acting close-up'; she states that you 'can see every flicker of every thought and emotion on the 2000 muscles on the actor's face' (2006). These descriptions demonstrate yet another instance of 'media epistemology' in the process and performance of the production.

When acting on-camera, the performers adopted a naturalistic, and arguably cinematic, acting style; this is reflected by Paul Ready, who remarks that: 'They say the camera can read your thoughts' (2010b). Ready's rhetoric reflects key concerns in film acting, articulated in Jeremiah Comey's *The Art of Film Acting* (2002) which distinguishes 'film experience' from 'stage experience' by demonstrating the 'emotional exposure' of the close-up shot (p. 24). These descriptions of the exposure offered by the close-up shot give the impression of more intense emotion. However, these descriptions offer problematic assumptions on the 'truth' of realist screen acting; for example, Comey states that the close-up 'uncovers your personality by revealing your deepest thoughts', and compares this to stage performance:

---

[140] Billington responds by stating that 'there seems [...] something extravagantly pointless about trying to give Woolf's words a physical reality' (2006).

> The stage actor has to project the dialogue and use larger-than-life movements to reach the back row. The experience of an actress on stage may be as deep as [...] the close up, but the distance from the stage to the audience makes that experience less visible and intimate. Onstage intimacy has to be heightened to convey its meaning to the audience. Paradoxically, however, when you heighten intimacy, it diminishes. (p. 25)

While these statements might describe the intensity of the close-ups encountered in *Waves,* this is a crude argument concerning the performer's process, as the construction of intimacy and emotion must rely on the skill of the actor in both theatrical and cinematic circumstances. Despite the narrow vocabulary available to describe the process of acting in close-up, the distinction Comey provides is significant if one regards Mitchell's direction of actor Ben Wishaw, who performed in her later production *...Some Trace of Her*. Whilst not speaking in relation to performances in *Waves,* his remarks demonstrate how realist conventions of acting 'truthfully' in close-up were conceived in these productions:

> The style of acting that we have to employ is very filmic [...] it's a case of trying to allow very internal things to be going on; quite often in rehearsal, Katie would just say: so Ben you're going to have to think of something very interesting at the moment [...] the interesting thing about acting for camera is that it doesn't matter what you're thinking about as long as you're thinking something because the camera picks up on it.
> (Wishaw, 2010)

The construction of emotion and intimacy in the close-up shots requires the artful engagement of the performer, who is more exposed on-camera than in certain stage configurations. In this case the actor's own activity of thought is recorded by the camera; this method of performing engagement is reflected in existing descriptions of the film actor's work in a close-up shot. For example, Churcher demonstrates that a close-up 'has to be filled with thoughts and needs' (2003, p. 176). Comey also describes the film close-up as 'a quiet reality' with a 'normal level of human interaction' (p. 14). However, he goes further to add that 'you have to be not only subtle but real', as the 'camera sees everything and demands absolute truth' (p. 14). While this descriptive rhetoric is simplistic, it is clearly reflected in the performance approaches of Mitchell's casts. As such, the grammar of acting adopted in these video sequences is arguably more cinematic than the technique employed for their stage performances.

In contrast to the realism of the on-screen performances, stage activity was seemingly non-representational and task-based. One could argue that the performers were subordinated to the moving images they were required to configure throughout the performance. However, in my interviews I often encountered a description of stage activity as a 'dance', suggesting that the onstage movement was considered a choreographed and compelling activity:

> Despite having these characters our real focus was just: "get this lamp to here"; "OK now we have to be in this image now so put your hand in here"; "hold this backdrop". It was chaotically busy until it then became quite graceful because we got it into our muscle memory - our bodies - it became more like a dance. (Ready, 2010)

> You couldn't really get more 'ensemble' because you were playing somebody else's hand, or their voice. So many things are called ensemble but they're not. [...] Bravura performances are fantastic as well but there's a great satisfaction in being part of a whole. It was very beautiful to perform. It was like dance. (Duchene, 2010)

The rhetoric of 'muscle memory' and 'dance' in these descriptions reveals the proficiency with which the performers executed the tasks required of them in *Waves.* However, despite their emphasis on choreographed tasks it is intriguing that the cast approached their on-stage performances through psychological routes of characterization.[141]

Paul Ready describes Mitchell's approach to rehearsing the actors' onstage performances; he reveals that she 'always likes to give you other things to focus on as a way of channelling what you're doing; to give you some kind of focus' (2010). In this instance, Mitchell offered direction regarding the characterization of the performers onstage; this was conceived separately from the fictional characters they represented on-screen. Her rationale for this stemmed from autobiographical aspects she discerned in Woolf's novel; on this basis, she

---

[141] Philip Zarrilli describes 'psychologically whole' characters in the 'realist plays of Anton Chekhov, Henrik Ibsen' and Tennessee Williams; he sees 'realist approaches to acting' as conventional, and argues that psychology has been important to 'shaping the dramaturgy of realist and naturalist plays from the late nineteenth through the twentieth centuries' (2008, p. 7). However, Zarrilli argues that these approaches 'may be inadequate or even inappropriate to the realization of the dramaturgy and acting tasks that constitute an actor's performance score in a post-dramatic text or performance' (p. 8). He argues that the 'psychological' can therefore no longer describe the full range of work the 'contemporary actor' might encounter (p. 8). However, this is not only a contemporary problem, one could argue that older forms of performance such as *commedia dell'arte* and French mime use physicality to inform the psychology of acting.

conceived of a fictional performance artist - based upon Virginia Woolf – as the progenitor of the performers' activities in the theatrical event:

> She [Woolf] was an artist that had got together this group of people that were supposedly experts in their field. I played a video designer - so I would be Leo [Warner] if it had been the actual circumstance - and the concept was that she'd got this group of people together to put on this production of *The Waves* in a Maida Vale radio studio in front of a live audience. (Ready, 2010)

In this sense, the performers conceived of a fictional referent to psychologise their on-stage activities. The fictional motivation of performing a radio-play allowed them to qualify their presence in front of a live audience as they then used Foley techniques and various media apparatus to deliver the fictional action of Woolf's story as an audio/visual artefact. Kate Duchene reveals that these performance-artist characters shared their own onstage relationships which were distinct from the characters of Woolf's novel that they portrayed on-screen:

> We created characters with quite complicated backgrounds and relationships that were then looking after the characters in the novel. So in our heads, to begin with, we were playing two people. Well, we were playing one person who was playing another person. (2010)

This demonstrates a psychological overlay to the otherwise task-based – what might be described as 'postdramatic' (Lehmann, 2007) – stage activity.[142] Despite the cast's own psychological rationalization of their onstage activities, the theatre space was not indexed as a fictional radio studio, nor could a spectator be aware of the performance-artist characters the actors were playing.[143] As such, while there is a psychological rationale to the performances, one might also regard an additional layer which is more effectively notated through Philip Zarrilli's paradigm of 'psychophysical acting'.

---

[142] Gould explains that Mitchell is 'traditionally known for complete character immersion' (2010).
[143] Despite this, audience members may have been making the associations themselves.

Zarrilli responds to a contemporary situation where 'today's contemporary actor is no longer restricted to playing fully rounded, individual characters' (2008, p. 7).[144] Zarrilli therefore argues that 'acting should be viewed as a set of psychophysical processes by means of which a (theatrical) world is made available in the moment of its appearance and experience for both actors and audiences' (p. 9). Zarrilli's paradigm of contemporary acting therefore has more in common with the aesthetically conceived 'auratic presence' described by Power (see Chapter 2), than the engendering of 'fictional presence' required for playing realist characters. As such, I would argue that even if the performers in *Waves* were not consciously adopting a psychophysical approach, one might still read their onstage behaviour as an activation of the 'presentational space' of the theatre through an aesthetically conceived 'presence', such as described in the previous chapter. Striking in this respect, however, is a gap between the theatrical medium and representation, where a moving image-based realist portrayal of Woolf's novel seemingly dominates a theatrical space that serves only to generate its mediatized content. One could argue that the theatre is subjugated by the moving image in *Waves.* For example, the performance styles described by the cast demonstrate a particular focus on cinematic acting techniques; furthermore, the processes of the 'rehearsal space' I have described reveal a saturation of media-derived rhetoric as one observes the storyboarding and 'editing' of the diegesis of the production.[145] Arguably, *Waves* was mediatized to the extent that it has been conceived, created, performed, and received through moving image grammars; on the balance of this, one must ask how to account for the operation of the theatrical frame in this live film.

I will allay anxieties of dominance by turning attention to the operation of theatre's grammars of space and presence in this production. The moving image, despite its ownership of the fiction of this production, is still situated within - and mediated by - the theatrical key in ways that are vital to notating the synthesised theatrical event as a whole. Duchene's insistence

[144] Zarrilli explains that actors now perform 'across a broad spectrum' of 'dramaturgies such as the later plays of Samuel Beckett' (2008, p. 7).
[145] By 'diegesis' I mean the 'narrative presented by a cinematographic film or literary work; the fictional time, place, characters, and events which constitute the universe of the narrative'. *OED* [online] Available at@ <www.oed.com/view/Entry/52402?redirectedFrom=diegesis#> [Accessed 27th February 2011].

in interview that 'Waves was theatre' (2010) suggests that despite the saturation of 'media epistemology' in this production, one cannot describe the performance as a complete text without taking into consideration its theatrical qualities.

3. MEDIUM AND REPRESENTATION IN *WAVES*

Striking in *Waves* is an apparent imbalance between medium and representation, where the theatrical fame is used to *present* a moving image which *represents* Woolf's novel. This challenge to notation can be described through Cormac Power's paradigm of 'fictional presence', which describes activation of theatrical space and its objects, so that performers, props, and settings stand *for* fictional entities. To highlight the distance between medium and representation in *Waves*, one can draw on Power's distinction between 'fictional presence' in the theatre and representation in the moving image. Power argues that activating the material objects of the stage as fictional items 'requires a wilful act of imagination on the part of spectators which fundamentally separates the respective experiences of theatre and film' (2008, p. 24). However, Power insists that 'we are never fooled into thinking that the chairs and tables onstage *are* actually those in a fiction', arguing that audience members 'pretend' that these objects are part of a text by marking them 'with a minus sign'; this leads Power to conclude that in order to engender fictional presence, the reality of theatre-objects has to be 'subtracted' (2008, p. 18). Regarding the moving image, Power argues that because film does not represent material objects in the first place, no subtraction of reality need occur to engender fiction; the result is a 'strong sense of action happening in the present' (p. 21). By this logic, the material reality of the props and sets onstage in *Waves* are never activated as fictional items, but are simultaneously absorbed by the moving image while we can see the images being created. This is part of the moving image's compelling normative grammar, and demonstrates why complex situations in *Waves* - where open framings and continuity editing engender spatial illusion - are

not disrupted by the simultaneous visibility of their stage fabrication. This also provides an adequate explanation for the compelling realism of the video images in this production.

As the theatre's spaces are devoid of a fictional presence, one must consider the activity of the theatrical frame in this production as the activation of the threshold stage of 'presentational space' as described by McAuley (see Chapter 2). However, in this instance where the diegesis is delivered through the moving image and amplified sound, it is difficult to describe to what extent theatrical space and presence contribute to this production which has been - for the most part - conceived cinematically. My interview with Kate Duchene is interesting in this respect, where she insisted that the six cast-members 'were there to make present *one thing*';

> What happened with the video was that you had a vision of the artist's mind in a different way from how you - obviously - read her mind in the book. But you had a sense of the creative process because you saw the mess down on the stage, and the fiddling, and themes. (2010)

This statement provides an eloquent solution to the problem of medium and representation in *Waves.* Considering a 'synthesised space' that encompasses the activated 'presentational space' and the film space within it, it could be argued that a wider fictional presence is activated, which in this case engenders the representation of the creative process of memory-making one encounters in Woolf's novel. This is interesting in relation to Shiv Kumar's description of the 'stream of consciousness' novel, where he describes the action underneath a 'frozen surface', where one finds personalities in a 'state of perpetual flux' (1962, p. 98). Not taking this literally, but understanding the expressive implications of Kumar's observation, I would argue that the multimedia staging of *Waves* activates a 'synthesised space' that presents a private world in flux, which is based upon the fictionalised artist-creator implicit in Duchene's description.[146] As such, the stage space, activated as a 'presentational space' by the presence of the performers, demarcates an area in which moving image representations of memories are generated and then delivered onto a screen which might simulate an artfully constructed 'consciousness' itself.

---

[146] Mitchell's interpretation reflects romanticised readings of Woolf's work as autobiographical such as those of Jane Goldman (2006).

Kumar has demonstrated that the unique action of the stream of consciousness novel stems from a 'marked shift from a conception of personality as built round a hard and changeless core to a realization of it as a dynamic process' (Kumar, 1962, p. 10). Taking into account these new paradigms, Kumar identifies the representation of character's memories as 'the essence of the stream of consciousness novel' (1962, p. 25). Despite being contextualised against psychological theories by philosophers such as Henri Bergson (1859-1941), Kumar insists that establishing 'memory' as the province of activity in the stream of consciousness novel is a matter of technique and not a representation of reality. The facets of this technique are described in further detail in Humphrey's preceding study *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel* (1954). Of particular significance is Humphrey's description of 'consciousness' as the place of action in these works. Humphrey tries to map the literary 'stream-of-consciousness' paradigm; he argues that in works such as *The Waves,* 'the depicted consciousness serves as a screen on which the material in these novels is presented' (1954, p. 2).[147] This model of a 'screen' of consciousness can engender inevitable comparisons with Mitchell's multimedia staging in *Waves,* where one might argue that the memories that drive the action of Woolf's novel are literally presented on a 'screen' that simulates this technique. If consciousness is regarded as the locus of activity, then Humphrey argues that the term 'stream' describes its action. In relation to Mitchell's production, one might regard the moving image content as the representation of this stream, but also the stage activity of the performers who create these live in the theatrical event.[148] However, while the screen imagery - and the performances contained

---

[147] This is a problematic statement, Despite the trends he observes in works such as *Orlando* (1928) – in which the protagonist experiences multiple identities (and genders) – Humphrey argues that *The Waves* offers an alternative experience and contains 'no mystical quest after identity'; his reading is, instead, of a 'presentation of the purest psychological analysis in literature' (1954, p. 14). He thus places Woolf in a tradition of authors that have 'added mental functioning and psychic existence to the already established domain of motive and action'; Humphrey makes the romantic claim that Woolf's achievement was to create a 'fiction centered on the core of human experience' (1954, p. 22). Engaging in this domain – which is a simulation of theoretical models of the stream of consciousness - Woolf discovers dramatic conflict, which Humphrey applauds: 'The achievement is the tracing of the growth of psychic lives. The method is as much the presentation of uncensored observations by the characters of each other as it is of the characters' own psychological make-up' (1954, p. 14).

[148] It is worth noting that literature is a startling omission in Auslander's paradigm of cultural economy. Scholarship has shown that the written word has – and continues to – exert influence on the representational characteristics of other media including film and television. Despite these transmissions

within it - are decidedly realistic, the surrounding theatrical activity is not. This is an interesting effect of the divide between media in *Waves,* which poses problems for the notation of their synthesis. My solution is to focus not on the 'fictional presence' of theatrical elements, but on the 'auratic presence' of the human activities we observe and how this might mediate the otherwise realist moving image representations.

'AURATIC PRESENCE' AND THE MOVING IMAGE AS A 'STREAM'

The contribution of theatre's grammar to this otherwise mediatized production can be illuminated through Kumar, Humphrey and Fernihaugh's description of 'stream-of-consciousness' technique. I have already demonstrated how the moving image medium allowed the performers in *Waves* to portray the imagery in Woolf's novel realistically*.* However, while individual sequences such as the London dinner segment were arranged through grammars of spatial continuity, the scenes in *Waves* are themselves not logically continuous, but instead presented as a stream of instances.[149] This reflects Kumar's analysis of the literary technique of the stream of consciousness novel, where he argues that the 'the real creative impulse behind the new mode of portraying character' in this genre is to present them 'as a ceaseless stream of becoming' (1962, p. vii). More recently, Anne Fernihough has remarked on characterisation in

---

we find that literature is often ignored in theoretical works engaging with multimedia theatre. Literature does not neatly fit into a deterministic model such as Auslander's, despite its continuous influence.

[149] It is relevant that Karla Oeler, in her essay 'A Collective Interior Monologue' (2006), has identified 'stream of consciousness' literature as a referent for the unconventional editing styles proposed by Russian director Sergei Eisenstein (1898- 1948). Oeler examines a 1934 lecture delivered by Eisenstein at the State Institute of Cinematography (VGIK) on the work of James Joyce. She argues that Eisenstein attempted to demonstrate that Joyce's technique of interior monologue was based upon cinematic convention (2006, p. 472). From this she proceeds to explore the 'self-conscious aesthetic realization' of 'internal speech' in the work of Eisenstein and Armenian film-director Sergei Parajanov (2006, p. 472). Oeler introduces Vygotsky's theories on 'inner speech', which is distinguished from 'speech for others', stemming from a 'child's ability to distinguish between a shorthand speech for oneself and publicly comprehensible speech' (2006, p. 473). Oeler argues that 'inner speech' relies on the sense of a word and not its meaning; furthermore she argues that Viygotsky found that the 'non-conventional combination of words' could 'express complex ideas' (2006, p. 473). Oeler argues that Eisenstein saw cinema as a representation of this 'inner speech' due to the editing of 'sensual images and sounds'; indeed, Oeler argues that Eisenstein sought to 'supersede representation altogether', instead 'enabling the spectator to experience the shadows on the screen not as mimesis, but immediately as thought' (2006, p. 474). While based upon out-dated and ill-informed notions of the mind's activity, one is able to discern here an aesthetic of film editing where the sequencing of images is conceived as a representation of the 'inner speech' of memory and thought.

stream-of-consciousness literature, describing a 'present' that is 'swollen with the past' (2007, p. 69).[150]

> […] it is through memory, he argued, that our actions transcend predictable mechanical responses to the extent that we bring our accumulated experiences to bear on a given situation. Consciousness or 'duration', in which the present is swollen with the past, is the essential feature of our humanity.' (Fernihough, 2007, p. 69)

This rhetoric of accumulation, and a present 'swollen' by past experiences, is interesting in relation to the representation of the mind's activity in Mitchell's *Waves.* Without spatial indices to sustain a narrative between the disparate moving image scenes shown in performance, no tangible continuity could be sustained between them. Furthermore, the video images - sustained as they were by conventions of cinematic realism - could only index shots spatially and temporally, not as disparate thoughts on a simulated 'screen' of consciousness. As such, structuring the distribution of time in the theatrical event presents itself as a considerable challenge, which I would argue fell to theatrical space and the presence of its performers. Illuminating in this regard are Kumar's descriptions of similar problems and solutions in the stream-of-consciousness novel, focussing in particular on Woolf's structuring techniques in *The Waves.*

Kumar argues that Woolf has 'tried to project time on two different levels: the normal life-span and the diurnal movement of the sun' (1962, p. 83). These two temporal trajectories offer the clearest indication of the 'present' as one reads through the novel and observes its numerous and alogical unities of time, place, and action, which are held together by an abstract structure based on 'nine progressive phases of the sun' (1962, p. 84). The movement of the sun, and the lives of the characters, therefore become durational markers that provide rigid structure to an otherwise fluctuating temporal experience. Humhprey also highlights this difficult handling of temporal structure, arguing that the 'stream-of-consciousness writer cannot draw on the conventional use of plot to provide a necessary unity'; he adds that these authors have to

---

[150] Fernihough uses this rhetoric in relation to the work of Henri Bergson whom she argues informed much of the simulated activity of the mind in 'stream-of-consciousness' literature (2007).

employ 'theoretical cyclical schemes', which would include 'musical structures' and 'cycles of history' (1954, p. 86). Concentrating on *The Waves,* Humphrey demonstrates how the individual unities of time and action that represent 'memories' become established as scenes within these rigid abstract structures:

> The formal scenic arrangement of *The Waves* serves as a substitute for the lack of time unity and of plot, for each scene carries its own unity of time and the whole book is connected by the symbolic descriptions between the scenes.
> (1954, pp. 103-104)

Kumar and Humphrey have demonstrated how disparate 'memories' in *The Waves* are diffracted from a 'stream' of thoughts that co-operate as individual scenes encompassed within abstract temporal structures in order to form a remarkable inner world. My argument is that the theatrical frame, and in particular the 'auratic presence' of the performers, provides a similar rigid structure for the disparate moving-image scenes in Mitchell's simulation of these literary techniques in *Waves*

Despite the extensive mediatization of this production, and the dominance of realistic video representations, I would conclude that the activation of 'presentational space' by the performers in *Waves* sustains the structure of the theatrical event, thereby mediating the moving image which displays the 'stream' of images of Woolf's novel. In this sense, the theatrical frame is a compelling component of this performance due to the 'auratic' mode of presence, a quality of the theatre which Power describes as 'less about making *fictions* present than it is about making our experience of the present a subject of contemplation' (2008, p. 16). The activity of the performers, while not part of the diegesis of *Waves,* might be considered on the 'threshold stage' of 'presentational space' that McAuley describes. In this space, the 'dance' that the performers' executed in order to generate the film space becomes a compelling 'text' in its own right. This was reflected in a number of reviews, which curiously read this space as part of the simulated 'stream of consciousness', being compelled enough by this idea to describe the performance as a representation of the creative mind. For example, Lyn Gardner's review of the

production in *The Guardian* states that *Waves* is 'about the very act of creativity itself, the tools we use to make art and the self we sacrifice to do it, and if it is sometimes painful - well, birth is seldom easy' (2006). This is echoed in a review by Susannah Clapp for *The Observer,* who understood the stage business as 'the fragmented experience behind the image' (2006). Alastair Macauley also notes this fragmentation as a representation of the mind's activity, stating that 'Mitchell's most audacious stroke is to separate the outer person from the inner voice' (2006). Claire Allfree also took a literal interpretation of this separation, arguing that by 'emphasising the production's dramatic technique, Mitchell cleverly implies that memory is itself a creative, almost artificial act' (2006). These responses demonstrate that the 'stream of consciousness' technique, despite being a construction, provided a compelling referent through which to read the unconventional staging of the production. Despite this, I remain cynical towards such interpretations for reasons explained by Kumar and Humphrey on the inability to represent 'consciousness' through art. Furthermore, there is no convention, theatrical or cinematic, that marks a synthesised multimedia *mise-en-scène* as representing an 'inner world'; as such one must be wary of these critics reading preconceptions of 'stream-of-consciousness' into the performance. However, implicit in these reviews are responses to expressive and non-representational effects of the multimedia staging which are not readily explained by the grammars I have outlined thus far.

NEW QUESTIONS

Despite the creative rationale for using media-derived epistemology in this production being decidedly representational, there was a discernable expressive effect of the combination of stage and screen which is difficult to describe using the vocabularies of film language, or those of space and presence I have identified. It is significant, then, that Lyn Gardner observes a 'painful' act of creativity staged by the performers in *Waves,* and her review for *The Guardian* contains adjectives describing visceral, pleasurable, and embodied experiences that are striking:

[*Waves*] is akin to having an out of body experience. You feel as if you've mistakenly wandered into someone else's head and are drowning in an internal monologue in which the whispered banality of the everyday knocks hard against the deepest unarticulated desires, and the conscious and the unconscious can be simultaneously seen and heard clamouring for attention. A split second later you are in yet another person's head as the multi-stranded, non-linear, non-narrative stream of consciousness unfolds with the fluidity of running water. (2006)

Gardner's response is highly intriguing; of particular significance to my enquiry is her statement that the experience of *Waves* 'feels shockingly intimate and oddly dispassionate', she adds that 'neither film nor live action alone could come anywhere close to achieving this curious and disconcerting split sensation' (2006). Also of interest is Susan Irvine's description in *The Sunday Telegraph* of feeling 'disturbed by the lack of a centre':

Where to look? Which image - filmed, staged, read aloud, or 'radio-played' - was the true one? The effect was like dramatic cubism' (2006)

These responses to the spectatorship of this multimedia visual field ask new questions about the expressive effects of the multimedia *mise-en-scène,* which ask how a combination of stage and screen might induce visceral and pleasurable effects in the theatrical event. Despite this, the paradigms of space, presence and continuity grammar do not provide sufficient vocabulary to notate this. It is, however, revealing that Mitchell has described her primary goal in presenting *Waves* as an emotional experience. She explains this in her recent interview for the National Theatre:

So I'm into the science of very minute construction of feelings for the audience. And I'm doing it by using lights, rhythm, tempo, selecting some bits of text and not other bits of text. So I am artificially giving you the impression of a dreamlike emotional landscape. It's completely constructed. (Mitchell, 2010)

Whilst Michael Billington found the 'heart untouched' by *Waves,* he was perhaps looking for feeling in the wrong place, as it is intriguing that Mitchell wishes to create feelings 'for' the audience and not 'in' the audience. Mitchell's expressive rationale in *Waves* was not aesthetically dramatic, instead an elaborate manipulation of the senses which could be described as ravishing. The emotional effects experienced through the bombardment of

performance and constructed media in *Waves* therefore invites analysis of a non-representational effect of an otherwise realistic moving image in this theatrical event. I would posit that Mitchell's descriptive rhetoric of expressive lighting and rhythm evokes what Fernando De Toro has briefly described as the 'environmental index' of the theatre.

Describing indices that activate theatrical space and time, De Toro argues that the environmental index 'has to do with the affective and emotive part of theatre' (p. 83). He demonstrates that this is most commonly associated with 'music and lighting', and that this 'is perhaps one of the more specific features of theatre' (p. 83). However, he fails to take this further, or place it in relation to the use of the moving image in the theatre. As such, in my next chapter I examine the extent to which the moving image can operate as an environmental index in the theatrical event, and how a multimedia *mise-en-scène* might be read for its expressive contribution. To do so draws upon the discourses of film and theatre spectatorship, two areas of research that have seen little exchange of knowledge apart from questionable intermedial approaches by scholars such as Nibbelink and Merx (2010). I would argue that analysis of recent research into theatre and film spectatorship can offer insights to the way a synthesis of moving image and performance can be read both for its representational content, and for its pleasurable and visceral effects.

CHAPTER 4:
SPECTATORSHIP AND THE EXPRESSIVE MOVING IMAGE IN THE THEATRE

1. NEW QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

When its use in the theatrical event is representational, as it is in *Waves,* the moving image might be employed to take advantage of its sophisticated spatial grammar and photographic realism. However, these cinematic - and realist - conventions of moving image artefacts do not describe completely their uniquely theatrical use. For example, while the grammars of film explain the realist video content of *Waves,* they do not provide adequate vocabulary for describing the expressive effects of this medium in the theatre. The work of TIWG, Birringer and Auslander concentrate on the mediatized codes of moving image representation. This focus on the mechanical reproduction of photorealistic imagery is narrow in application, neglecting the physical properties of film and the visual cues it contributes to theatrical *mise-en-scène.* In this chapter I attempt to expand the scope of analyses by putting pressure on theories of moving image spectatorship in the theatre in order to uncover routes of questioning that reveal the non-representational and visceral effects of film as an environmental index in the theatre. To do so, I must re-assert how the moving image in a multimedia production is mediated by the participatory conditions of the theatrical key.

As I have observed in Mitchell's *Waves,* the activation of 'presentational space' by the actors sustained an unconventional use of the moving image that did not obey normative cinematic conventions of continuity and narrative. This mediation implies that spectatorship of the moving image in the theatrical event is different to its normative circumstances of exhibition. This is, perhaps, an obvious statement but in this chapter I take this further, looking at new ways

of seeing the image in the theatre. In doing so, I reveal the moving image's expressive contribution to the theatrical event as an environmental index. To demonstrate this requires the negotiation of two significant obstacles. First, the compelling photorealistic imagery offered by the moving image, as well as its grammar of spatial illusion, make it difficult to discern its non-representational effects. Indeed, the discourse of film spectatorship is saturated by studies that explore the viewer's relationship to the illusion of reality provided in the cinema, and how viewers take pleasure in these realistic images (Dayan, 1974) (Mulvey, 1975) (Sobchack, 1992) (Allen, 1997). Second, existing theories of multimedia spectatorship, such as those formulated by Nibbelink and Merx (2010) in TIWG's second volume, perpetuate these realist interpretations of the moving image and pursue analysis based on both the discourse of theatre's ontological privilege in a mediatized culture – thus continuing in the vein of Phelan and Birringer - and on the ideology implicit in realistic moving image spectatorship (Dayan, 1974); (Mulvey, 1975). I demonstrate here that such approaches offer an unsatisfying synthesis of existing scholarship on film and theatre spectatorship, I suggest an alternative strategy that takes advantage of key developments in this field in order to notate the expressive contribution of the moving image in the theatrical key.

SPECTATING THE MOVING IMAGE IN THE THEATRICAL KEY

Insufficient dialogue has taken place between recent theories of film and theatre spectatorship, which now place less emphasis on the viewer's recognition of an illusion of reality on stage and screen, and have instead concentrated upon their active participation in these media; this has generated new descriptions of contemporary spectators taking pleasure - or displeasure - in the visual cues provided by these media. Recent scholarship has also revised work in the light of new technologies of reception, such as Laura Mulvey's *Death 24x a Second* (2006) which follows her influential work on pleasure in the cinema (Mulvey, 1975), in order to respond effectively to contemporary digital spectatorship:

> Then, I was absorbed in Hollywood cinema, turning to the avant-garde as its binary opposite. Now, I think that the aesthetics of cinema have a greater coherence across its historic body in the face of new media technologies and the new ways of watching films they have generated. (2006, p. 7)

While useful in regard to the contemporary cultural experience of the moving image artefact, Mulvey's approach also eventually focuses on the photorealistic imagery, or compelling illusion, offered by the screen. As such, she does not effectively analyse the visceral and expressive effects of the moving image. Interestingly, these qualities have recently been described in Jennifer Barker's monograph *The Tactile Eye* (2009). Here she provides a definition of 'visceral' responses to the cinema, arguing that when 'we speak of viscera, we're usually speaking about one of two things':

> Either we use the term in its specific, medical sense [...] or to refer to a general area – the insides, the depths, the guts – that describes not organs but feelings, emotions, and intuition. (2009, p. 122)

Significant to my enquiry is Barker's description of an 'embodied experience of film' (pp. 122-123), which offers insight into the expressive rhetoric often found in responses to the multimedia theatre. Despite this, contemporary theories of the spectator's participation in multimedia work have neglected these developments in film theory, and also rely on narrow models of theatre spectatorship. An example of this is Sigrid Merx's analysis of Guy Cassier's production *Swann's Way* (which I have already introduced in Chapter 2). Merx describes the video projections in *Swann's Way* as creating 'an exciting tension between the live and the mediatized' which - due to the simultaneous viewing of live and mediatized characters - is 'able to conjure up an immediate sensation, and in so doing, it has the potential to trigger all kind of memories of the audience' (2006, p. 74). Writing for TIWG, and under the assumption that an 'intermedial space' is activated for the viewer, Merx's logic is ultimately flawed as her notation demonstrates readings of intermediality that, as I have argued, serve a narrow institutional frame of the theatrical event. Despite this, her response to the 'sensation' of the moving image, and the inciting of 'memories', are valid observations. However, her reliance on the logic of a

'meta-text' is problematic and, given recent developments in the discourse of theatre spectatorship, are erroneous, as the experiences she describes could be considered normative in all theatrical events, not just those that combine media. For example, Jacques Rancière has recently described how theatre 'spectators see, feel and understand something in as much as they compose their own poem, as, in their way, do actors or playwrights, directors, dancers or performers' (Rancière, 2009, p. 13). This description of the spectator's activity echoes a number of recent studies that have empowered the theatre spectator as an active thinker and participant in a theatrical event. Furthermore, this description suggests that the emotional and reflective experience described by Merx is always the case in the theatre, and does not require the reading of an 'intermedial space' in which to reflect, or the presence of the moving image, whatsoever. Despite this, I am interested in expressive effects that are specific to the use of the moving image in the theatre, and in this chapter I will put pressure on models of spectatorship to locate a vocabulary and paradigm that can notate effectively the visceral responses implicit in a number of analyses of multimedia work.

RESPONSES TO THE EXPRESSIVE ELEMENTS IN MULTIMEDIA THEATRE

While expressive reactions to the moving image in the theatre have been observed by scholars, they have reached few useful conclusions on how and why these effects are created. For example, Steve Dixon argues that to 'juxtapose live performance and projected media' might 'excite visceral, subjective, or subconscious audience responses' (2007, p. 336). While his remarks are relevant to my enquiry, he does not take this further, and also provides a false dichotomy between visceral and intellectual reactions. For example, he adds that these effects might 'appeal to the senses and the nervous system [...] rather than to the rational intellect' (2007, p. 336). Such a description disregards recent theories that consider a thoughtful theatre spectator (Rancière, 2009); and I would posit that imaginative and reflective activity should be regarded as a normative experience of the theatre, which Dixon neglects. Arguably, his rhetoric

of viscera and excitement might also describe normative experiences of the moving image, as revealed in Barker's recent study:

> Close analysis of sound and image will reveal certain patterns of texture, space, and rhythm enacted by films and viewers. Attention to these embodied structures and patterns allows for a sensually formed (and informed) understanding of the ways that meaning and significance emerge in and are articulated through the fleshy, muscular, and visceral engagement that occurs between films' and viewer's bodies. (2009, p. 4)

Unlike Dixon, Barker does not engage with film's use in the theatrical event, but her commentary concerning the tactile experience of the moving image provides a much needed paradigm of expressivity which might allow one to notate projected or screen media as environmental indices, which - as De Toro describes - touch upon the 'affective and emotive part of theatre' (1995, p. 83). My question in this chapter is how the video image might be read viscerally in the theatre. To locate an effective paradigm through which to notate this requires a notion of how theatre spectatorship affects the consumption of the moving image medium. Of note in this regard is Andy Lavender's striking essay 'Mise en Scène, Hypermediacy and the Sensorium' (2006), published in TIWG's first volume. Lavender calls for the study of the 'visceral nature of spectatorship and effects of visible, acoustic, motional, rhythmic and textural aspects' of the multimedia theatre (p. 64). Whilst he attempts an intervention that is arguably similar to my own enquiry in this chapter, Lavender reaches few useful conclusions due to lack of focus on the visual cues of the moving image itself. Nonetheless, his emphasis on *mise-en-scène* as a 'continuum' that 'hypermediates' the moving image (p. 63) demonstrates a logic of mediation by the theatrical key comparable to my own model of the activation of 'presentational space' described in chapters 2 & 3. It is therefore striking that Lavender describes the theatre's *mise-en-scène* as 'an engine for spectatorship' (p. 63). This raises urgent questions about how the visual field of the theatre 'organises space for spectating and thereby redistributes meaning and effect' when the moving image is placed within it (p. 63).

Lavender's use of the term *mise-en-scène* might be better substituted for an activated 'presentational space' that I have identified in *Waves*, *Celebrity* and *Mad Forest* where the moving

image is placed in what McAuley describes as a 'threshold stage' (1999, p. 42). Here I posit that there are two relevant definitions of the term 'threshold' that reveal interesting theoretical trajectories for identifying the pleasurable and visceral effects of the moving image in the theatre. Firstly, the use of the term to describe the: 'magnitude or intensity that must be exceeded for a certain reaction or phenomenon to occur'; and secondly, the: 'Border, limit (of a region); the line which one crosses in entering' (*OED*, n. d). I contend that the 'presentational space' that is activated by the 'auratic presence' of the performer - and which consequently marks the activity of the moving image – demands examination of the pre-representational spectatorship of the image (its border) in order to determine how its medium can be exposed for visceral effect in the theatre's 'synthesised space'. However, to do so evokes a third definition of 'threshold' as an 'obstacle' or 'stumbling-block' (*OED,* n. d), as the normative frame of the moving image invites the spectatorship of representational illusion.

<div align="center">METHODOLOGY</div>

In this chapter I review key works in the discourse of theatre spectatorship to demonstrate the contemporary 'engine' for reading the moving image in performance. In addition, I integrate relevant film theories with this literature review. Showing how attempts to notate the spectatorship of the moving image in the theatre have focussed too much on its representational codes. I offer an alternative approach by focussing on the image as a non-representational medium of dynamic light. However, this approach is problematic if one takes into account the mechanically reproduced photorealism that the projection provides. In order to overcome this obstacle of representation, and to describe the moving image's visceral activity in the 'threshold stage' of the theatre, I draw upon the neglected but useful scholarship of Richard Allen, whose monograph *Projecting Illusion* (1997) offers routes into describing 'medium aware' readings of pictorial representations, and provides an inventive model of 'seeing aspects', which has been untested in regards to theatre spectatorship. Allen's scholarship, along with the others I have described above, will be examined in this chapter by using their models to analyse

instances of expressive multimedia activity in Out of the Blue's *Mad Forest* (2007), and the National Theatre of Scotland's production of Gregory Burke's *Black Watch* (2006). In doing so, I intend to reveal not only the spectator's visceral participation in seeing the moving image in the theatre, but the creative motivation for using this effect in productions that are predominantly theatrical.

2. THEATRE SPECTATORSHIP AND THE MOVING IMAGE

Taking into consideration recent interventions, my methodology in this chapter is the exploration of the moving image's expressive effects through the lens of spectatorship. It is therefore significant that the dominant narrative of the discourse of theatre spectatorship regularly distinguishes between an assumedly passive cinema viewer and the active participation of the theatre-goer. This is a problematic polarity that ignores a plethora of recent developments, yet it is perpetuated in a number of studies. For example, Gay McAuley argues that theatre spectatorship is distinguished from film viewing due to participatory conditions with no 'centralizing apparatus' through which to 'position the spectator in relation' to their subject':

> Instead of a screen there is a stage, horizontal in relation to the spectator rather than vertical, the auditorium provides a multiplicity of different viewing positions (good and bad) instead of the uniform vision of the cinema, instead of the virtual presence of the filmed image there is the real presence of the actor, instead of the reassurance of repeatability there is the knowledge that the performance is unique, can never be repeated, and furthermore that the spectators' presence, behaviour, and response is part of the event, instead of completeness and closure there is an ongoing process whereby the work continues to evolve and change throughout the run of performances. (1999, p. 245)

There are a number of distinctions drawn in this statement which have been explored variously by scholars (Bennet, 1990); (Phelan, 1993); (Weber, 2004); (Shepherd, 2006); (Garner Jr, 2007); (Bleeker, 2008); (Rancière, 2009). However, particularly striking is McAuley's argument that the 'monolithic gaze', often regarded in film spectatorship, is not a valid model for the

theatre, arguing that the viewer 'does not receive information in a purely linear way' (1999, p. 35).[151] While this distinction is sound, there is an implied passivity of the moving image spectator, a notion that has been revised by a number of film scholars (Sobchack, 1992); (Allen, 1997); (Mulvey, 2006); (Barker, 2009). It is therefore significant that studies of intermediality often assume that out-dated 'passive' modes of spectatorship - such as those established by Daniel Dayan (1974) - are the normative experience of the moving image. As a result they present questionable accounts of the spectatorship of the moving image in the theatre (Nibbelink & Merx, 2010). In this section I will demonstrate these problems and put pressure on assumptions of intermedial spectatorship in order to provide a context of contemporary scholarship that will allow my eventual analysis of the expressive contribution of the moving image in contemporary theatre.

THEATRE SPECTATORSHIP

Despite a plethora of publications on this discourse, an anxiety prevails that 'the problem of contemporary spectatorship in the field of theatre and performance studies has been so far under-theorized' (Albacan, 2010, p. 225).[152] This is perhaps due to the variety of concerns that the theatre viewer must negotiate, as McAuley describes: these include the lack of a fixed viewpoint, the presence of the actor, the evanescence of the performance, and the expectations and behaviour of the audience (McAuley, 1999, p. 245). The result is therefore a dispersed body of scholarship, as individual theorists rarely follow all these trajectories as they

---

[151] McAuley concedes that the individual theatre spectator, 'sitting in a darkened auditorium', might aspire 'to the condition of being a "viewpoint and nothing more", but argues that 'the theatre always resists this reduction': 'In the theatre the scopic drive is always being subverted or displaced, either because the reality of the actors' bodies and the performance space intrude themselves, thereby disrupting the fiction, or through the periodic return to the social due to the physical presence of other spectators and the institutionalized breaks in the performance, or because the performance itself demands active participation' (1999, p. 239). However, McAuley's distinction between theatrical circumstances and those of the cinema are simplistic, as the physical presence of other spectators, for example, is a characteristic of both.

[152] McAuley argues that 'it is true to say that theatrical spectatorship is still relatively untheorized compared with film' (1999, p. 236).

intervene in the discourse; key works are therefore highly specific in their focus. Interestingly, one finds arguments relating to the active spectator in many of these currents.

Susan Bennett's influential study *Theatre Audiences* (1990) describes the ideological concerns of theatre spectatorship, observing the social backgrounds of attendees on the rationale that the theatre is 'an event which relies on the physical presence of an audience to confirm its cultural status' (1990, p. 92).[153] Bennett observes the audience's reflection in the evolution of the theatrical medium, demonstrating that 'fixed stage-auditorium relationships' have led to 'its necessity for a comfortable theatrical experience':

> The predominant architectural design of theatres – a foyer which encourages observing and observation in the small, familiar groups in which we attend the theatre, and an auditorium which assures anonymity (and thus reassurance) in the larger collective – has thus been received and translated by theatre audiences into psychological need. (Bennett, 1990, p. 141)

This is a simplistic, and now dated, observation that is difficult to apply to a theatre culture where each theatre building retains its own individual history and design. Yet despite the normative anonymous conditions she describes, Bennett does not find this conducive to a passive spectatorship. She argues instead that despite being 'passive in their demonstrated behaviour' in the theatrical event, spectators are 'active in their decoding of the sign systems made available' in performance; the rationale for such a relationship is mostly practical:

> Performers rely on the active decoding, but passive behaviour of the audience so that they can unfold the planned on-stage activity. (Bennett, 1990, p. 179)[154]

---

[153] Bennett argues that 'Perhaps too readily theatre-going is thought of as a middle-class occupation by definition' (1990, p. 1). This is a simplistic argument that disregards commercial musical theatre, which might serve a strong working class demographic. However, she adds that 'Higher seat prices have assured the predominance of middle-class Londoners or tourists as the theatre audience' (p. 124) Bennett's ideological model of spectatorship relies on a reciprocal model of the literal presence of the performers and spectators in the theatrical space and how their class and expectations alter the theatre-culture itself.
[154] Bennett argues that these 'signs can be considered in two groups: those that are part of the actor and his craft, and those external to the actor's performance. These external signs derive from the set, props, lighting, sound, and music'(1990, p. 149). Despite this, she does not allow for the problems of cross-cultural decoding of sign systems; how would she, for example, account for tourists visiting a London theatre? One might argue that the moving image's grammars are more international than those of theatrical space.

Bennett's model provides an elegant description whereby the theatrical event is sustained by seemingly passive spectators, but which relies upon their silent activity in order to bestow meaning on the indices and presences they observe. This is therefore essential in sustaining the grammars I have identified in Chapter 2.

Bennett's conclusion is useful in relation to McAuley's description of the viewer's role in deciphering the activation of the spaces in her taxonomy (see Chapter 2). One could argue that the passive behaviour she describes sustains 'presentational space', which – as I have shown – is an essential continuum for the placement of the moving image in the theatre. It is therefore not surprising that McAuley's own framework of the theatrical event follows a similar trajectory to Bennett's model of spectatorship:

> If the principal function of the primary framework constituted by the theatre building is to signal to all concerned that, once inside, we are in the realm of "denegation," an equally important one is to set in motion the spectators' work of meaning making. (McAuley, 1999, p. 42)

McAuley adds that all stage activity is 'perceived as potentially meaningful by spectators, and, even if nothing is happening, that too will be interpreted as meaningful' (1999, p. 42). This relies on the spectator's activity in seeing the *mise-en-scène,* yet in Samuel Weber's more recent monograph *Theatricality as Medium* (2004) he questions the 'valorization of sight over the other senses, especially hearing' in the theatre (p. 3). Weber argues that this 'often results from the desire to secure a position, from a distance that ostensibly permits one to view the object in its entirety while remaining at a safe remove from it' (2004, p. 3). I agree with this to the extent that one must consider non-visual cues in the theatre that incite the spectator's activity and thought in performance. However, my focus remains the visual dynamic of the moving image, and how it might be viewed as expressive. One must, however, regard facets such as sound and human presence as mediating agents that affect the consumption of the moving image. Indeed, the presence of the performer adds an additional concern for the spectator, as Simon Shepherd describes.

169

Shepherd has demonstrated sensory experiences of the theatre in relation to seeing the body onstage, thus evoking the notion of 'auratic presence' as described by Power (2008). Shepherd's model of spectatorship privileges the human performer over other visual stimuli in the *mise-en-scène*, in doing so he demonstrates an active experience of viewing:

> Theatre is an art of bodies witnessed by bodies. Witnesses are something more than passive viewers. In the act of witnessing a person attests to the truth of something that is or was present for them. (Shepherd, 2006, p. 71)

There is a difficult logic at work in this description, which implies that constructed performances are perceived as truthful in the presence of these witnesses. However, of interest to my enquiry are the tactile responses Shepherd's describes; for example, he uses the term 'muscular empathy' (p. 72) to describe the spectator's participatory activity in performance, and observes their 'kinaesthetic responses' to the body onstage (p. 75). These responses indicate how the presence of the performer provides an object of interest that is not purely visual, and the empathy Shepherd describes must lead one to consider how this active participation affects the reading of the moving image when it is simultaneously staged. However, a number of recent studies eschew these notations of an active kinaesthetic experience, instead privileging representational stages and the passive and immersive conditions they might engender.

In Alan Garner Jr's essay 'Sensing realism' (2007), he argues that 'strategies of illusionism, realist stagecraft and dramaturgy seek to enforce a separation between the dramatic stage world and that of the audience'; these naturalistic conditions might seem an anathema to the participation described by Shepherd:

> The dynamic is familiar: the dramatic world is constituted as autonomous field to the extent that the worlds of audience and performance are bracketed out, deactivated as fields of attention in their own right. (Garner Jr. 2007, p. 116)

This is a difficult statement, as one must consider the individual plays, or texts, themselves and the unique theatre buildings in which a performance might take place. I would argue that - in relation to multimedia theatre - Garner's analysis may be more valid when observing

productions where the moving image is used for scenic purposes, such as Tom Stoppard's *The Coast of Utopia* (2002). In productions such as this, where the moving image is indexed as part of the fictional stage world, one might even place them in Garner's narrative of 'technological developments that enabled and accompanied the realist revolution' (2007, pp. 116-117). [155] However, Garner's spectator is more passive than those described by Shepherd and McAuley, and does not accommodate visceral responses to the stimuli of the theatrical event. For example, he argues that if 'illusionism requires that the spectator become invisible in relation to the dramatic world', then their 'sensory participation in the field of performance must be carefully delimited' (2007, p. 118). This statement is self-restricting to representational stages, whilst Garner questions the validity of sensory approaches to theatre spectatorship, his analysis does not provide an obstacle to my enquiry due to his focus on realist theatre. The various formats of theatrical presentation provided by productions such as *Waves* do not fit his criteria, despite the realism of the moving image within them, thus demonstrating that no all-encompassing model of spectatorship exists (neither would such a model be desirable in such a varied theatre culture). Of interest to me are recent studies of the spectator's thoughtful and imaginative activity in the theatre, recently described in publications by Alan Read and Jacques Rancière which offer interesting insights into normative experiences of performance that must be taken into account in analyses of the multimedia theatre.

Read challenges passive models in *Theatre, Intimacy & Engagement* (2008), where he implicates the spectator's active thought and imagination. His rhetoric is iconoclastic as he argues that the very notion of spectatorship in the theatre has promoted an 'artificial schism':

> While few of us would readily volunteer to practise bridging this apparent divide (we still think twice before accepting the offer of a seat in the front row), materially and

---

[155] He argues that these 'worked both to heighten the verisimilitude of the represented world and further to enclose this world in representational self-sufficiency. The institution of gas lighting, for instance, allowed light on stage to assume greater perceptual realism, but it could do so only through the eclipsing, the putting out of play, of the actual lighting (or non-lighting) of the theatrical auditorium as a whole. Light, in this sense, is fictionalized and at the same time detheatricalized, in that its technological origins in the performance moment are placed "out of attention" (2007, pp. 116-117).

imaginatively we do it all the time. (Read, 2008, p. 63)[156]

Read proposes an alternative model of empathy and embodied spectatorship, arguing that, as participants, we 'live within, and imagine ourselves outside, the times and spaces of performance':

> [...] ferrying back and forth, at once engaged with, at other times distracted from involvement. It is this 'to and from', then, now and to be, that characterises all those involved in the act of theatre way beyond the promising, but eventually contradictory redistribution of terms such as 'spectator' and 'witness'. (Read, 2008, p. 63)

This description of the act of imagination in the theatrical event, and the active critical thought of the spectator, is echoed in Rancière's recent monograph *The Emancipated Spectator* (2009). While obscured by heavy polemic, Rancière's writings describe the cerebral pleasure of participating as a spectator in a theatrical event. In Rancière's descriptions of spectatorship, the sustained passive behaviour of the viewer is not a barrier to their active participation.[157] Contextualizing his writing within arguments on passivity in the theatre, Rancière argues that theatre 'accuses itself of rendering spectators passive and thereby betraying its essence as community action':

---

[156] This schism can be demonstrated by Maaike Bleeker's recent study *Visuality in the Theatre* (2008) which demonstrates active and embodied spectatorship in the 'aesthetic logic of the dramatic theatre', which she argues 'presents the audience with a stable and detached point of view' which allows 'spectators to project themselves into the onstage world' (p. 15). Bleeker offers a problematic assertion that in contemporary theatre, the 'spectator is no longer presented with a fixed perspective, and is free (at least metaphorically) to wander'; adding that this also involves the spectator's embodiment of a position 'at a certain distance from him or herself as a body looking' (p. 15). While his historical assertion that this is new is flawed, this notion of the spectator's activity is interesting. The implications of this are seen as ideological, as Bleeker argues that events in the theatre are 'always presented from within a certain 'vision' (p. 27). Bleeker calls this 'focalization', employing the term in order to describe the 'relationship between this vision [the embodied position] and that which is "seen" (p. 27). Bleeker argues that focalization 'draws attention to the position from which things, people and events are seen and also how this subjective position mediates the vision presented to us' (p. 28). Attempting to find an engine for spectatorship similar to the cinematic frame, Bleeker describes, with difficulty, an ideological 'external focalizor'; which she argues is an 'anonymous agent through whose eyes we as audience see the performance': As long as this position remains invisible, the performance can appear simply 'there to be seen' independent from any particular point of view.' (Bleeker, 2008, p. 31) This understanding that the gaze has been constructed and mediated in the theatrical event has ideological implications that lead us to ask questions of the mediality of the spectatorship in the theatre.

[157] Rancière engages with the theatre but often writes of 'spectacle' in more general terms, defining this as encompassing 'all those forms of spectacle – drama, dance, performance art, mime and so on – that place bodies in action before an assembled audience' (2009, p. 2).

It consequently assigns itself the mission of reversing its effects and expiating its sins by restoring to spectators ownership of their consciousness and their activity. The theatrical stage and performance thus become a vanishing mediation between the evil of spectacle and the virtue of true theatre. (Rancière, 2009, p. 7)

Arguing that the 'spectator also acts', Rancière posits a useful description of the spectator's internal activities in witnessing the theatrical event:

She observes, selects, compares, interprets. She links what she sees to a host of other things that she has seen on other stages, in other kinds of place. She composes her own poem with the elements of the poem before her. She participates in the performance by refashioning it in her own way – by drawing back, for example, from the vital energy that it is supposed to transmit in order to make it a pure image and associate this image with a story which she has read or dreamt, experienced or invented. They are thus both distant spectators and active interpreters of the spectacle offered to them.'
(Rancière, 2009, p. 13)

Though highly polemical, these arguments might be useful in regard to the multimedia theatrical event. Taking into consideration the memory, imagination and thought of the spectator, one must regard the viewer's ability to reference their normative knowledge of film and media in their observation of the synthesised space. More importantly, the spectator in the theatre can choose how, when, and why to read the moving image in the theatre. This raises three key questions. Considering how the moving image is read in the theatre, one must ask if the spectator recognises its photorealism as reality, or whether they regard it as an illusion, and to what extent they take pleasure in expressive non-representational cues it might provide. Second, one must consider how the moving image is indexed for alternative readings in the duration of performance. Third, it is essential to ask why the moving image might be placed in the theatrical key to engender alternative spectatorship. In the current discourse the only answer to these currently lies in the 'intermediality' of TIWG, which has presented questionable notations that demonstrate narrow assumptions on the spectatorship of theatre and the moving image.

In Chapter 1, I demonstrated a questionable assumption in TIWG's scholarship that identifies a 'meta-text' of intermediality that unravels mediatized codes for the spectator. Taking into consideration the current discourse of theatre spectatorship, my argument that the perception of intermediality demands highly specialised participation in a narrow institutional frame of theatre culture is qualified. For example, in their essay 'Presence and Perception: Analysing Intermediality in Performance' (2010), Liesbeth Groot Nibbelink and Sigrid Merx argue that in 'intermedial performances spectatorship in itself becomes a self-reflective act', and is 'able to entail a politics of spectating' (p. 218). This cannot be discounted, but such an observation of the use of the moving image in the theatre is limited in its impact to the specialised intermedial theatre. For example, if one considers Rancière's descriptions of the spectator's thought in performance, then one could argue that only a participant in the institutional frame of 'intermediality' would be able to perceive the 'politics' of 'self-reflective' spectatorship that Nibbelink and Merx describe.

Arguably, re-evaluating responses to intermediality as imaginative and thoughtful acts on behalf of the spectator removes the need to legislate for the engendering of an 'intermedial space' or 'meta-text' in order to reflect upon the moving image in the theatre. For example, Merx's previous essay on Guy Cassiers' production *Swann's Way* is questionable in its intermedial assumption that the production, by not 'using this space for an explicit media critique', 'leaves the space empty, or should we say full with possibilities' (2006, p. 79).[158] This implies that this is more so in intermedial practice than in other forms of theatre; I strongly doubt the validity of privileging multimedia performance in this way, and I must question Merx's logic of intermediality in explaining the spectator's behaviour:

---

[158] I have already identified Sigrid Merx's 2006 essay on Guy Cassiers' production *Swann's Way* as somewhat of an anomaly in TIWG's body of research in its analysis of a production that does not explicitly 'stage the screen' nor comment upon mediality. However, in Chapter 2 I demonstrated that the mediality 'staged' in Merx's analysis is an ontological one that privileges the moving image as a reproduced object and thus a representation of memory. This seems to be an essential quality of 'intermedial' theatre, but I would argue it is based on flawed logic.

> In the work of Cassiers however this distance between what is presented and represented, ultimately has to be considered as a space, which can be filled by the images, experiences and memories of the audience themselves. Thus, is becomes a totally intermedial experience, as the audience become constructors of images and create a lyrical perspective of their own in response to the inner world shown on stage. Intermediality is located in the creative process of Cassiers. (2006, p. 78)

The emotional response that Merx describes is problematically formulated through an assumption of spectatorship that is only applicable to participants in the discourse of intermediality. A more valid explanation would widen the institutional frame to accommodate a greater number of spectators whilst drawing on the active embodied and cerebral models put forward by Shepherd, Read and Rancière. Merx's assumptions of intermedial spectatorship are questionable, and it is significant that this logic is sustained in her more recent collaborative essay with Nibbelink described above. Even more problematic is their argument that the ideological codes of the moving image are revealed to the viewer when it is placed before them in a theatrical event.

Nibbelink and Merx argue that by situating the performer and the moving image in the spectator's visual field, a 'clash between digitally influenced perceptions and embodied presence manifests itself particularly as a *disturbance* of the senses and results in a *blurring of realities*' (p. 219). Their rhetoric of reality, and their assumptions about the ideology of the mediatized image, recalls out-dated models of film spectatorship that regard the cultural implications of a passive viewer participating in an illusion. Nibbelink and Merx argue that by placing the moving image in the hypermedium of the theatre, the spectator becomes an active observer who is able to scrutinise its ideological codes. However, this subscribes to a now-questionable mode of film spectatorship that assumes a passive viewer. An example of this is Daniel Dayan's essay 'The Tutor-Code of Classical Cinema' (1974), where he argues that the 'system that negotiates the viewer's access to the film' is 'far from ideology-free' (p. 106). He argues that this system, which allows the viewer to recognise the fiction of the film as reality, 'is built so as to mask the ideological origin and nature of cinematographic statements (p. 106). Dayan thus describes the spectator's passive mediation by these codes in the cinema:

> When I occupy the place of the subject, the codes which led me to occupy this place become invisible to me. The signifiers of the presence of the subject disappear from my consciousness because they are signifiers of my presence. (p. 106)

In this model, the spectator's passive immersion in a constructed reality engendered by the moving image's compelling system leads Dayan to conclude that 'cinema establishes itself as the ventriloquist of ideology' (p. 117). It is these codes that Nibbelink and Merx, and scholars such as Giesekam (2007), assume are revealed in instances of intermediality, a revelation that appears to require the spectator to possess prior knowledge of this complex system. However, subsequent scholarship by Richard Allen (1997) has revised theories such as Dayan's, detailing a more active mode of spectatorship that further diminishes the validity of Nibbelink and Merx's argument.

Allen describes 'common theoretical assumptions' of the 'impression of reality in the cinema' in his monograph *Projecting Illusion* (1997, p. 1).[159] He explains that scholars such as Dayan understand that the *image* is not real, but argue that the viewer recognizes an '*impression of reality'* as reality itself; as a result, they have observed the spectator's response to the moving image in order to exemplify 'the way in which ideology in general functions' (p. 2). It is this ideology that studies of intermediality assume a combination of theatre and moving image reveals; it is therefore significant that Allen's intervention claims that these assumptions are 'logically incoherent' (p. 2).[160] Allen provides a rebuttal to passive modes of spectatorship, arguing that there 'must be a film spectator who *can* see a film and his own relationship to it for what it actually is', adding that if 'such a human or film spectator exists', 'then the theory is

---

[159] He adds that these assumptions have 'occupied a preeminent place in the theoretical literature on film in the past twenty years'(1997, p. 1). Allen offers a more detailed explanation of this model: 'Cinema is a form of signification that creates the appearance of a knowable reality and hence confirms the self-definition of the human subject as someone capable of knowing that reality; but in fact both reality and the human subject who appears capable of knowing that reality are "effects" of a process of signification. The film theorists' exposure of the way in which the spectator experiences cinematic representation as an illusion thus seems to reveal the more fundamental illusion upon which subjectivity itself is based' (p. 2).

[160] Allen demonstrates that these models eventually claim how 'the spectator's response to cinematic discourse illuminates the manner in which the human being in general is constructed in discourse' (1997, p. 2).

false.' (1997, p. 2)[161] It is perhaps an obvious challenge that Allen makes against models that consider the 'film spectator as a passive observer of the image who is duped into believing that it is real' (Allen, 1997, p. 3). However, his intervention is useful in providing a model through which one might describe a spectator who understands that the screen image is an illusion, but who can actively *choose* to see it as reality. Like Rancière and Read's notion of the thoughtful spectator, a reading of Allen's thesis leads one to question the need for intermediality's ideological revelations by demonstrating that the observer's recognition of the medium is actively implicated in the normative experience of cinematic illusion.

Allen describes a film spectator who understands that they are viewing a moving image, but who allows its representational cues - be they visual cues or complex grammars - to compel them as reality might. He describes this activity as 'seeing as', arguing that this takes place in the spectatorship of a variety of representational media. Allen argues that it is always the viewer's decision to see the image as reality; he explains that, in order to accomplish this, the viewer – when looking at the still photograph, painting, or moving image –must lose what he terms their 'medium awareness' (1997, p. 82).[162] To demonstrate this, Allen provides the example of tromp l'oeil in painting, where an image could be viewed 'as if it were an object and not a pictorial representation at all' (p. 82). Allen argues that when encountering the tromp l'oeil, the spectator might eschew their medium awareness and thus actively sustain an illusion of reality; in cases such as these, the viewer participates in a 'projective illusion' (p. 82). This term becomes central to Allen's model, as it describes a viewer whose 'awareness of the painting as a painting may be eclipsed entirely, and we may imagine or visualize that the object of the painting is before us, unmediated by representation':

---

[161] Allen also states that 'if such a human or film spectator does not exist, then the way in which the human being is constructed in discourse cannot be known and the theory is vacuous' (1997, p. 2).

[162] Allen does not find this in the theatre, arguing instead for an illusion 'where an actor masquerades as a real person: a member of the audience' (1997, p. 82). Crucially, Allen also argues that participation in a medium's representation of reality is affected by historical and social conditions and that marked shifts occur as thresholds of representing reality are crossed. Photography, for example, moved the threshold of engendering an illusion of reality further away from the cues that had sustained illusions in paintings.

> When we entertain the painting in this fashion we do not think that the represented object is actually before us in the space of the real world, yet we visualize that the object in the painting is fully realized before us. We imagine that we inhabit the world of the painting in the manner of an internal observer. (1997, p. 88)[163]

The 'projective illusion' he defines is a result of an active viewer's participation in the mediality of a representational form; as such, a prerequisite to the loss of medium awareness is an understanding of the participatory codes of the medium itself.

Allen's thesis is significant in demonstrating that the assumption of passive moving image spectatorship is questionable. It is therefore not valid to assume - as Nibbelink and Merx do - that placing this artefact in the visual field of the theatre spectator reveals its codes, as one might argue that normative viewing in the cinema would already involve active participation in the moving image's mediality. However, Allen's study is over a decade old, and more recent theories of spectatorship have demonstrated the ways in which encounters with the moving image have changed significantly in the 21st century. As such, what Allen regards as standard formats of film exhibition are now less relevant, as the normative condition of spectatorship must take into account the viewing of DVDs and Blu-Ray copies outside the cinema, television re-runs, downloadable media for replay on portable devices, and the viewing of streaming clips on websites such as YouTube (Mulvey, 2006); (Auslander, 2009). The activity of the spectator in consuming these media suggests that contemporary experiences of the moving image are further removed from the ideological passivity described by Nibbelink and Merx.

Laura Mulvey's revisionist monograph *Death 24x a Second* (2006) re-assesses her own influential theories on spectatorship in light of new contexts of encountering the moving image. In her 1975 essay 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', Mulvey argued that the ideology of the spectator's pleasure in viewing cinema images is 'reinforced by pre-existing patterns of fascination already at work within the individual subject and the social formations that have

---

[163] Allen's description of the circumstances of exhibition is naïve, disregarding the situation of the exhibition hall and the activity of other spectators and cues that surround them, such as notes and other works purposefully curated for them. However, Allen is not describing an optical trick where the viewer mistakes a painting for reality, but a mediality whereby they participate in an illusion; therefore the particulars of this specific example is less relevant to my enquiry.

moulded him' (p. 837).[164] However, her more recent scholarship re-assesses this, as cinematic exhibition is no longer the only normative experience of the moving image:

> Once upon a time, most people could only watch a movie in the cinema where it was projected at the correct pace for the illusion of movement and according to a given narrative sequence. (Mulvey, 2006, p. 22)

Mulvey argues that contemporary experiences are now more often with digital media such as DVD recordings; she therefore argues that a new 'point of departure is an obvious, everyday reality: that video and digital media have opened up new ways of seeing old movies' (2006, p. 8). Focussing on classical cinematic texts, and the way they might be anatomised and consumed through digital reproduction, leads her to focus on a new 'kind of spectatorship that has developed with the use of new technologies' (p. 8). Mulvey is specifically concerned with the ability afforded the viewer of a digital medium of 'returning to and repeating a specific film fragment' (2006, p. 8). Mulvey sees this in the context of a previously 'ephemeral' cinema experience, arguing that 'it has always been difficult to hold on to its precious moments, images and, most particularly, its idols'(2006, p. 161). Mulvey's intervention thus focuses on new ways of spectating mainstream cinema, and the pleasure taken by spectators in viewing, re-viewing, and anatomising their favourite films and images of the stars they idolise.

Mulvey's thesis might seem limited in its applicability to the multimedia theatre, where the images might not fetishise freeze-frames of stars or classic cinematic texts; however, it demonstrates the agency and activity of the viewer in seeking pleasure through the use of digital media.[165] The ideology of this fetishistic spectatorship is not a point of contention in this thesis, as Mulvey draws heavily on discourses of psychoanalysis that are not in the province of my enquiry. However, her revisions demonstrate that disruptions to what Noel Carroll describes as the 'mechanical inevitability' of film's ontology (2006, p. 115), are now part of

---

[164] Mulvey draws heavily on psychoanalytic theory, which she argued is a 'political weapon' that demonstrates 'the way the unconscious of patriarchal society has structured film form' (1975, p. 837).
[165] I would doubt that the revelatory intermedial space of Nibbelink and Merx could reveal the complex ideology of visual pleasure that Mulvey describes for the same reasons I have set out so far concerning the legislative institutional frame of TIWG's discourse (See Chapter 1).

contemporary moving image experience. This disruption is of particular interest in regards to the expressive spectatorship of the moving image which Barker has recently perceived in the 'occasional crises' of the cinema (2009, p. 129).

While Allen and Mulvey demonstrate participation in the illusion and pleasures of representational imagery in the cinema, Jennifer Barker's recent study *The Tactile Eye* (2009) has concentrated upon the rhythmic and tactile pleasures of film's mechanisms as well as its pictures:

> The tenuous connection between the film's and viewer's muscular bodies, which is variously terrifying, reassuring, and exhilarating, finds its way as well into the depths of the film's and viewer's body, where a similar dynamic of attraction and repulsion, similarity and difference, is at play. (2009, p. 120)

Barker describes an embodied experience of the moving image that is similar to Shepherd's writing on the spectatorship of the human performer in the theatre. Barker employs the term 'kinaesthetic', also used by Shepherd, in order to describe 'the resonance and reverberation of tactile patterns between the human body and the cinema' (2009, p. 3). Observing muscular empathy in response to representational imagery in the cinema, Barker then turns her attention to the moving image's own 'viscera' (p. 129). Significant to my enquiry is Barker's description of moments that 'remind us of the discontinuity at the heart of our body and the film's, when our perceptual attention is so clearly directed away from it':

> A random fibre caught in the projector's gate diverts attention from the images to the frantic movement of this stray speck; it leaps wildly across the screen at every frame advance, reminding us of the flurry of activity that accompanies even the most languorous long take as the images race through the gate. [...] In all these cases, the cinema's internal body comes hurtling forward to our conscious attention (and its own) in a moment of crisis. (p. 129)

One can't help but question the overall validity of these statements concerning the 'muscularity' of film, as the celluloid projection Barker describes is now more likely replaced by 2K high definition formats; furthermore, one now finds that video, rather than film, is used in the

theatre.[166] Despite this, implicit in Barker's writing is a notion that there are normative experiences of the moving image medium that are non-representational, and which encourage the spectator to respond to its rhythm and light, rather than its photo-realism or illusion of reality. This leads one to ask whether tactile participation in moving images might be engendered in the theatrical event, and how spectatorship in a multimedia performance might take account of these qualities.

3. MEDIUM AWARENESS AND THE THRESHOLD STAGE

Barker's description of the embodied experience of the film in 'crisis' is interesting in relation to the rhetoric used to describe the expressive effects of the moving image in the theatre. For example, Steve Dixon argues that 'film, video, and computer artists' can 'construct a bombardment of images' in the theatre (2007, p. 335). One also finds descriptions of the expressive effects of moving images in Andy Lavender's analysis of Complicite and Setagaya Public Theatre of Tokyo's production *The Elephant Vanishes.* Here, Lavender notates a 'flux of motion across different planes and media, multiple points of focus' and 'simultaneous interactions in separable spaces' (2006, p. 61). Describing the dynamic movement and variety of these images, he focuses less on their representational content and more on the sensual participation they incite. He states that the 'effect is of an intoxicating rush of movement, vivid, intense and pleasingly disproportionate' (p. 61). However, Lavender does not reach substantial conclusions on this effect, instead commenting simultaneously on the co-presence of the actor and their moving image double, and the spatial dichotomy of two-dimensional images in three-dimensional space (p. 62). While his conclusions are largely speculative, Lavender does attempt to describe the moving image's 'impact upon a spectator', arguing that is 'likely to be in relation to meaning-effects - but may also have a *felt* charge that structures our experience of the event' (p. 64). Lavender does not take this further, but argues that future scholarship must reveal the

---

[166] A chapter on 'High Definition Projection' in the Third edition of Paul Wheeler's *High Definition Cinematography* details the prevalence of digital delivery methods (2009, pp. 17-27).

'visceral nature of spectatorship and effects of visible, acoustic, motional, rhythmic and textural aspects' of the multimedia mise-en-scène' (2006, p. 64).

Overall I am persuaded by Lavender and Dixon's descriptions of the expressive effects of the multimedia *mise-en-scène.* However, their arguments are not sufficient to notate the operation of the moving image as an environmental index within the theatrical key, which synthesises grammars of presence, space, and cinema. On the balance of existing scholarship on theatre spectatorship and the tactile and active models described by Allen, Mulvey, and Barker, I would argue that these expressive effects might be analysed through a reading of the moving image's non-representational effect as a dynamic form. However, this is complicated by the compelling representational cues of the normative frame of the moving image. To solve this, I will re-visit Richard Allen's arguments on 'medium awareness', and in particular his notion of the viewer 'seeing aspects' in a image, in order to begin describing these expressive effects in the theatre.

MEDIUM AWARENESS AND DISRUPTING THE MOVING-IMAGE FRAME

Allen argues that the spectator, when encountering a representational artefact, can actively decide to 'see in' to an image. By this he means that the viewer can emphasise their medium awareness to observe – for instance - 'the way in which the surface of the painting has been marked in order to produce an image of the object' (1997, p. 83). This is a seemingly obvious activity, but nonetheless I would argue that this option becomes available to the active spectator encountering the moving image in the theatrical event. The implications of such a medium-aware reading would be akin to the embodied spectatorship that Barker describes of the moving image in 'crisis' (2009, p. 129). Despite this, Allen limits 'seeing in' to non-photographic media, arguing that the lifelike reproduction afforded by the camera complicates the viewer's participation of medium awareness in the cinema (pp. 83-85). He does so by emphasising the cinematic conditions of the moving image, including the size of the projected

image, the 'linear perspective' of the camera's image, 'photographic lifelikeness, projection, movement, sound' and 'color' (p. 88). Allen argues that these qualities minimize 'the contribution required by the spectator's imagination in order to experience the depiction as if it were a fully realized world' (p. 89). However, I would argue that these conditions are not relevant when encountering the moving image in the theatrical event.[167]

In the multimedia theatre there is no legislation for the relative size of the image, whether it should be projected onto a standard frame, or whether the spectator should regard it as they would in the cinema. It is therefore limiting that Allen emphasises properties such as the largeness of the screen which, he argues, 'encourages the spectator to be unaware of the frame of the image' (1997, p. 89). In fact, this notion of the 'frame' is disrupted by the placement of the moving image in the theatrical key. For example, I have demonstrated that in the theatre the moving image is placed in a 'presentational space' activated by the auratic presence of performers and spectators. I have also demonstrated how this activated space remains resonant even when uninhabited by human performers as the moving image plays on its own. Therefore, a medium-aware reading of the moving image in the theatrical event could engender a reading of the normally concealed frame itself. This can be demonstrated in an instance from *Mad Forest*, where a reading of the image's frame was engendered for visceral effect.

In Out of the Blue's 2007 production, for which I was the video designer, a re-scripted ending to an existing scene was added to Caryl Churchill's text by director Mary Luckhurst to provide essential context to the performance, which was originally staged months after the events it interrogated in 1989.[168] In this energetic yet sensitive sequence, where jubilant Romanian citizens re-enact the trial and execution of deposed President Nicolae Ceauşescu and his wife Elena Ceauşescu, documentary images of their bodies were projected at the close of the scene. No moving images were projected previously during the scene, which was entirely

---

[167] Furthermore, Allen's dated model does not take into account developments in spectatorship such as those described by Mulvey and Barker, which demonstrate how consumption of the moving image has altered in the last decade. One might argue that non-linear viewing of the image has become less disruptive and more normative if one takes into account Mulvey's study of digital spectatorship.

[168] Script from archive of Mary Luckhurst.

focussed upon the activities of the characters; as such, drawing on McAuley's taxonomy one might argue that a 'fictional space' had been activated in the threshold stage of 'presentational space'. This action of the fictional space was halted by a blackout, which was quickly followed by the projection of documentary images of the executed leader and his wife. While the fictional space was de-activated, the presentational space resonated with the actors' presence. The expressive effect that this halt created was engendered by the delivery method of the moving image, which was not in keeping with those employed previously in the performance. Until this moment, all moving images shared identical size and framing; however, these documentary images were purposefully re-framed in order to be relatively small. As the video designer for this production, my motivation in doing this was to disrupt the viewers' attention. In bringing the unsettling documentary images of the dead bodies into the visual field, I wished to avoid filling the projection screen; instead I provided the tiny image which, whilst visible to all, required the viewer to actively re-focus their attention on it to discern its content. While the documentary images were read in relation to the preceding scene of the execution, the images were not provided to legislate any particular meaning in doing so. Instead, the re-framing - and the visual disruption this caused - was intended to produce a change in tempo which would resonate in the theatre environment inviting the spectator to a personal reading of the situation. A medium aware reading of the moving image and its frame was essential in achieving this effect; however, also striking was the brightness of images of the bodies, which spilled onto the stage and illuminated the spectators. Given this, one cannot argue, as Allen does, that the moving image's frame 'circumscribes the limits of your visual field' (1997, p. 107) when observed in a theatrical event.

THE MOVING IMAGE AS AN ENVIRONMENTAL INDEX

In viewing the moving image in the cinema, convention dictates that the spectator is focussed on the frame of the moving image; however, there are additional areas of interest available to them in the theatrical key. One must consider, for example, the moving image in the

theatre in conditions where a number of other visual cues - such as performers, objects, and the audience themselves - might win the attention of the theatre spectator who is free to look where they choose and how they choose. On the balance of this disruption to the conditions of cinematic exhibition that Allen prescribes, I would argue that in the theatrical event a medium aware reading of the moving image becomes available to the viewer where they can discern its mechanism as dynamic projected light.[169] This effect could be observed in another instance in Out of the Blue's *Mad Forest* (2007). At the close of the play, the stage was inhabited with performers enacting a scene whereby layers of arguments build into a cacophony of voices. The stage lighting faded to darkness as a moving image sequence played to a musical accompaniment. Immediately striking was how the image made silhouettes of the performers who remained onstage; the footage also played as dynamic light on the bodies of the performers. A combination of documentary images from the 1989 Romanian Revolution and original footage, taken from scenes staged earlier in the performance, were displayed in an elegiac edited sequence. While the images in this sequence were representational, one might discern medium-aware readings during this instance where the 'presentational space' had again been activated by the performers' presence, which resonated as this footage played on the screen.

The light from the projected imagery illuminated the environment of York Theatre Royal Studio, providing visual cues from changing images that were striking in their contrasting intensity. Certain images whose tonal values privileged darker hues would plunge the theatre into darkness. Others that were brighter would spill light onto the stage space, and cast shadows and silhouettes of the onstage performers (Figures 5 & 6). The spill of the light affected yet more of the theatre's spaces, including the 'audience space', throwing the spectators into visibility as

---

[169] My understanding of stage lighting as a rhythmic and dynamic environmental index is based on a number of texts (McCandles, 1939); (Cadena, 2002); (Baugh, 2005). What is striking is that they frequently evoke the early-twentieth century scenographic theory of Edward Gordon Craig and Adolphe Appia. Their work demonstrates the rhythmic and expressive qualities of stage lighting which is often represented in their striking model theatres and drawings. (Craig, 1963); (Craig, 1968a); (Craig, 1968b). In particular, Appia demonstrated how non-representational light could provide a visual counterpoint directly related to rhythm and music.. I have read Appia's texts in translation in a number of volumes by Richard Beacham (Beacham, 1987); (Beacham, (1993); (Beacham, 1994).

they were painted by the reflected light of the screen.[170] In this situation, the theatre spectator can choose to see the activity of this dynamic light, which one might argue provides what De Toro describes as an 'environmental index'. In situations such as this, the dynamism of the screen images remains in the visual field of the theatre spectator's wandering eye as they focus on the stage's inhabitants or their fellow audience members. Furthermore, as this medium-aware reading affects the entire theatre environment, the spectator might also participate in tactile spectatorship of the moving image while regarding these elements in the theatre space. It is therefore significant that Barker describes the moving image in crisis as 'a heart palpitation', explaining that it is 'not *our* heart that's fluttering: it is the heart of the film' (p. 129). It is my contention that medium aware readings of the image in the theatre's environment provide a 'heartbeat' to the threshold stage described by McAuley. As such, the moving image in the theatre contributes rhythmic and tactile cues that index stage activity in expressive ways. This notion that the moving image becomes a rhythmic 'heartbeat' as an environmental index for stage activity can be discerned through a case-analysis of the National Theatre of Scotland's production of Gregory Burke's *Black Watch* (*dir. John Tiffany,* 2006). In this production, the moving image was often used to provide rhythmic cues that offered emotional and visceral indices to accompany the activity of the stage performers.

---

[170] My rhetoric reflects a creative notion of stage lighting as 'paint'; Cadena argues that stage 'lighting is like painting a canvas' (2002, p. 37).

FIGURE 4 - *MAD FOREST* (YORK THEATRE ROYAL STUDIO, YORK, 2007) DIRECTOR: MARY LUCKHURST, VIDEO DESIGN: NIKOLAUS MORRIS

FIGURE 5 - *MAD FOREST* (YORK THEATRE ROYAL STUDIO, YORK, 2007) DIRECTOR: MARY LUCKHURST, VIDEO DESIGN: NIKOLAUS MORRIS

Gregory Burke's *Black Watch,* initially performed at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival in 2006, was celebrated for its video design created by '59 Productions', who also facilitated the creation of the moving image content in *Waves.*[171] Praising *Black Watch,* theatre critic Lyn Gardner described the video as 'integral to the production and always in service of it' (2008).[172] Paul Taylor of *The Independent* similarly described the production's successful synthesis of 'elements rarely found in tandem':

> On the aesthetic level, it unites the gritty authenticity of verbatim drama and the poetic theatricality of a style of staging prepared to embrace emotionally expressive choreography, plangent military song, video projection, and subtext-revealing mime. On the moral plane, it conjoins dismay at this particular conflict with elegiac sorrow for a regiment betrayed simultaneously on two fronts. (2008)

In its most striking instances, video projections were used as expressive devices that indexed the environment and performances with rhythmic imagery. As such, one might indeed describe the moving image as the 'heart-beat' of the threshold stage in this production.

Black Watch is a documentary play, written from materials based on interviews with soldiers in the Scottish Black Watch military Regiment. The play narrates both the experiences of a group of Fife soldiers during the Iraq War, and the three-century history of the regiment which has since become a Battalion within the Royal Regiment of Scotland formed in the British government's 2006 reorganisation of the Army (The Black Watch, n.d.) The production combined a variety of performance styles; certain moments documented and commented upon the recent history of the Iraq conflict and the Regiment's history and amalgamation, other sequences were movement-based, taking direction from emotional themes expressed in the play. Many scenes were dramatic, following a core ensemble of characters both in a Fife pub and in conflict in the Middle East. The emphasis on physicality was striking in this production; having undergone military training to prepare for their roles, the cast embodied the heroic and

---

[171] Theatre critic Lyn Gardner praised '59 Productions' contribution to both productions in *The Guardian* (2008)

[172] Gardner refers to both *Black Watch* and *Alex: Live On Stage*.

intimidating stature of their characters while representing them both at war and at home.[173] As such, in movement sequences the aesthetic presence of the performers' bodies expressed a compelling beauty that juxtaposed the violence and menace of their demeanour in dramatic episodes. It is therefore essential to understand the use of video images in a context which emphasised the fictional, auratic, and literal presences of the performers and theatre environment.

The activation of the 'presentational space' of performance came as the audience took their seats, during which the environmental setting emulated the atmosphere of a military tattoo through lights, sound, and a roving projected image of a Scottish flag.[174] The 'stage space' was a traverse stage with a central aisle; audience were seated on either side, fully visible to each other. At either end of this aisle were additional performance areas, including a scaffold surrounding a large entrance adorned with a number of video-monitors. On the opposite side stood two scaffold towers with a gauze hung between them which received projected video content; this gauze would eventually drop at the end of the play to reveal the victims of a suicide blast. The various delivery methods of the moving image in *Black Watch* activated 'presentational' spaces across this environment. Multiple projectors delivered moving image content to the sides of the building and the stage-floor in addition to numerous video-monitors. The projection design thus accompanied and punctuated a theatre-space where the physical presence of performers and spectators were continuously emphasised.

---

[173] A video document of the training process is available on the National Theatre of Scotland's website. [online] Available at: <http://www.nationaltheatrescotland.com/content/default.asp?page=s666> Accessed 30th May 2011.

[174] Lyn Gardner comments on this in her review for *The Stage:* 'For a split second you think you might have wandered into the wrong place. With the bagpipes blaring and search lights roving it looks as if you are about to see a smaller version of the Tattoo' (2006). Since its revival at the Barbican Theatre, London (2008, 2010) reviews suggest that this atmosphere has not been diminished despite its relocation out the Edinburgh drill hall where it was first performed. Paul Taylor of *The Independent* argues that the most recent revival manages to 'retain the unofficial tattoo-like atmosphere, the main house has been reconfigured as a cavernous black hangar, framed by scaffolding towers, with the audience in steeply banked seating on either side of the action' (2010). However, Chris Wilkinson, writing for *The Guardian* describes a different experience in the Barbican production: 'In this respect, seeing it a second time was a very different experience. The original, drill hall setting made the piece feel like a single, unified, awe-inspiring event. In this more traditional space, I found myself focussing on the intricacies of the performance itself. I discovered a myriad of visual subtleties in the show that had passed me by in that initial overwhelming experience.' (2008).

Regarding the grammars of the theatrical frame, the activation of spaces in *Black Watch* was complex. The material reality of the environment, its objects and its inhabitants required instantaneous re-activation throughout the event. For example, a pool table used as a prop in a Fife pub scene was suddenly activated - through conventions of fictional presence (see Power, 2008) - as an armoured personnel carrier in Iraq when armed soldiers burst through the felt following a lighting change. Constant indexing of the actors and spaces thus required the attention of the spectator in adjusting and re-adjusting their readings of the stage throughout the performance. Paul Taylor described this moment in particular as an example of the 'vibrant immediacy' of the production; this response reflects the focus on performance and theatrical activity in this event.

When the moving image was used, it was often for its visceral effect. In one movement sequence where the soldiers enter into a controlled brawl ordered by their commanding officer, rapid numerical countdowns were projected simultaneously across the theatre environment. These did not detract from the immediacy and performance of the actors as they fought each other in an aggressively spectacular choreography that spread individual fights across the central aisle. The spectator was free to roam their gaze around this space, viewing simultaneously the aggression of the soldiers, the proficiency of the performers, the visible spectators, and the peripheral rhythms of the video projections which provided a tactile index for this stage activity. The rapid rhythms of the images thus provided an intense 'heart-beat' that indexed the 'presentational', 'fictional', and 'audience' spaces, inviting an embodied experience of the environment to produce an intensely expressive scene.

Multiple projections were used in a similar way during a sequence where the soldiers came under missile attack whilst in their armoured personnel carrier. Sitting in the pool-table, which represented the armoured vehicle, the soldiers suddenly became aware of a signal warning them of the impending strike, their trained response to the threat seemed eerily controlled. The sense of danger in this moment was thus sustained through the use of the

moving image as an environmental index. A number of crosshair symbols resembling gun-sights were projected on various parts of the ground. As the soldiers anticipated the attack, the crosshairs rapidly converged on their location before they were struck by the missile. In this instance, the measured demeanours of the clearly panicked soldiers were thus augmented by the environmental index provided by the rapid movement of the projected images that added an intensity of fear and imminent risk of death to the stage situation.

The contribution of the moving image in *Black Watch* might be described as 'visceral'. The effects are similar to the 'bombardment' that Dixon identifies (2007, p. 335), or the 'intoxicating rush of movement' that Lavender notates in the multimedia *mise-en-scène* (2006, p. 61)*.* These uses of the moving image can be regarded as environmental indices that provide rhythmic and tactile cues through dynamic light that can mark the spectator's consumption of performance and fiction in the visual field. Despite this, a spectator would need to maintain their medium awareness of the moving image in order to discern these environmental effects; this raises the question of whether a more valid reading of the images would be a representational one.

In the instances I have described in *Black Watch,* the projected images displayed representational symbols; in one case a rapid countdown of numbers from '10' to '1', and in another, a crosshair symbol. Furthermore, the instances I have described in *Mad Forest* were significant for their photographic content of Nicolae and Elena Ceauşescu's executed bodies, documentary images of the Romanian revolution, and fictional material that anatomised scenes of the play. A conundrum thus presents itself in the notation of these productions, particularly in a format such as *Waves* where the moving image is employed via its normative 'mediatized' grammar to engender a representational fiction whilst it might also be regarded for its expressive medium-aware qualities. In *Waves,* where the spatial grammars of representational cinema are often employed, a purely medium-aware reading might be inappropriate as it would neglect the diegesis of the moving image, which is an essential element of the performance. I

would like to posit that a solution to this problem of notating the spectator's experience of the expressive qualities of representational imagery in the theatre can be revealed by Allen's intriguing model of 'seeing aspects'.

<div style="text-align:center">SEEING ASPECTS</div>

In the case of *Waves,* the fictional space of the moving image was simultaneously present for consumption in the visual field along with the onstage performers and the objects that provided its content. The spectator could see actors scramble to erect sets and set-up cameras, they could also see how the eight performers collaborated together to represent single characters on-screen. As a result of this staging, one might argue that the theatre-viewer is always aware of their relationship with the moving image, as they are actively participating in its illusion. Allen's thesis can certainly account for this, as he demonstrates a dualism in his model of active spectatorship where 'we experience a pictorial representation as a projective illusion', but simultaneously 'do not believe that what we see is real' (1997, pp. 97-98). Allen provides a solution to this by drawing comparisons with optical tricks; he argues that in an optical illusion the viewer really sees an image as something-else, despite their knowledge that their perception has been engendered by the strategic placement of visual cues (1997, p. 98-99). Allen calls this phenomenon a 'sensory illusion', arguing that such readings demand the active participation of the spectator:

> Sensory illusion thus involves entertaining the thought that the object perceived is before us, but, unlike seeing in general, it does not entail that we believe the object is before us. (1997, p. 100)

Based on this logic, Allen argues that all instances of projective illusion should be understood as 'a form of sensory illusion' (1997, p. 100).

Allen is careful to distinguish optical illusion from projective illusion in the cinema, indicating that an illustration that sustains an optical illusion is 'artfully constructed in a way that is compelling even when we no longer believe it' and that the moving image is not (1997, p.

<div style="text-align:center">192</div>

100).[175] He argues that projective illusion is 'context dependent', as 'our knowledge about what we are seeing can break the hold of the illusion' (1997, p. 100). This presents a problem for Allen: he argues that the viewer knows that the image is not real, and can therefore see the moving image as a fabrication; however, the viewer chooses to participate in the illusion and therefore actively 'sees' a fictional world. Allen's solution is to argue that the spectator actively participates in the impression of reality provided by the moving image by 'seeing' a variety of 'aspects', thus allowing them to experience a projective illusion despite their simultaneous knowledge that they are viewing a fabrication (1997, p. 101).

Allen demonstrates 'seeing aspects' through comparison with another optical trick - the 'duck-rabbit' illustration - in which the viewer can discern either the image of a duck, or a rabbit, but never both at the same time. Based on a spectator's experience of this diagram, Allen argues that 'our thoughts about an object cannot be divorced from our perception of that object in the activity of seeing' (1997, p. 101). One might thus describe a spectator aware that two readings are available to them, but who remains restricted to seeing either one or the other; the choice of which to see is their own.[176] This model of 'seeing aspects' therefore demands the active participation of a viewer who – regardless of their knowledge of every available 'aspect' available to them – must choose to see only one of them at any moment. This explains the spectators' experience in *Waves,* where they can instantaneously see the aspect of projective illusion - which provides the diegesis - or view the image through an aspect where they see photographic reproductions of the simultaneous onstage activity. However, whilst Allen disregards medium aware readings in the cinema, an additional medium-aware aspect becomes available to the theatre spectator who encounters the moving image.

---

[175] In an illusion such as the Müller-Lyer diagram - in which lines of equal length are perceived as being unequal due to visual cues in the image that offer an illusion of depth - one continues to see the optical illusion even when one tries not to.

[176] Allen adapts this logic of seeing to describe a variety of 'aspects' available to the spectator of representational imagery: Viewing the traditional trompe l'oeil we are unable to reconcile our perception of the painting as a painting with our perception of the painting as an object. [...] we remain unable to reconcile the two aspects of our visual field and see the apparent object or photograph in the painting (1997, p. 104).

Thus far I have argued that a medium aware aspect is made available to the spectator when video or film projection is employed in the theatre. This aspect invites the spectator to view the moving image in perpetual crisis, disrupting its normative mediatized experience to view it as a theatrical 'environmental index'. To do so, the spectator must choose to 'see in' to the moving image to discern its component interplay of dynamic light and shade. This represents a marriage of contemporary theories of active theatre and film spectatorship that can - I would argue - describe simultaneously representational and expressive experiences such as *Waves,* and the 'visceral' 'bombardment' of images described by Dixon and Lavender. Moreover, the availability of this aspect does not legislate how the spectator takes pleasure in the multimedia *mise-en-scène,* but rather offers a participation that is both emancipated and inherently theatrical. This experience has been described by Hattie Morahan, who acted in Katie Mitchell's multimedia production *...Some Trace of Her*:

> The people who've really taken to it have loved the fact that there's choice [...] you almost create your own evening, you create your own journey, you can chose to follow one person you can chose to watch the film, you can create any experience you want, it's all there for you. (Morahan, 2010)

These comments demonstrate the variety of spectating methods that the viewer is compelled to employ in reading the 'synthesised space' of the multimedia theatre, and demonstrates that their activity is not controlled. Therefore it would be erroneous to describe the inherent dominance - as Auslander does - or the inherent reflexivity - as TIWG's scholars do - of the moving image in the theatre. Furthermore, while I have continuously demonstrated that 'media epistemology' has indeed informed the contemporary use of the moving image in the theatre, one might argue that the medium aware 'aspect' demonstrates a point of assimilation into the theatrical frame, where it is no longer 'film' but light, movement, colour, and shade.[177] As such, the theatrical key

---

[177] This effect has been described in nightclubs where video images are often manipulated and projected by VJs. Turco argues that in these environments, as dancers populate the club, 'the video does not represent any longer, it just shows colours, lights and shapes, reacting to the music beat.' (2010, p. 60).

mediates the image in that it might be viewed as an 'environmental index' that is understood in relation to the extra-diegetic effects of lighting, movement and music.[178]

I have shown that realist conventions of moving image spectatorship are disrupted by its placement in the theatrical key. While the images might remain compelling as representational cues, attention can be drawn away from their photorealism or their inherent grammars of 'projective illusion' so that – at times – the viewer can see its medium of light as an index to stage activity. I would posit that this is a way of seeing and taking pleasure in the moving image that is decidedly theatrical, and through the paradigm of 'seeing aspects' is able to occur simultaneously with representational viewings of the image and stage. Earlier in this chapter I posited questions on 'how', 'when', and 'why' the spectator might make alternative readings of the moving image in the theatrical event. Lavender and Shepherd have demonstrated that the theatrical event, with its many objects of interest and 'kinaesthetic' stimuli provides an 'engine for spectatorship' (2006, p. 63) that is unlike the normative condition of cinematic exhibition. Furthermore, Read and Rancière have demonstrated the activity of the viewer as an imaginative and thoughtful participant in their visual field. On the balance of this, and the 'medium

However, where this differs from theatrical experience is Turco's observation that no spectatorship is involved in this situation, arguing that the 'clubbers are no longer spectators but experiencers [...] their entire bodies are turned into perceiving mediums' (2010, p. 60).

[178] The notion of total theatre is interesting in relation to this. While the rhetoric of Wagner's *Gesamtkunstwerk* is frequently found in studies of intermediality, the only academic engagement with 'total theatre' I have encountered is E. T. Kirby's *Total Theatre: An Anthology* (1969)*.* Kirby presents an anthology of works, beginning with Wagner's writings on *Gesamtkunstwerk,* which he presents in parallel to his own historical narrative of the 'hieroglyphic' synthesis of music and dance. Kirby translates Wagner's term variously as a "collected," "united," "whole" or "total artwork" (1969, p. xiii). Kirby argues that the Total Theatre does not yet exist and is 'to be a result of history, or a cultural evolutionary process' (1969, p. xiii). Contained within the anthology is an essay by E. T. Kirby that promotes the projected image as the eventual tool of the total theatre. Kirby favours non-representational uses of the projected image in performance and is interested in the 'sensory' effect of experiencing it. He concludes that as an 'instrument of total theatre', the projected image can 'merge the stage with cinema and with music to create an interplay of sensory modalities and a new plastic vocabulary of forms in space, a totality which is now the essential language of the stage itself' (1969b, p. 246). The 'plastic vocabulary of forms in space' seem to refer to the projection of human figures, or of abstract figures who are individually discernable and who synthesize their movement with dancers or actors onstage. Kirby seems to rationalize the visual abstractions of projected imagery as choreographed companions to the human performer. However, his anthology is problematic due to its hypothesising on a hieroglyphic 'total theatre' where abstract images and human forms create symbols. This 'hieroglyphic' logic is problematic as it does not respect either the normative grammars of making meaning in either the theatrical or moving image frame. As such, he is unable to account for the actual activity of the potentially visceral experience he hypothesises.

awareness' and 'aspects' described by Richard Allen, I have revealed a vocabulary through which to describe the possible readings available to the active theatre spectator who can choose to consume the expressive contribution of the moving image in synthesis with a plethora of other stimuli when the compelling presence of performance draws attention from the normative realistic illusion of the moving image. As such, the moving image can be an environmental index and can be creatively employed for expressive and visceral effect, as the work of 59 Productions in *Black Watch* has demonstrated.

CONCLUSION

Significant omissions dog the recent discourse of the moving image in the theatre. In particular, the body of work engaging with 'intermediality' has sustained an uroboric performance-genre that generates its own narrow grammar which it derives from a self-restricting paradigm of scholarly assumptions. These contemporary responses have increasingly distanced themselves from mainstream theatre culture by concentrating on scholarly languages of performance and reception that are incompatible with the sophisticated grammars of stage and screen I have identified. I would go as far to say that the discourse of intermediality is considered mainly with performance rather than theatre; it is therefore highly misleading that TIWG maintain the 'theatre' as the focus of their methodology. The 'theatre' of intermediality is a constructed and academic medium, and therefore the revelations of this discourse cannot be readily applied to theatre and media culture. Even Baudrillard, whose rhetoric of simulation has saturated this discourse, talks of 'the man who, having lost his key in a dark alley, looks for it in a lighted area because, he says, that it is the only place where he could find it' (1975, p. 107). So too has the discourse searched, created and found instances of intermedial and ideological revelation that become increasingly removed from the mainstream institutional frame of these media.

Centred on the academy, responses to 'intermediality' place unrealistic demands on spectators, assuming that they participate in theoretical discourses on the ideology of mechanically reproduced moving imagery whilst viewing multimedia performances. Not only does this assumption narrow the institutional frame of this discourse's notion of theatre, but it also relies on out-dated theories to sustain anxieties of mediatization that, I have argued, it is now essential to avoid. The perceived anxiety of media dominance in contemporary culture has resulted in a fetishism of live performance elements in multimedia productions. This is a self-limiting value judgment that obstructs valid responses to the work of practitioners, and has

privileged reflexive work. A perceived polarity between live theatre and the mechanically reproduced moving image has considered theatre under a protective umbrella of liveness that resists the contamination of reproduced works. Working under these assumptions, scholars have repeatedly reached the misguided conclusion that the theatre is ideally suited to the scrutiny of contemporary media culture. Not only does this overlook the theatre's own mediating apparatus and codes, but it succumbs to negative rhetoric concerning moving image artefacts, a churlish value judgment that it is now vital to abandon: cinema, television and interactive media are not intruders, but sophisticated artistic media.

My own position on the moving image in the theatre is a radical one, and offers a new way forward that embraces both media as popular and creative forms. Considering the ways in which artists and spectators participate and develop the grammars of theatre, film, television, and interactive media, it is clear that the narrow scope of the existing discourse is increasingly irrelevant. An urgent rejection is required of anxieties of contamination and the binary ontological models that saturate this discourse. It is essential to abandon value judgments on either live or mechanically produced artworks. Unlike the discourse of intermediality which considers the theatre a 'hypermedium' (Kattenbelt, 2006), I do not privilege live performance when observing multimedia work. Neither do I assume, as Auslander does, the dominance of mediatized forms in contemporary culture. Purist resistance to the cultural paraphernalia of the moving image is self-limiting; by refusing to embrace the media-grammars which saturate the cultural experience of spectators, one could not, for example, notate the process, production and performance of a mainstream theatre production such as Katie Mitchell's *Waves* (2006)*.* The paradigm of intermediality is therefore only able to engage with works generated according to its own 'code', or else works must be forcibly notated within the confines of its methodology.

I insist that multimedia theatre must be studied by embracing the paradigm of contemporary moving image grammars, or what Auslander describes as 'media epistemology' (2008, p. 36). However, whereas he identifies these traits as evidence of the dominance of

mediatized forms over the live, I reach an alternative - and more holistic - conclusion by positing a paradigm of synthesis whereby the compelling grammars of the theatre – those of space and presence (McAuley, 1999); (Power, 2008) – form a theatrical key signature that mediates the moving image by providing engines of representation, meaning, and spectatorship. By understanding that media are placed within this kingdom, one can notate uniquely theatrical experiences of the moving image that include the expressive qualities I have identified in John Tiffany's *Black Watch* (2006), and the visceral effects I have encountered and experimented with in my own work as a video designer for Out of the Blue's *Mad Forest* (2007) and *Celebrity* (2008). Observing these creative uses of the moving image represents a clear departure from the self-fulfilling spiral of reflexivity one encounters in existing scholarship. Stepping outside this paradigm is therefore essential, as for too long the academy has run parallel to – and often overlooked - the work of mainstream theatre practitioners' creative endeavours with these media by focussing on a manufactured body of performance that serves its own expectations and anxieties.

The moving image is now an established tool in the theatre-makers repertoire, and arguably always has been. To find the use of these technologies in live performance peculiar is therefore questionable. It is essential to notate these productions for their artistic merit rather than their wrongly perceived novelty. One must not simply call the moving image a stage technology, but must take into consideration its sophisticated code of artistry and spectatorship that offers new experiences when amalgamated with the immediacy, presence, and space of the theatrical event. Rather than a contaminant, I would regard the moving image as a creative tool that is advantageous to the practitioner precisely *because of* its media epistemology. While Birringer and TIWG admonish the ideology of the mass media by staging the video image in ways that aestheticise the strangling of the live by the contemporary codes espoused by Baudrillard, one might easily forget that the contemporary moving image is a source of entertainment, pleasure, expression, and art. As such, I see no reason to resist the compelling grammars that one enjoys in these media if their considered use can contribute to the theatrical

event to create works of art. Theatre culture benefits by engaging with the contemporary spectator who is able to participate in a number of compelling media languages. As a result, my own thesis offers a new paradigm and opens a multitude of new trajectories for further research which promise revelations on the creative and emotional effects of multimedia theatre rather than the inherent reflexivity implied in existing scholarship.

In order to resolve an imbalance in this discourse that skews it towards reflexive uses of video and film in theatre, the grammars of the moving image and its ever-changing technologies and spectatorship must be regarded for their creative potential as well as their politics. To describe a production such as *Waves* or *Black Watch* simply for their mediatization would only reveal so much, and would neglect the artistic rationale of the practitioner and the experience engendered by performers and spectators in these theatrical events. So how must scholarship proceed to engage with the artistic combination of stage and screen? Studies of multimedia theatre are inherently multidisciplinary, yet I would argue that while the majority of contemporary approaches have drawn on cultural theory and postmodern concerns, an alternative approach would demonstrate, for example, the musicality of the moving image in the theatre as an expressive index, and the pleasure and emotion offered by its images and narratives. How has the moving image been used for expressive effect? How do factors such as the brightness, size, and distance of the image affect its experience; and to what extent do these effects compare with the ways in which spectators take pleasure and experience visceral effects in film and television? Curiously, what has become clear in my research is that remarkably little has been said about writing multimedia productions. The scripting of media elements and the ways in which their grammars offer new narrative possibilities and genres has been neglected. Furthermore, one must also ask how the moving image can be regarded in the context of scenography and contemporary visual design in mainstream theatre. Lastly, an urgent concern is interactivity and social networking in contemporary moving image culture; this raises questions about the amalgamation of grammars of gaming and networking with those of the theatre. With further research into these questions, the creative endeavours of theatre artists

utilising these new methods can be celebrated. The anxieties and narrow-focus on technologies themselves – and their implicit ideologies – can therefore be restricted to the discourse of cultural theory; in doing so, an opportunity arises for multimedia theatre to be reclaimed from the academy for the benefit of theatre studies and theatre culture.

APPENDIX:
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

This section provides transcripts of interviews I conducted for my research with *Waves* actors Mike Gould, Kate Duchene and Paul Ready. I also include a transcript of an interview I conducted with Dutch theatre director Teunkie van der Sluijs, which is revealing in regards to my enquiry in this thesis.

1. MIKE GOULD - 4TH FEBRUARY 2010

Mike Gould was part of the original company that devised and performed Katie Mitchell's Waves (2006). He also performed in Mitchell's production of Martin Crimp's Attempts on Her Life (2007) and the subsequent 2008 international tour of Waves.

Mike: I first came across Katie's idea in a workshop context rather than a rehearsal context. That was just purely exploratory. There was a production planned at the time, but the first engagement with it was production-free.

Nik: Was that aiming for a production of *The Waves*?

Mike: There was a production of *The Waves* planned but it hadn't been cast, and it was very early-days when we did this workshop. I'd never heard of Foley before; we had a Foley artist come and talk to us, and show a few of his techniques. I guess in that workshop context we would just – Katie had done the highly edited version of it – so she was picking and choosing what she needed from the novel. In a way, it was her personal relationship to the novel. Obviously a novel is so massive, to get all of it in - what she was hoping - would be an hour and a half, it really ended up being a snapshot of a novel in the same way that she did *The Idiot*.[179] You'd have to acknowledge it's like a film, almost impossible to capture everything. When you look at a novel you can look at a paragraph and just see there's so much in it which theatre time doesn't allow you to tell. The idea was to multitask onstage to try and create the atmosphere of the book; the images of what's being described and – to some extent – as strong an impression of character as possible and I suppose the stream of consciousness was a useful one to start that kind of laboratory exploration with. The truncated nature of the text was such that Bernard, who I played - or represented, I think, or 'looked after' is what we called it, I think [...] we didn't do the last forty pages, which is more or less all his voice.
Katie was particularly interested, I think, in Rhoda, and it would have become unbalanced in the end if it ... .in the novel it became Robbie's...... I mean Bernard's reflections.

Nik: In the last sections yes, Bernard reflects and tells you what happened to everyone.

Mike: I think there's a slight problem in the novel, dare I say, of Virginia Woolf.

---

[179] Mitchell's multimedia production *Some Trace Of Her...* (2008) was based on Dostoevksy's novel *The Idiot* (1869)*.*

Nik: Of course it's a snapshot of the novel, and it's interesting that it brought in cinematic grammars. Film schools will very often tell directing students to show and not tell when you're using the sort of cinematic techniques. Do you think because of the cuts you made to the novel, and by using the framings - by being able to express things by how an image was created - that you were able to put a lot back in that's otherwise described in the text?

Mike: We were constantly aware of that risk – the show and tell risk – it's a conversation often had in a theatre context as well as a film context. It is vaguely fatal. What I think started to work for us was a fragmentary thing, where rather than showing and telling the same thing we could, I suppose, multilayer the moment. So hopefully the text wasn't doing exactly what the image did, and hopefully the music was complementing rather than repeating. And I think we did – in our making of the images – I think we were quite careful to not allow that, and we maybe mistimed it slightly – deliberately - so that something would be said and then maybe not seen until much later, or the opposite of that. So I think we were playing with time a bit. You asked for an example... I'm trying to think ... the water, if you remember the... Bernard describes being washed?

Nik: Yes, and the water down the back, the sponge down the back; that comes back in the novel a lot as well.

Mike: Probably we did look for leitmotif as well. That kind of texture built and built and you could layer it and build it gradually. It wasn't laid on in one go. We made a very conscious decision to have Bernard's voice there, and his point of view there, so in a way I suppose that was a little bit show-and-tell, but it was more about a sensation rather than anything else.

Nik: An interesting thing that comes from that is how you say you shift point of view, which is much more easily understood by audiences used to seeing films where you can shift point of view using shot construction. Do you think that using the multimedia techniques allowed you to switch point of view the way Virginia Woolf does in the novel? Shifting from character to character.

Mike: I think so. And hopefully there's a mobility brought about by voice as well. So if you were to... I've seen adaptations of novels onstage before - I remember *Jude the Obscure* which was ... can't remember who did that now... I think it was Shared Experience - it was very much more in the traditional vein of adaptation on stage and I thought it was actually show-and-tell because you actually limit your tools by just theatrical tools, so we were more ... I think the point of view was much easier to achieve. You could write it large or small; you could go in close on hands, or you could go in close on eyes. I think when Katie went on to do *Some Trace of Her*, she realised what we were lacking was a depth of field, so you couldn't do those longer shots. You know, the deeper shots. It [*Waves*] was a much flatter thing. We only had four cameras - two of which were mobile and a couple that were preset - so our range of options was a bit more limited than it was on *Some Trace of Her*. But what I think we learnt was how close you could get to somebody thinking, how much you could project onto what somebody was thinking or saying by just having the face or the words. From an acting point of view, acting in a theatre with film, multimedia technology is a very different thing, and it got quite confusing at times as to what space we were playing. Are we playing theatre space or the film space, the cinematic space? And I think what we settled on was, theatrically speaking, what I hope was a pleasure for the audience which was seeing the images being made. So all the actors in a flap on stage running around trying to make things.

Nik: In the platform recording, where Katie Mitchell speaks, the audience seem delighted by the charisma of the actors and how authentic the images are. That's a real delight for them. It's mentioned a lot. Did you feel that your presence was ever subordinate to the film, or did you feel that you were equal players?

Mike: No. I think that very early, close to the first performances, there was a small panic; more on my part, can't really speak for everybody else. But there was a small panic that we were being drowned by the video and, you know, we had principled conversations about whether it was appropriate or not to have film so dominant in a theatre space. So there was a small panic. There was this principled panic. And I think at that point we did, then, we did feel worried we were being overwhelmed by the image on screen, and I think that melted away. Most worries melt away when you're in a successful production. And most worries get multiplied if the production's a flop.

Nik: I think what fascinated me, which I haven't really thought about, is when you talked about depth of field, which is a very important part of cinematic grammar. And I'm wondering if you know whether Katie Mitchell incorporated depth of field effects using different lenses in different multimedia productions?

Mike: Oh I don't know. You'd have to ask someone who was in one of those. In *Some Trace of Her,* well, in *Attempts on Her Life, -* you know what, are you talking to Paul Ready?

Nik: Yes, at some point.

Mike: He did a lot more work on the cameras than I did. I did more work on lighting more than anything else. I remember we did *Attempts on Her Life,* which was similar techniques. So Paul will be more up to speed with the grammar of the camera, as it were. When I said depth of field I might have been talking a little bit loosely. What I mean is that they had used the stage, they had a deeper stage, so they could do longer shots, you see what I mean? But we [in *Waves*] didn't have much depth on the stage itself. So I think it gave her [Katie Mitchell] more options; and Leo Warner was the main sort of guy behind a lot of the work as well.

Nik: He's part of '59 Productions', but he came in on his own for this one? Did he come in with his whole company?

Mike: He came in as part of '59 Productions', and Mark was part of it too, Mark Grimmer. Katie leaned on their knowledge a lot. Katie would say 'I don't we can do that', and then Leo would turn round and say 'no of course you can'; so he and Mark opened Katie's vision up to some much broader possibilities. Actually, one of those influences was the water shot – you know – the sponge, and how we had the camera underneath the glass tank. I suggested that, and Katie didn't think that would work, and then Mark and Leo, or one of them, said absolutely they could make it work.

Nik: It was interesting what you were saying about 'presence'. Did you feel, when you were in shots where you were emulating the continuity style - for example, you'd reach out over a table and it would cut someone else's hand who would be on the other side of the stage - did you find that more 'presence' was being given to the character you'd created on the screen?

Mike: Well... during rehearsals, there was a degree of anxiety about what our role was, you know? Sometimes you felt like the last skill you were being asked to use was the only one you felt you really qualified to do which was act. So Foley is one skill, camerawork is

another, lighting is another skill, and it felt at times like the last thing Katie wanted you to do was act; so there was a degree of anxiety about that. When it came to that teapot stuff the character I think was very much in the voice in that point. It was being vocally led. Paul and I were very much focussed on making continuity work. But of course, continuity is part of your skill-set as an actor anyway. You should be thinking about it to some extent with film anyway, so it's a much more objective mechanical technical skill than character immersion. So I would say the – when I said earlier that Katie asked us to 'look after' certain characters it was almost like we were detached from the characters to some extent and were just responsible for making sure that the character who lived and breathed - but not in the traditional sense of you embodied it all the time. So somebody like Jonah Russell at that point was expressing Bernard's character through the voice. So Jonah and I would talk coherently about what the character was about at that point and then Paul and I would embody the physical reality of that. So there was a kind of team work on character as well as on the technical aspects of achieving the shots. It was a fantastic kind of ensemble experience I must say – one of the best I've ever had really - because we had to work together in different ways and different contexts.

Nik: It's interesting that you use the word embodiment. Because if you take the word 'presence' under another definition, which is the fictional mode where you almost disappear into your character, you make the character and setting present. An interesting thing to me is that the ensemble were making present the flux of memory you have in the book: the images that would arrive and the interpretations of them that were narrated by the characters. Did you feel that that was your goal. To make the mess of consciousness present?

Mike: Just to throw another ingredient into that. I don't think necessarily you would know this as an audience member, but there were always other characters onstage, which was the characters who we were embodying the characters from *The Waves*. For example, I had a character called Robbie – you would never in a million years know this – but Robbie was my character. So Michael embodied the character of Robbie throughout, and Robbie was at times a Foley artist doing some Foley work, at times he was doing something else, and we all had character things going on between us which were about another completely other individual that you would not know about. It was a sort of holding form for our fear.

Nik: I completely understand how it would work, and be an interesting way to approach it as well.

Mike: That's just another layer but I suppose – yes- you see, what we were aiming for is quite interesting because after a while what we're aiming for was to get the show on without electrocuting ourselves. I've worked with Katie a lot and she is traditionally known for complete character immersion in the actors. So you do a lot of work on the character's back story and then what they want and need at any particular time, and the environment that they're working in, and we tried to do that on *Waves* but we simply ran out of time. We tried to do all that with these characters, these meta-characters as it were, but we ran out of time to do that fully and coherently so it became much more about delivering the novel in a multimedia form, and I like to think we achieved that.

Nik: I think you absolutely did.

Mike: It's one of those skin of your teeth experiences where by the end of it we were all thinking very fast. We tried to do a technical run through in the rehearsal room - the last day in the rehearsal room – and it took five hours or something to get through the first

ten minutes of it because it was just technically a monster, and of course once it was on it was much easier. Once we got through the first two or three it actually became more mechanical, just as interesting, but our focus was much more on... well the actor rediscovers the fear and the nuance after a while, 'cos after a while it's such a tight, coherent, piece you had to deliver the same way every night, otherwise you would crash into each other and we would electrocute each other.

Nik: A lot of water and electricity.

Mike: I famously said on the last day of rehearsals something about water and electricity not being good. On the first performance I managed to place, and leave, a live cable in a fish bowl. Somebody pointed that out to me as self-elected health and safety officer.

2. KATE DUCHENE - 9TH FEBRUARY 2010

Kate Duchene was part of the original company that devised and performed Katie Mitchell's Waves (2006). She also performed in Mitchell's subsequent multimedia production Attempts on Her Life (2007) and the 2008 international tour of Waves.

Nik: I'm aware that it [*Waves*] began life as a workshop which was very exploratory. I'm wondering if you could tell me a bit about those early days of the production.

Kate: I loved them. They weren't multimedia; that came in very slowly. You may have heard a lot of this from other people. Who else have you talked to?

Nik: I've spoken so far to Mike Gould. You're the second person I've spoken to.

Kate: The first stage: Katie had an idea ages ago - I'm not even sure Waves was in her head - of having people and microphones on the stage and doing a sort of aural experience. Not necessarily for *The Waves*. I think she had a picture in her head, and I'm sure that people would all have been in black and we'd have been completely invisible [*laughs*] and then she – she [*long pause*] We had a microphone in the room, I remember, for the first one just to do sound effects and voiceover. They were very rudimentary sound effects except for Stace [Anastasia Hill]. You must try and talk to Stace. She was the heartbeat of the piece, Anastasia Hill. She was right on to it right from the beginning. I remember her doing the monster very early on. What's his name ... monster, I've forgotten his name?

Nik: Is that one of the characters?

Kate: Yeah... anyway I remember her doing the monster from the deep.

Nik: Oh, Louis is the Australian.

Kate: Louis! And we did a few really lovely things, but without video. There was one beautiful thing that Stace initiated of a slow motion walk-down of all six characters. Very slow motion. When they meet at Hampton Court holding hands, there was a voiceover and you could see them doing what they were doing, and it was very slow and it was very really beautiful. And I remember Katie talking about how we're going to do the bits in between the bits at the house. And I remember something I thought worked quite well that I thought of, which Stace performed, was painting a horizon: painting colours on the wall so there was an idea that between the scenes we'd paint another bit of the horizon

of the sun rising or falling. And then there was another exercise with Susan baking, and her memories coming out from under the table and we did a whole restaurant for the last chapter when only Bernard is left alive, the restaurant with the grumpy waiter waiting for him to go away... the memory coming out from under the table. But it wasn't multimedia. It was simply using microphones. A lot of it was beautiful work but never got in in the end. Then I can't quite remember the sequence of events. Katie had the idea for video herself and we tried and it was very rudimentary and it only took off when Leo joined us: Leo Warner.

Nik: From 59 Productions.

Kate: Yeah. And he could basically translate our visions into reality. Because he's brilliant at lighting and knowing how to create effects, and effects with mirrors and effects with moving lamps. All we had was angle poise lamps, that's all we had. And so we did the lighting for the shots but he told us how to do it and it had to be very meticulously set up. So when Leo came along that took off, but that was in rehearsal; that was after. I think I did two or three workshops on *Waves*.

Nik: Were those at the NT [National Theatre] Studio?

Kate: Yes.

Nik: It's very interesting that it starts with sound and also – sound that doesn't ... it shows things rather than tells things. You're talking about sound that really sets the scene and gives the impression.

Kate: Voiceover is a very... like explanation... very literal.

Nik: The interesting thing about moving from the form of a novel is that using text can take you from one point of view to another very quickly, and I think Wolf does that very explicitly in *The Waves* by jumping from character to character and being able to explain thoughts and colour events using very literary terms, and that's something that film can do very well using framing and the type of lenses you use, and the sort of shots that you set up. Did you find that once the video started to be used that you were able to express certain things in the novel more easily. Was the novel a great challenge to do before the film?

Kate: Yes. I don't think you could've done the novel as a straight piece of theatre because of it being interior monologue. It would have destroyed the sense of the novel. But I think what – I suppose it is possible – it's been done to do the novel simply aurally. Simply – [....] I think that the video in my opinion made the novel into something else. [...] I think it made it into something else. Which is why we said it was suggested by *The Waves* and not an adaptation of *The Waves*. I think that what happened with the video was that you had a vision of the artist's mind in a different way from how you obviously read her mind in the book. But you had a sense of the creative process, because you saw the mess down on the stage and the fiddling and themes and then there were these shafts of clarity on the screen in a different time and place and I think that was a different way of expressing the stream of consciousness, and added to it something different. So I think... I think the video was definitely something that could help to express the stream of consciousness but also took it somewhere else.

Nik: It's interesting to say that it made present the artist's mind.

Kate: That's just my opinion.

Nik: Of course. If we think of stage presence as a charismatic thing... sometimes... but also there are those who talk of fictional modes of presence; the illusion of the characters and the theatre world being made present onstage and real. But of course you were sometimes divided between : for example in a scene when someone would move their hand across a table and there'd be another actor on the other side of the room. Did you feel that you were there to make present the characters or what you suggested, which was the mind of the author or the flux, the mess of memory that's expressed?

Kate: We all felt we were there to make present one thing. We weren't there to express just our own characters. We 'took care' of one character. We each had a character we 'took care' of .

Nik: This idea of taking care of a character. Mike [Gould] used the same words and I'm wondering was this something prescribed by Katie [Mitchell]?

Kate: It wasn't prescribed, it was just how we came to call it because we were all aware that we weren't playing a character in a way. Our faces... the faces had to be the same for people to follow, and obviously a lot of people felt they didn't follow enough. Yes. So that was just a phrase we started to use. I loved... I think we all loved it... we were very very devoted to that project and I think because it made explicit, as a performer, the best of being an actor: which is when you really ... it really was ensemble. You couldn't really get more ensemble in a way, because you were playing somebody else's hand, or their voice, or their... so many things are called ensemble but they're not. And it depends what sort of actor... bravura performances are fantastic as well, but there's a great satisfaction in being part of a whole. It was very beautiful to perform. It was like dance. I remember a dress rehearsal where I was absolutely terrified. We were all absolutely terrified of the first performance. I just thought: I'm not going to make it through, for the first time in my life I'm going to have to say 'stop': because I'm not good with props. I think of myself in a very English acting tradition and I'm not good with props at the best of times, and for this show... was just [*laughs*] hell! Not literally: I loved doing it but I thought: 'I'm never going to make it; I'm never going to make it'. I know the others did too. I remember the first rehearsal where I got a bit of it and it flowed and I thought - I remember saying - 'It's like a dance'; and it becomes in your memory a physical memory. And sometimes, I'm sure Mike said almost all the same things because we talked about it so much, we've done it so much, that we found a language to talk about it but it's what we all experience, I think. But sometimes in performance if something went wrong - even out by a split second sometimes - you'd find somebody else, somebody coming at you in a different configuration from normal and you'd go: 'Oh no! What's happening?' Very funny.

Nik: Did it all work organically? If, let's say, something was mistimed, was it easy to solve because you were working as such a close-knit group?

Kate: We never stopped. We never stopped. The video machine packed up a couple of times. But *we* never stopped. It was usually easy to sort out, and then there were things like: people had to run across stages and get – put up – laps [...] You know ,we had to be flexible. It was quite exciting as we got to know it better. It was quite exciting when things went wrong because you really had to sort it out. It was much harder for Paul [Ready] and Jonah [Hill] who were filming. They had to do things really to the split second and they had to remember all the settings and everything, so that was very hard.

Nik: Did you yourselves all train with the camera equipment. or was it just Paul and Jonah?

Kate: We all did it.

Nik: What sort of training? I'm interested because it certainly used cinematic grammars. I think that's what helped the audience understand it quite well because you used continuity style, you used shots and reverse shots, you cut from one scene to the other in quite a traditional way; even though it was being used in a very experimental way. The framings themselves were quite cinematic at times. Did you train to learn those kinds of framings? What sort of work did you do?

Kate: Leo did that.

Nik: You were prescribed the framings?

Kate: Prescribing doesn't describe the rehearsal process because we all worked on it together. For instance, Katie [Mitchell] would say, 'could you work on this scene; you work on that scene; you work on that scene'. Usually almost always about the character you were looking after. So I go off with a scene about Susan. For instance, there's the scene that became the shot with the sheet with the maid [Florrie] and the manservant in the garden and he embraces her. Do you remember that? That's the shadow?

Nik: They have the sheet up on the stage, if I remember?

Kate: Yes. Katie told me to go off and work on that scene, that section where Susan talks about seeing them embracing in the garden. And I worked out what I wanted to see in my head but I had no idea how to do it. I wanted a perspective from - I thought maybe I could do it with a cutaway to Susan, feet on the grass, and see them embracing; but I didn't know how to do the sky and the perspective and everything. Leo looked at what I'd tried to do, and so I'd go away and work on it, probably overnight, and then come back with the ideas of the text and say 'I'd like this cutaway and I'm not quite sure how we'd do this'. We tried it and it didn't work because it was too difficult, this big outdoors scene, and then he had the brilliant idea of the sheet; and then we all worked out what angle everything had to be at and the sheet endlessly had to be worked out. It had to be exactly the right angle and exactly the right height so that the hands weren't in the shot and all that, so it's very precise but it – so that - but even that isn't prescribed. We all knew what we were heading for once we'd done it, once we knew what we had to do. Leo would look at the shot and: 'you need to be'... 'what's going wrong'... 'I can't see'... 'it's funny, it's not working this time round'.

Nik: It would be fair to say that Leo facilitated the ideas that came from the cast. It's interesting you say you were sent to work on individual scenes. Just to clarify, in that sequence were you working on, were you storyboarding that for what the camera would do? Or were you devising...

Kate: In that instance, I storyboarded for what the camera would do but it didn't work. We couldn't make it work and then Leo had the idea of the sheet. Often storyboards... Stace can draw and she often came back with very intricate [storyboards]; the whole Rhoda sequence at the end of chapter one with her on the bed and drowning, and in the water and everything: Stace had completely storyboarded and we all worked on that to make her storyboards come to life

Nik: It's interesting you bring up one of the Rhoda sequences. I'm sure there are many examples of this. It's a moment with Rhoda that sticks in my head because I found it in the book [*The Waves*] as well. A lot of film makers are taught to show and not tell, and of

course in Hollywood cinema voiceover is always discouraged - even though sometimes it works very well - but there are things in the book, in the prose... For example, there'll be a list of the characters doing something, and then in brackets Woolf will use syntax to alienate Rhoda in a way, to make her lonely. It'll say explicitly: '(and not Rhoda)'. These things may be difficult to put into dramatic dialogue and voiceover, but I think with the framing and choice of shots, and how the sequences were revealed to the audience you were able to show the point of view of the character. A lot of the novel had to be cut, but did you find that there were a lot of things that were in prose in the novel that you could show, and not tell, by using the camera and sound equipment?

Kate: The water imagery springs to mind, the different elements associated with the different characters: Jinny had fire which was harder to do; I had Earth which was less ... in a way less ....

Nik: Were you burying the school in the ground?

Kate: Yes. Though I actually physically didn't do it. I can't now think of any other specific examples. But certainly the water was shown and not told; the elements.

Nik: Just to clarify; was all the music live?

Kate: Yes; it was in the National [Theatre].

Nik: There was a lot of extra-diegetic music. It's interesting because it's quite a cinematic, and maybe operatic, trait but it's interesting that you had music that was not in the scenes. You had sounds and maybe even images that would lift and support the rhythm of the piece. How were those decisions arrived at? What did those things do?

Kate: Katie works often with the same actors and technicians. It becomes a group. And we have within the group two long term collaborators of Katie's who are Gareth Fry, who won an award for the sound - and he's an amazing sound designer - and he always works with Katie whenever she can. And the other is Paul Clarke who does the actual music and they work together a lot and its: 'have you got something to go under this?' Katie hands it over to Gareth basically I think: 'So this is what I'm doing, you do what you do.' They're brilliant.

Nik: Well it worked wonderfully and really lifted the rhythm of the novel I think.

Kate: Just brilliant. They can turn their hands to anything.

Nik: There are a lot of academics who have written on multimedia performance. They've made very bold assertions that any use of video for example, immediately negates the presence of the performer. Is that something you felt?

Kate: I don't think it negates it. I know that it's simply because we were working in the dark a lot of the time; we ourselves weren't very visible, but I think people were very... In *Waves* what worked well was the balance between stage and screen, in that people were very intrigued to see what was going on. But I ... yes, it negates , it removes the need for so much ego, and I think that's a good thing. You don't have to worry so much about your effect, the effect you're having. And also ... oh yes one thing that didn't happen - that I would have liked to have happened more - and that Katie had almost dropped from her multimedia work, which I think is a shame, which is that we started off with an onstage life as well. So we had two characters we were taking care of. Did Michael [Gould] talk about this?

Nik: Are these the characters you created? One of them had a dance background.

Kate: Yes. The characters we created for our characters, which were performing a one-off gig for a performance artist, and they all had their onstage relationships. But actually, in the making of the piece, we created characters with quite complicated backgrounds and relationships who were then looking after the characters in the novel. So in our heads to begin with we were playing two people. Well, we were playing one person who was playing another person. But in the making of the piece we didn't have enough time really to work on that and it fell a bit by the wayside. There was a bit in our heads. but not in other people's heads. It didn't reach the audience, and I think it's a real shame. I think it would be great to have the balance a bit more on stage so that you could have two realities going on: a stage reality and a screen reality. And I think if we do more devised work we might try and do more of that.

Nik: I don't know if you ever heard. The NT [National Theatre] made a platform recording of Katie talking about *Waves*.

Kate: I didn't.

Nik: The audience are invited to ask questions, and a lot of them struck me as talking about the audience's delight in the charisma of the Foley artists, and the characters onstage creating things.

Kate: Yes, they liked that.

Nik: Everything felt very authentic to them, I think. So this idea of live cinema: the charisma of the actor and their skill and the rehearsal which is evident behind what you're doing - you said it was like a dance - was certainly not lost on the audience, and I think they took a lot of delight in that.

Kate: I think so too. And we took a lot of delight in doing it, which probably showed. There was a brilliant thing I overheard on tour. On tour in Bath, that proverbial little old lady I overheard in the interval saying: 'Gosh they've got a lot of things to remember, they should make a list and make sure they're always in the same place.' As if we hadn't done that! As if we were just busking the lot!

Nik: That's wonderful.

Kate: She thought it was just good luck, and that we were rushing about trying to find things.

[We closed the interview with a more informal discussion on Katie Mitchell's subsequent multimedia production of Martin Crimp's *Attempts on Her Life* (2007), in which Duchene also performed, I include here some points of interest]

Kate: Some people loved it, lots of people hated it. We had hecklers and stuff. Very exciting. [...] But I think the balance in the Olivier... you need the Cottlesloe, you need to see what people are doing on stage. We disappeared completely on the Olivier in black.[180]

[...]

---

[180] Mitchell's *Attempts on Her Life* was actually staged in the Lyttelton Theatre at the Royal National Theatre in London, and not the Olivier. However, Duchene's comparison between these large stages and the more intimate Cottesloe Theatre- in which *Waves* was staged - remains relevant despite her misrecollection.

Nik: It's interesting when you talk about the tour [of *Waves*]; and the fact you had hecklers in *Attempts on Her Life*. The actual literal presence of the event interests me too. Was it sold as theatre on the tour, when it went international? Did people receive it as theatre or did they... there is one review, I think it's Lyn Gardner, who says that the company and Katie had created a new art form, but do you believe that? Or do you think it was very much in the "key" of theatre, as it were?

Kate: I think *Waves* was theatre; I think *Attempts on Her Life* wanted to make film.

Nik: I see.

Kate: *Waves* was theatre.

[...]

Nik: In the platform recording Katie mentions a Polish influence -

Kate: - which I'm blissfully unaware of. Katie has a Polish influence in anything she does [*laughter*].

3. PAUL READY - 28TH MAY 2010

Paul Ready was part of the original company that devised and performed Katie Mitchell's Waves (2006). He also performed in Mitchell's production of Martin Crimp's Attempts on Her Life (2007) and was an associate on her production Some Trace of Her... (2008), he also performed in the 2008 international tour of Waves.

Paul: Katie [Mitchell] had been work-shopping this idea for a long time, maybe five years. It's a book she came to when she was studying at university and just loved, she's always been slightly obsessed by it but had no idea how to get it onto a stage, and so over the years she's been work-shopping it to the point when I met it. When I went to meet her about it she said – it was around 2006, so I would have met her in July or something like that – and I went to the meeting, she says 'this is a bit of a strange one, I don't know what we're going to do with it: what I can tell you is there'll be a couple of cameras, we'll be using a couple of cameras and we'll be working with' - I can't remember if she said sound, but she said there'll be a couple of cameras. Apart from that, she said she wasn't really sure how we're going to do it. Having done it she really didn't know how it was going to come about.

I guess we were looking at our own stream of consciousness, and what Katie always does with her work is she identifies the themes of a play and then you'll maybe find something in your life which is relevant to that theme, and then you re-enact that part of your life using other actors. Say: you play my brother etc... and then you try and awaken or re-awaken, or remember what those themes were for that particular moment; always engaged with the theme. So this one she used that technique a bit, but it didn't have to be as literal, "you can have voiceovers, you can have images if that helps, so use that to represent"; same exercise but use your imagination in a different way. And that's where it started really, remembering dreams and how you remember things as a child ... I remember one – my childhood was.... there was these old ladies that used to live next to us and I'd – I remembered a pair of slippers and then a massive grandfather clock – just in my memory. And then something else, and my thought pattern went - like that, and they weren't linked particularly, apart from by the old ladies. But the images could have been anything; that's how my memory worked. And we started to look at how memory

worked as well. For example the grandfather clock was massive in my memory because when I was a kid it was massive, now I'm the same height as it. So we were looking at things like that. Then we started rehearsals. We had eight weeks.

The general process that Katie does, which is a lot of improvisation and snippets of your life, the pressure in an eight week period, creating what had to be done was immense. It was about a week in, or a week-and-a-half in, the video designers came in: Leo Warner. We worked on it per chapter. And actually we would each have a character to look after. So, I was looking after Neville, and that meant I had to– as much as I could – take care of his story. So we'd go away in separate groups and go, 'okay how are we going to represent this bit?' And then we work out what images perhaps we'd want to see. Basically trying to storyboard it for ourselves. And then, with the massive help of Leo - who's amazing - we'd see what we could represent in a very simple setting. And it always had to be close-ups because the backdrops were only small, they were just rectangles of wallpaper. Using stream of consciousness ourselves, using the images – as many of the images as we could of hers [Woolf's] - and then also what is possible with our [own].

The perimeters were very strict, because - as I say - you couldn't have a wide-shot or anything like that. We just didn't have the facilities for it. So yeah, also at the same time the idea of what the space represented, and at the same time Katie was working on who these people were that we were. She always likes to give you other things to focus on as a way of channelling what you're doing, to give you some kind of focus. And eventually what was come up with – she came up with something very different, but the same idea as something to focus. So there's bits of Virginia Woolf's autobiography in the piece and she was represented by this actress, and the idea was that she was an artist. She was an artist that got together this group of people that were supposedly like experts in their field. I played a video designer, and there was another video designer. So basically I would be Leo and Mark if it had been that actual circumstance. The concept was that she'd got this group of people together to put on this production of *The Waves* and it was in a radio studio in front of a live audience. So that was the concept.

I've worked with Katie a few times, and nobody is ever bigger than a project. I think when you work on something like this it's not really... it doesn't really feel like a performance. And because we were very busy... I mean *really* busy... it got easier, because we managed to get very proficient at it. But the first time we ran it, the last rehearsal before we went into technical rehearsal, was a disaster. It lasted about three hours and we didn't get to an end, and we were breaking things and we had to keep stopping. The wires... the lamps... so we didn't even know if we'd get through it on the first performance. In fact, we assumed we'd need to stop, because actually despite having these characters our real focus was just 'get this lamp to here'; 'OK, now we have to be in this image now, so put your hand in here'; 'hold this backdrop'. It was chaotically busy until it then became quite graceful because we got it into our muscle memory, our bodies, it became more like a dance. Probably peaceful to watch a group of people helping each other to do each part, and so we were thinking about nothing else other than that really.

[Following up my previous discussion with Mike Gould, I asked Paul Ready whether Mitchell experimented with the effects of different lenses to manipulate depth of field in subsequent multimedia productions *Attempts on Her Life* and *Some Trace of Her...*]

Paul: No. Well, I think that was kind of impossible in ways [regarding depth of field] because –
        the focus was actually changed slightly, but the images were quite simple. It was manual,
        but because there was no great depth, there was no distance. Literally no distance. It
        might have been a pair of slippers, in which case you're just looking at a pair of slippers.
        But they did have longer shots in *Some Trace of Her,* they had longer shots and they used
        different lights had more cameras they had tracking shots. Only small tracking shots but
        that's how the technology got better, and also they had big backdrops which could slide
        across rather than just this square.

[Having been informed by Gould that Paul was the most proficiently trained with the camera in
Waves, I asked him about his rehearsal with the video equipment]

Paul: The person I was going through was a video designer [he is referring to the fictional
        character he embodied], so I had to take control. It just meant I became a bit more
        familiar with it, and really I was picking up ideas from Leo because he is incredible at his
        job. He came in to watch early-on and he saw the potential, he thought "ok" this is a good
        thing for him to be involved in because it was imaginative. And you could see how it was
        pushing what he wanted to do. So a lot of it was from him, I picked up stuff and that's
        why I kind of – but really –people would take away a little bit and go 'how are we going
        to represent this?' So everybody was working on what images we could use here or
        there, and then we had to work out how to do the images. I'd be more useful then, you
        know, to go 'OK – we could do this or that'.

        Do you remember the bed? Rhoda is on the bed and she starts floating up towards the
        ceiling. That one I remember very much, Anastasia [Hill] had storyboarded it. 'This is
        what I'd like to see' ,because she was looking after Rhoda, 'This is what I'd like to see but
        how the hell are we going to do it?' Just remembering how to come up with that, that
        was Leo and anybody throwing in ideas, just experimenting and it was a difficult piece to
        do. How would you get the feeling a bed is lifting of the floor and then spinning out of
        control? So to get to that was interesting, to get from what she had on paper to actually
        what we could do was quite a journey. And actually, then it came down to having a little
        model of Rhoda made in bed and just lifting it up and spinning it. You could actually do
        quite a lot. Also there was a chapter in the book that is... we ran out of time, and also
        when I went to the meeting about it we didn't know where in the book we were going to
        start, and the last chapter of *The Waves* is all Bernard.

Nik: Yes.

Paul: So in the book he's going back over the whole thing and that was going to be in it. Then
        she [Mitchell] decided pretty early on, 'no', because that's just reflection, you need to go
        from actually what's happening. So that was cut. Also, another chapter was cut because
        we ran out of time. But I remember Leo coming up with this last sequence which
        happened literally in half an hour in rehearsals, it's like: 'that's how to finish it, that's it!'
        He was moving a light from a wine glass to the character, and then back to the wine glass
        and another character comes in, moves it back and it's a different character. It's right
        at the end, and very simple. It's when they all meet up at Hampton Court and go for food,
        and then it just ends with this very simple light movement. Moments like that were
        really exciting; I can remember that one in particular and being 'that's brilliant, that's
        amazing, and simple'.

[Ready and I discussed how the multimedia format aided storytelling in *Waves*]

Paul: I think it's a really interesting method of working. *Waves* in particular. To get a stream of consciousness onto stage, and also the fragmentation of these six characters in the book, and the fact that they're all part of each other and they're separate but also inseparable from each other. There's something like... maybe by accident - or maybe Katie was working towards - kind of worked incredibly well for *The Waves,* because that's what Virginia Woolf was saying. So as far as something as *Waves* goes I think it's an incredible way of working actually, and I think it gives something like... it can be very dream-like or it can take you somewhere-else because its feeding the senses in a way that some theatre does, and great theatre does occasionally, but it's not always the ... to feed the senses in some way, but to this extent? When sound suddenly takes over the room or when the minutiae of a sound suddenly – which you can't have ... which is what film does... you can focus on anything, you can take the viewer anywhere. That combination of theatre and film and sound is really valuable as an experience. It's difficult to know. *Some Trace of Her*, that was a play with talking on camera, and I was really interested to see that. That is a much more linear story, *The Idiot,* that something like *Waves,* but I've got to say I loved *Some Trace of Her*. Again, there was that feeling of peace, not just peace but, I find it quite emotional because that one I was able to watch. It's emotional to see people working together in that way, and that is also part of the evening. Part of the experience.

[We concluded the interview by discussing the reception of *Waves* on its international tour, and whether the multimedia production was considered a theatrical event.]

Paul: There was a guy when we were on tour about Waves. He was a French guy. We were in Luxembourg and he said, 'I've just witnessed the death of theatre'; and then he said 'It was a beautiful death'. [...] Multimedia... it's not regular theatre, obviously it's not regular theatre, maybe it will be, who knows. [...] You just get a different experience, which I can't put my finger on. Katie is highly influenced by Tarkovsky.[181] Specifically Waves, actually I think. Maybe the feel of the image had a little of that influence, and also because Tarkovsky is all stream of consciousness. I was watching *Nostalghia* (1983), and somebody is running down a cobbled street with a suitcase, and I suddenly felt really upset. It works on your senses in such a different way, and that's what something like *Waves* may be. Something like *Mirror* (1975)has in common, that kind of stream of consciousness.

4. TEUNKIE VAN DER SLUIJS - 19TH APRIL 2010

Teunkie Van Der Sluijs is a Dutch theatre director whom I met at the TaPRA 'Dealing with the Digital' symposium in March 2010 at Royal Holloway in London. I became interested in Teunkie's recent work with the Young Vic theatre in London where he explored the narrative potentiality of new moving image technologies, in particular those which incorporate interactivity and social networking. His theatre company Studio Dubbelagent is based in Amsterdam, and specialises in introducing contemporary European writing to the United Kingdom. Interestingly, his revelations on the use of the moving image in the Dutch theatre demonstrate the challenge of cultural specificity when notating multimedia productions across international borders.

---

[181] Andrei Tarkovsky (1932-1986) was a Russian film director whose poetic and rhythmic direction and cinematography can certainly be seen emulated in the video imagery and on-camera performances projected in Mitchell's *Waves.* It is not the province of this thesis to explore this aesthetic trajectory, but this comparison offers an intriguing route for further research.

Nik:	Can you tell me about the project at the Young Vic?

| Teunkie: | Essentially it came about from a contact that had been set up between Pauline and Matthew Bickerton who run *Bickerton*, a web design company, one of the earliest in the UK. In recent years they've shifted their focus from web design to open source programming; they're also avid theatregoers. So they'd approached the Young Vic to talk about the possibility of collaborating on digital theatre, who were just about to start looking at that themselves. There was a meeting last May (2009), an initial brainstorm session between Pauline and Matthew Bickerton at the Young Vic and a group of directors they'd invited to take part in this. On the basis of that, they asked people to put forward project proposals for ways of incorporating the digital into theatre practice. One of the things I've been finding very interesting is the way more and more user-generated content is created on the web now, and you see that going further and further from text and imagery. You now see there are possibilities for video, for instance, a project like *Cultura* which allows people to edit their own video without editing software.[182] I was thinking along the lines of trying to find ways around the theatre production to make your audience engage with the work you do in the production by offering the chance to create their own user-generated content. |

| Nik: | That's the audience in the theatrical event? |

| Teunkie: | Yes, either in the theatrical event or as an extra thing around it. You know how in recent years you've seen things pop up like companies that set up Facebook or Myspace profiles for characters in their productions, so people can engage with them outside the actual performance as well; I find that very interesting, so I've been looking into ways of incorporating that sort of work and I was asked to join in this digital theatre lab which happened in June last year (2009), which was a week of research and development at the Clare theatre at the Young Vic to basically test a couple of these concepts and proposals that people had put forward. |

| Nik: | Did you work with writers as well? |

| Teunkie: | No. We deliberately weren't, actually. We had a couple of actors in the room but we didn't approach any writers. There were a few directors who also wrote, but they weren't there in that capacity. |

| Nik: | You said that was a deliberate choice; why was that? |

| Teunkie: | Because we didn't want to be bogged down on text, and we wanted to really experiment with form rather than beginning with a piece of writing, and try to stage that somehow and use digital means to stage it. |

| Nik: | It's interesting you talk about form, because in your presentation you showed an image of one of the outcomes of the event where you talked about a story that |

---

[182] Due to the ever-changing and often ephemeral character of the world wide web, I have been unable to find this website, which I imagine has now ceased to exist. However, a more recent website offering a similar tool that democratises video editing is JayCut [online] Available at <www.jaycut.com> [Accessed 1st May 2011].

was emerging as a user was interacting with a computer, and you could see the Windows image projected.[183] I'm interested in the kinds of storytelling forms you found, that emerged from using technology.

Teunkie: Basically there were three short performances created that week. One was basically a story between man and a woman which was accompanied by a video projection screen behind them, and another story was very deliberately created and you could see the people creating it onstage by flashing up lots of different images and windows; so whereas there was a narrative going-on on the floor, there was also a second narrative which sometimes complemented - sometimes contradicted - what was happening on the floor, which is a little bit along the lines of the piece that I showed a little bit of at the presentation. Then there was a third performance which was created around so-called user-generated content, which started off as a presentation. It wasn't' really a narrative performance as such, it was a presentation by the directors that made it. It became a theatrical presentation and became – for want of a better word – a hoax.

Nik: So how did using these technologies support the narrative? How did they help with storytelling? Could you tell stories in new ways using these technologies?

Teunkie: I suppose when you're looking at the narrative structure you're looking at the pivotal events, the moments when the story takes a different direction or different angle. I think ultimately these kinds of means are another way of making those pivotal events, in the same way a change in the lighting state, or music cue, or dialogue, or physical performance does. I would say it's another means. But it doesn't replace any of the others.[184]

Nik: Can you give me an example when a pivotal change was helped by a large part by using a technology?

Teunkie: It's a pretty straight forward example, but in one piece images are being flashed up when you see narrative developed by actors onstage; but an image is flashed up that undermines the story that's been developing on the floor, because it gives a new set of information. That's pretty much the same using a video projection or having a character appear upstage when another is downstage; it's another way of doing a reveal.

Nik: So it's the reveal! What has interested me about video projection is that it functions like the door in a farce, anything can be revealed which can change the situation. Even if you're using live-generated content it's still going to work on that principle of the reveal.

Teunkie: I haven't thought about it before, but you're right, it is a reveal. It's very… it's a very exciting reveal as a practitioner because you can do so many different things, even though you're limited to a two-dimensional surface, there are ways

---

[183] The presentation to which I refer was given by Teunkie at the TaPRA *Dealing with the Digital* symposium held in March 2010 in London. Here he described and showed examples of his work as a director at the Young Vic.

[184] This is revealing in relation to the environmental index offered by the moving image in the theatre that I identified in Chapter 4.

you can project at angles to make the projection itself look like its more than two dimensional, but it is a 2D surface. Apart from that there's a lot that's possible whether it's moving image or still image or whether it's, like you're saying, something that's completely uncontrollable - because it's user-generated - that pops up, it's a very exciting way to incorporate a reveal into your design.

Nik: Returning to your translation work, do you find that European texts tend towards using technology more than British ones?

Teunkie: I think it's very difficult to generalize about trends in playwriting, and I wouldn't know what a European text would look like and what a British text would look like. You can find certain differences: traditional narrative structures are more prevalent in British writing than in European writing where structure tends to be a little more loose, actually. I know most about Dutch and Flemish writing. I think you see very clearly that there isn't a playwriting culture in the Netherlands and there never has been; there is a very advanced culture of physical theatre, dance, and performance art, and a very strong auteur director culture. But that's almost exclusively with classical writing, so there are very few contemporary Dutch playwrights; definitely very few that can make a living of it. We have few places to support playwriting, we don't have a Bush theatre or a Royal Court. There is no institution that furthers the playwriting. Because of that, you find that writers aren't working in a tradition, there is a lot more experimentation with form. Coupling that with the auteur director tradition you are more likely to see applications of new media or digital technology in theatre. In Britain there is an understanding that when you do a play for the first time you first and foremost honour the writing and let the play speak for itself, you leave the conceptual fireworks a little bit behind because it may just endanger the clarity of the production or the play. What's important to realise is that in Belgium, you see, there that playwrights write for a specific company, for their own company, or the playwright is part of a devising company who writes up what they've been devising and therefore gets the playwriting credit. So the process of writing is often part of a devising process, of a process that happens on-the-floor as opposed one where the writer locks himself away and comes up with his play. Occasionally there's workshops around it, but they tend to deliver finished plays as opposed to starting somewhere with a company of actors… if you work from that sort of process you're much more likely to start early-on to use other means to tell your story than dialogue. You can compare that model to the way Complicite work, or Robert Lepage.

The conclusion of our interview was less formal, yet these closing remarks are relevant to my enquiry:

Teunkie: One of the biggest problems you're facing when you're working with video as a practitioner is it's very big and it's very light. That sounds very banal but that's simply the reality of it. If there's an actor onstage, and a video-screen behind them or above them, that's where the audience attention goes. […] Even if you make it smaller it will always be as bright, or brighter than an actor will ever be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

1. ARCHIVE MATERIALS

Coast of Utopia Cue Sheet. RNT/SM/1/481C. National Theatre Archives. NT Studio. London.

Waves Platform Recording. RNT/PL/3/958 [audio recording] National Theatre Archives. NT Studio. London.

Waves Production Folder. NT Production Office Show Folder, *WAVES* at the National Theatre Archives.

Mad Forest. Script for 2007 Out of the Blue Production. From archive of Professor Mary Luckhurst, University of York.

2. INTERVIEW MATERIALS

Duchene, K. (2010). Interviewed by Nikolaus Morris on 9th February 2010.

Duchene, K. (2010b). *Interview for National Theatre discover: online.* [online] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Gould, M. (2010). Interviewed by Nikolaus Morris on 4th February 2010.

Jackson, S. (2010). *National Theatre discover: online.* [online] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Kettle. L. (2010). *National Theatre discover: online.* [online] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Mitchell. K. (2010) *National Theatre discover: online.* [online] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Morahan, H. (2010) *National Theatre discover: online.* [web] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

O'Hanlon, M. (2010). National Theatre discover: online. [web] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Read, D. (2010) *National Theatre discover: online.* [web] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Ready, P. (2010). Interviewed by Nikolaus Morris on 28th May 2010

Ready, P. (2010b). *National Theatre discover: online.* [web] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Van Der Sluijs, T. (2010) Interviewed by Nikolaus Morris on 19th April 2010.

Wishaw, B. (2010) *National Theatre discover: online.* [web] Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

3. CORPORATE DOCUMENTS

The Walt Disney Company 2008 Annual Report. (n.d.). (2008)

SECONDARY WORKS

1. UNPUBLISHED RESEARCH

Barker, M. (2010) (unpublished) *Report to Picturehouse Cinemas/City Screen on the Findings of a Research Project into Audience Responses to Streaming of Live Performances ('Alternative Content') to Cinemas.* Aberystwyth University. (Unpublished research).

2. AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

Holmes. P. (2004). [DVD] *Hollywood Camera Work: The Master Course in Blocking.* 12 volumes.

3. CONFERENCE PAPERS

Erickson, J. (2000b). Contribution to Roundtable on *Liveness.* In: ATHE Conference "Roundtable on Liveness", Washington D.C. 4 August 2000.

4. WEBSITES

Cull, L., Kuhn, S., Giannachi, G. and Kaye, N. (eds) A Presence Dictionary. Available at presence.stanford.edu:3455/Collaboratory/517 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Hernandez, E. Long Runs on Broadway (2010). Available at http://www.playbill.com/news/article/75222.html [Accessed 23 August 2009]*.*

National Theatre discover: online. Available at www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/61576/waves-and-some-trace-of-her/a-katie-mitchell-production.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.) *threshold*. Available at www.oed.com:80/Entry/201234 [Accessed 25 February 2011]

Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.) *live, adj.1, n., and adv.* Available at www.oed.com/view/Entry/109299?rskey=qPKgOa&result=1&isAdvanced=false# [Accessed 25 February 2011]

PPS Danse (n.d.). About PPS Danse. Available at http://www.ppsdanse.com/en/compagnie/index.html [Accessed 24/08/2009].

PPS Danse (n.d.). Pôles. Available at http://www.ppsdanse.com/en/repertoire/poles.html [Accessed 24/08/09].

Theatre Studies Utrecht University (n.d.). Projects / Intermediality in theatre and performance. Available at www.theatrestudies.nl/rp_intermediality.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

The Black Watch (n.d.). Available at www.theblackwatch.co.uk [Accessed 27/02/2011]

5. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Allfree, C. Review: Waves. *Metro (London).* 20th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1375.

Billington, M. Black Watch. *The Guardian.* 4 April 2007. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/apr/04/theatre1 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Billington, M. Michael Billington on theatre's technical skills. *The Guardian.* 21 October 2009. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/culture/2009/oct/21/critics-notebook-michael-billington [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Billington, M. Called to Account. *The Guardian.* 24 April 2007. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/apr/24/theatre [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Billington, M. Review: Waves. *The Guardian.* 17th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1373.

Brown, M. Blair in the dock. *Socialist Review.* Available at www.socialistreview.org.uk/article.php?articlenumber=9954 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Clapp, S. Review: Called to Account, *The Observer,* 29th April, 2007. In *Theatre Record,* 23rd April- 6th May 2007, p. 492.

Clapp, S. Review: Waves. *The Observer.* 19th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1374.

Clapp, S. Double indemnity. *The Guardian.* 25 April 2009. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/apr/29/theatre1?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

De Jongh, N. Review: Waves. *Evening Standard.* 20th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1374.

De Jongh, N. Blair Put on trial over Iraq, *This is London.* 24 April 2007. Available at www.thisislondon.co.uk/theatre/review-23393623-blair-put-on-trial-over-iraq-do [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Dibdin, T. Black Watch. *The Stage.* 5 October 2010. Available at www.thestage.co.uk/reviews/review.php/29828/black-watch [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Gardner, L. Modern theatre relies too much on technology. *The Guardian.* 17 April 2008. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2008/apr/17/theatretechnology [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Gardner, L. Black Watch. *The Guardian* . 8 August 2006. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2006/aug/08/theatre.edinburgh20061 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Gardner, L. Waves sets a high-water mark for multimedia theatre. *The Guardian* 4 December 2006. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2006/dec/04/wavessetsahighwatermarkfo [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Halliburton, R. Review: Waves. *Time Out London.* 22nd November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1374.

Irvine, S. Review: Waves. *The Sunday Telegraph.* 26th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1375.

Macaulay, A. Review: Waves. *Financial Times.* 22nd November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1374.

Marlowe, S. Review: Waves. *The Times.* 18th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1374.

Marmion, P. Review: Waves. *What's on in London.* 23rd November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1375.

Mitchell, K. (2008) Katie Mitchell on making *Waves. whatsonstage.com* Available at www.whatsonstage.com/blogs/manchester/2008/09/23/katie-mitchell-on-making-waves/ [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Mitchell, K. (2006) Breaking the waves. *The Guardian*, 11 November 2006. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2006/nov/11/theatre.stage [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Murphy, S. (2007). Review: Called to Account. *Metro (London)* 25/04/2007. In *Theatre Record.* 23 April - 6 May 2007, p. 492.

Nathan, J. Review: Called to Account. *Jewish Chronicle.* 27th April, 2007. In *Theatre Record*, 23 April - 6 May, 2007, p. 492.

Nightingale, Benedict (2007). Review: Called to Account. *The Times,* 24/4/2007. In *Theatre Record* 23rd April - 6th May 2007, p. 491.

Peter, J. Review: Waves. *The Sunday Times.* 26th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1375.

Riding, A. A Theater Holds a Hearing on Blair, Then Stages it. *The New York Times.* April 26, 2007. Available at query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C05E0DF153EF935A15757C0A9619C8B63 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Shuttleworth, I. (2007). Review: Called to Account. *The Financial Times,* 25/04/2007. In *Theatre Record* 23 April- 6 May 2007, p. 491.

Sierz, A. Review: Waves. *Tribune.* 24th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1375.

Spencer, C. Review: Waves. *The Daily Telegraph.* 18th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1373.

Szalwinska, M. Arts critics can no longer be confined by categories. *The Guardian.* 27 May 2009. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2009/may/27/arts-critics-categories [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Taylor, P. Review: Waves. *The Independent.* 17th November 2006. In *Theatre Record, 5-18 November 2006,* p. 1373.

Taylor, P. Review: Called to Account. *The Independent.* 26th April, 2007. In *Theatre Record,* 23 April - 6th May 2007, p. 492.

Taylor, P. Black Watch, Barbican London. *The Independent.* 26 June 2008. www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/reviews/black-watch-barbican-london-854183.html [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Walker, T. Review: Called to Account, *The Sunday Telegraph,* 29th April, 2007. In *Theatre Record.* 23rd April - 6th May 2007, p. 493.

Wiegan, C. Reviews roundup: Called to Account. *The Guardian.* 3 May 2007. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2007/may/03/theatre2 [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Wilkinson, C. (Black) Watch again: the verdict. *The Guardian.* 30 June 2008. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2008/jun/30/blackwatchagaintheverdict?INTCMP=SRCH [Accessed 27/02/2011]

Williams, I. R. Multimedia in theatre: sound and fury, signifying something. *The Guardian.* 15 December 2008. Available at www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2008/dec/15/theatre-multimedia-rupertgoold-katiemitchell [Accessed 27/02/2011]

6. JOURNAL ARTICLES

Albacan, A. I. (2010). REVIEW: Modes of Spectating, Alison Oddey and Christine White (Eds.). International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media. 6 (2).

Arnold, R. L. (1964). Animated Scenery. *Educational Theatre Journal,* 16(3).

Auslander, P. (2006). The Performativity of Performance Documentation. *Performing Arts Journal.* 84.

Auslander, P. (2005). After Liveness: An E-Interview. *Performance Paradigm: A Journal of Performance & Contemporary Culture*, 1. Available at http://www.lcc.gatech.edu/~auslander/interviews/Performance%20Paradigm%20Interview.pdf [Accessed 17/12/2010].

Auslander, P. (2002). Live From Cyberspace or I was sitting at my computer this guy appeared he thought I was a bot. *Performing Arts Journal,* 24 (1).

Auslander, P. (2000). Liveness, Mediatization, and Intermedial Performance, *Degrés: Revue de synthèse à orientation sémiologique*, No. 101.

Auslander, P. (1997). Against Ontology: Making Distinctions between the Live and the Mediatized. *Performance Research* 2 (3).

Barker, M. (2003). *Crash,* Theatre Audiences, and the idea of 'liveness'. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, 23(1). 21-39.

Burian, J. (1984). Aspects of Central European Design. *The Drama Review.* 28(2).

Bottoms, S. (2006). Putting the Document into Documentary: An Unwelcome Corrective? *The Drama Review.* 50(3).

Bordwell, D. (2002). Intensified Continuity: Visual Style in Contemporary American Film. In *Film Quarterly*, 55, (3).

Cohen P, (1972). REVIEW: Expanded Cinema, by Gene Youngblood. *Leonardo*, 5(3).

Cole, W. (1963)The Theatre Projects of Walter Gropius. In *Educational Theatre Journal,* 15(4).

Fenemore, A. (2007). Dialogical interaction and social participation in physical and virtual performance space. *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*, 3(1).

Féral, J. (1982). Performance and Theatricality: The subject demystified. Translated by T. Lyons. *Modern Drama.* 25. 170-181.

Feral, J. and Bermingham R. P. (2002). Theatricality: The Specificity of Theatrical Language. *SubStance*, 31, (2&3).

Fuchs, E. (1985). Presence and the Revenge of Writing: Re-thinking Theatre After Derrida. *Performing Arts Journal.* 9(2/3).

Goodman, L. (2007). Performing self beyond the body: Replay culture replayed. *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*. 3(2-3).

Herstand, T. (1966). Edward Gordon Craig on the Nature of the Artist. *Educational Theatre Journal*. 18(1)

Higgins, D. (2001). Intermedia. *Leonardo* [online] 34(1). Available at muse.jhu.edu/journals/leonardo/v034/34.1higgins.html [Accessed 16/12/2010]

Hobgood, B. M. (1968). Review: The Piscator Experiment. *Educational Theatre Journal*. 20(3).

Innes, C. (2005). Puppets and Machines of the Mind: Robert Lepage and the Modernist Heritage. *Theatre Research International.* 30(2).

Istel, J. (1995). Stage presence in cyberspace. *American Theatre* 12(10).

Kirby, M. (1966). The uses of film in the new theatre. *Tulane Drama Review*, 11(1).

Kook, E. F., Wilfred, T., Planer, P., Clark, P., McCandless, S., Conway, J. A., Wittlig, P. F. and Rubin, J. E. (1954). The Projected Setting: A Symposium. *Educational Theatre Journal,* 6(3).

Kwapisz, K. (2005). "Always in the Likeness": The Virtual Presences of Helmut Kajzaris Gw'azda in the Lothe Lachmann Theatre. *Modern Drama*, 48(3).

London, B. (1985). Video: A Selected Chronology, 1963-1983. *Art Journal*, 45(3).

Martin, C. (2006). Bodies of Evidence. *The Drama Review* 50(3).

Oeler, K. (2006). A Collective Interior Monologue: Sergei Parajanov and Eisenstein's Joyce-Inspired Vision of Cinema. In *The Modern Language Review*. 101 (2).

Odin, S. (1989). The Influence of Traditional Japanese Aesthetics on the Film Theory of Sergei Eisenstein. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 23(2).

Paget, D. (1987). Verbatim Theatre: Oral History and Documentary Techniques. *New Theatre Quarterly,* 3 (2).

Pepper, A. (1979). Kinetic Art: 3-Dimensional Luminous Images Projected into Volumes of Smoke (Pentrojection) *Leonardo*, 12(4).

Pepper A. (1981). Kinetic Light Art: Continuous 3-Dimensional Luminous Images Produced on Rapidly Rotating Strings (in Notes) *Leonardo*, 14(3).

Pratt, G. (1975). Early Stage and Screen: A Two-Way Street. *Cinema Journal.* 14(2).

Rajevsky, I. O. (2005). Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality. In *Intermèdialitiès,* 6.

Ronald, V. (1997). The Aristotelian theatrical paradigm as cultural-historical construct. *Theatre Research International.* 22(1).

Rundle, E. (2009). Review: 'Stage Presence'. *Theatre Journal*, 61(2).

Serge Denisoff, R. and Plasketes, G. (1990). Synergy in 1980s Film and Music: Formula for Success or Industry Mythology. *Film History*, 4(3).

Sherman, J. (2009). Review: Stage Presence. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 53(3).

Siegmund, G. (2007). Apparatus, Attention, and the Body. *The Drama Review*. 51(3).

Tallon, M. E. (1984). Appia's Theatre at Hellerau. *Theatre Journal*, 36(4).

Thomas, I. (2006). A Search for New Realities: Documentary Theatre in Germany. *The Drama Review*. 50(3).

Waltz G. (2006) Filmed Scenery on the Live Stage. *Theatre Journal*, 58(4).

7. CHAPTERS IN BOOKS

Allsopp, R. (2009). 'Foreword'. In S.Broadhurst, and J. Machon, *Sensualities/textualities and technologies: writings of the body in 21st century performance.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arfara, K. (2010). La Socìetas Raffaello Sanzio, *Purgatory* (2008). In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Auslander, P. (2009). Reactivation: Performance, Mediatization and the Present Moment. In M. Chatzichristodoulou, J. Jefferies & R. Zerihan *Eds. Interfaces of Performance*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Auslander, P. (2006a). Humanoid Boogie: Reflections on Robotic Performance. In D. Krasner, and D. Z. Saltz, Eds. *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Auslander, P. (2006). Afterward: 'Is There Life after Liveness?' In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Auslander, P. (2006). AnimalCam: Ocularcentrism and Non-Human Performance. In J. Christie, R. Gough, and D. Walt, Eds. *A Performance Cosmology.* London: Routledge.

Auslander, P. (1997). *Presence* and *theatricality* in the discourse of performance and the visual arts. In P. Auslander, Ed. *From Acting to Performance*. London: Routledge.

Auslander, P. (1997). "Holy Theatre" and catharsis. In P. Auslander, Ed. *From acting to performance: essays in modernism and postmodernism.* London: Routledge.

Auslander, P. (1997). Vito Acconci and the politics of the body. In P. Auslander, Ed. *From acting to performance: essays in modernism and postmodernism.* London: Routledge.

Auslander, P. (1996). LIVENESS: Performance and the anxiety of simulation. In E. Diamon Ed. *Performance and cultural politics*. London: Routledge.

Bay-Cheng, S. (2010a). Temporality. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bay-Cheng, S. (2010b). Instance: Richard Foreman, *The Gods Are Pounding My Head! (Aka Lumberjca Messiah)* (2005), *Deep Trance Behaviour in Potatoland* (2008). In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bazin, A. (1967)The Evolution of the Language of Cinema. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brady, M. (2006). Brecht and film. In P. Thomson and G. Sacks, Eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brejzek T. (2006). Physicality and Virtuality: Memory, Space and Actor on the Mediated Stage. In: A. Oddey and C. White Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces*. Intellect Books: Bristol.

Brooker, P. (2007). Postmodern adaptation: pastiche, intertextuality and re-functioning. In D. Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boenisch, P. M. (2006). Aesthetic Art to Aisthetic Act: Theatre, Media, Intermedial Performance. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Bolin, G. (2004). Spaces of Television: The structuring of consumers in a Swedish shopping mall. In Couldry, N. and McCarthy, A. Eds. *Mediaspace: Place, Scale and Culture in a Media Age.* London: Routledge.

Broadhurst, S. (2006). Intelligence, Interaction, Reaction, and Performance. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Broadhurst, S. and Machon, J. (2006). Introduction: Body, Space, and Technology. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Brown, C. (2006). Learning to Dance with Angelfish: Choreographic Encounters Between Virtuality and Reality. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Callens, J. (2006). Spatial Practices: The Wooster Group's Rhode Island Trilogy. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Cardullo, B. (2001). 'En Garde' The Theatrical Avant-Garde in Historical, Intellectual, and Cultural context. In B. Cardallo and R. Knopff. Eds. *Theater of the Avant-Garde 1890-1950*. London: Yale University Press.

Carroll, N. (2006). Philosophy and Drama. In D. Krasner, and D. Z. Saltz, Eds. *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Cartmell, D. and Whelehan, I. (2007). Introduction – Literature on screen: a synoptic view. In D Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cartmell, D. and Whelehan, I. (2007). Theories of Literature on Screen. In D Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Černy, F. (1972). Lighting that creates the scene and lighting as an actor. In F. Hodge, Ed. *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Chatzichristodoulou, M. (2009). How to Kidnap your Audiences: An Interview with Matt Adams from Blast Theory. In M. Chatzichristodoulou, J. Jefferies & R. Zerihan, Eds. *Interfaces of Performance*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Chapple, F. & Kattenbelt, C. (2006). Key Issues in Intermediality in theatre and performance. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Coniglio, M. (2006) Materials vs Content in Digitally Mediated Performance. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Coveney, M. (2008). The National Theatre and Civic responsibility in the British Isles. In S. E. Wilmer, Ed. *National Theatres in a Changing Europe.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Davison, A. (2007). High fidelity? Music in screen adaptations. In D Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dayan D. (1974) The Tutor-Code of Classical Cinema. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dietrich, M. (1972). Twentieth-century innovations in stage design, stage machinery, and theatre architecture in Austria. In F. Hodge, Ed. *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Dixon, S. (2006). Digitizing Artaud. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Dundjerović, A. (2010). Robert Lepage and Ex Machina - *Lipsycnh* (2007) - Performance transformations and cycles. In J Harvie and A Lavender, *Making Contemporary Theatre.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Eckersall, P. (2010). Not Yet It's Difficult - *Blowback* (2004) - Unmaking *Blowback* - a visceral process for a political theatre. In J Harvie and A Lavender, *Making Contemporary Theatre.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Eisenstein, S. (2004). Beyond the Shot [The Cinematographic Principle and the Ideogram] . In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenstein, S. (2004). The Dramaturgy of Film Form [The Dialectical Approach to Film Form]. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erickson, J. (2006). Presence. In D. Krasner, and D. Z. Saltz, Eds. *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ernst, W. D. (2010). Instance: Gob Squad, *Room Service* (2003). In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Fernihough, A. (2007). Consciousness as a stream. In M. Shiach, Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Modernist Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fewster, R. (2010) Instance: *The Lost Babylon* (Adelaide Fringe Festival 2006) In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Fewster, R. (2010b) Presence. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Garner Jr. S. B. (2007). Sensing realism: illusionism, actuality, and the theatrical sensorium. In S. Barnes & A. Lepecki. (2007) Eds. *The Senses in Performance.* London: Routledge.

Gruber, K. (2006). The Staging of Writing, Intermediality and the avant-garde. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi,

Gualtieri, E. (2003). The Grammar of Time: Photography, Modernism and History. In J. Murphet and L. Raindford, Eds. *Literature and Visual Technologies: Writing After Cinema.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, P. (1989). Foreword. In J. Goodwin, Ed. *British Theatre Design: The Modern Age.* London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Halliwell, M. (2007). Modernism and adaptation. In D Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Havens, H. (2010). The Intermedial Performer Prepares. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Henke S. (2007). *The Waves* as Ontological Trauma Narrative: The Anxiety of a Death (Un)Foreseen. In S. Henke & D. Eberly, Eds. *Virginia Woolf and Trauma: embodied texts.* New York: Pace University Press.

Hollinger, V. (1992). Playing at the End of the World: Postmodern Theater. In P. D. Murphy, Ed. *Staging the Impossible: The Fantastic Mode in Modern Drama.* London: Greenwood Press.

Howard, P. (2006). Directors and Designers. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Howard, P. (1989) Using the Space. In J. Goodwin, Ed. *British Theatre Design: The Modern Age.* London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Hunter, F. J. (1972). Norman Bel Geddes: Renaissance Man of The American Theatre. In F. Hodge, Ed. *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Jackson, R. (2004). Victorian and Edwardian stagecraft: techniques and issues. In K. Powell, Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jaeger, S. M, (2006). Embodiment and Presence: The Ontology of Presence Reconsidered. In D. Krasner, and D. Z. Saltz, Eds. *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Kaplan, E. (1988) Whose Imaginary? The Television Apparatus, the Female Body and Textual Strategies in Select Rock Videos on MTV. In E. D. Pribram, Ed. *Female Spectators Looking at Film and Television*, pp.

Kattenbelt, C.(2006), Theatre as the art of the performer and the stage of intermediality. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, pp.

Kelly, R. (2005). On *The Art of Vision.* In D. E. James, Ed. *Stan Brakhage: filmmaker.* Phildelphia: Temple University Press.

Kirby, M. (1969). 'Environmental Theatre'. In E. T. Kirby, *Total Theatre: A Critical Anthology.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Klich, R. (2010). The Builders Association, *Super Vision* (2005). In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lavender, A. (2010). The Builders Association - *Super Vision* (2005) - Digital dataflow and the synthesis of everything. In *Making Contemporary Theatre.*

Lavender, A. (2010). Digital Culture. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lavender, A. (2006). Theatre and Technology. In M. Luckhurst, Ed. *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lavender, A. (2006). Mise en Scène, Hypermediacy and the Sensorium. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

MacCabe, C. (2003). On Impurity: The Dialectics of Cinema and Literature. In J. Murphet and L. Raindford, Eds. *Literature and Visual Technologies: Writing After Cinema.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marcus, L. (2003). How Newness Enters the World: the Birth of Cinema and the Origins of Man. *Literature and Visual Technologies: Writing After Cinema.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

McFarlane, (2007). B. Reading film and literature. In D Cartmell and I. Whelehan, Eds. *Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mekas, J. (2005). Brakhage. Breer. Menken. The Pure Poets of Cinema. In D. E. James, Ed. *Stan Brakhage: filmmaker*. Phildelphia: Temple University Press.

Metz, C. (1974) Some Points in the Semiotics of the Cinema. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McKechnie, K. (2010). Rimini Protokoll, Mnemopark. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Merx. S, (2006). Swann's Way: Video and Theatre as an Intermedial Stage for the Representation of Time. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murphie, A. (2005). Negotiating Presence: Performance and new technologies. In P. Auslander Ed. *Performance: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge. 1st Ed. 2003.

Nelson, R. (2006). New Small Screen Space: A Performative Phenomenon? In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Nibbelink. L. G. & Merx, S. (2010). Presence and Perception: Analysing Intermediality in Performance. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

O'Brien, T. (1989) Time Future. In J. Goodwin, Ed. *British Theatre Design: The Modern Age*. London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Oddey, A. (2006). The Potentials of Autobiographical Spaces. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Oenclager, D. (1969). Robert Edmond Jones: Artist of the Theatre. In F. Hodge, Ed. *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Palmer, S. (2006). A Place to Play: Experimentation and Interactions Between Technology and Performance. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Parks, L. (2004). Kinetic Screens: Epistemologies of movement at the interface. In N. Couldry & A. McCarthy, Eds. *Mediaspace: Place, Scale and Culture in a Media Age.* London: Routledge.

Patel, R. (2006). Collaborative Explorations: Reformulating the boundaries of scenographic practice. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Petralia, P. (2010). The Fragmented Stage of *Virtuoso (working title)*. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Pluta, I. (2010). Robert Lepage and Ex Machina, *The Andersen Project*. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Prince, S. (1996) The Discourse of Pictures: Iconicity and Film Studies. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pudovkin, V. (1958) From Film Technique [On Editing]. In L. Baudry & M. Cohen, (2004) Eds. *Film Theory and Criticism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rayner, A. (2006). Presenting Objects, Presenting Things. In D. Krasner, and D. Z. Saltz, Eds. *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Remshardt, R. (2006). The Actor as Intermedialist: Remediation, Appropriation, Adaptation. In F. Chapple & C. Kattenbelt, Eds. Intermediality in Theatre and Performance, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Scheer, E. (2010). Granular Synthesis, *Modell 5.* In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Schone, G. (1972). Karl Lautensclager: Reformer of stage Scenery. In F. Hodge, Ed. *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Schiller, G. (2006). Kinaesthetic Traces Across Material Forms: Stretching the Screen's Stage. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Shank, T. (1992). The Shock of the Actual: Disrupting the Theatrical Illusion. In P. D. Murphy, Ed. *Staging the Impossible: The Fantastic Mode in Modern Drama*. London: Greenwood Press.

Sontag, S. (1966). Film and Theatre. In P. Auslander, Ed. (2005) *Performance: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*, Vol 4. London: Routledge.

Strong, R. (1989). The Years Before. In J. Goodwin, Ed. *British Theatre Design: The Modern Age*. London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Tracy C. Davies, (2004). The Show business economy, and its discontents. In K. Powell, Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turco, M. (2010). Instance: Intermediality in VJing: Two VJ Sets by Gerald van der Kapp (alias VJ oo-Kaap) In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Vanhoutte, K. & Wynants, N. (2010) The Work of CREW with Eric Joris. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Van Mannen, H. (2004). How Contexts Frame Theatrical Events. In V. A. Cremona, P. Eversmann, H. Van Maanen, W. Sauter & J. Tulloch. Eds. *Theatrical Events: Borders, Dynamics, Frames.* New York: Rodopi.

Wechsler, R. (2006). Artistic Considerations in the Use of Motion Tracking within Live Performance: A Practical Guide. In S. Broadhurst, and J. Machon, Eds. *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Whitclock, L. (2006). Re-Designing the Human: motion capture and performance potentials. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

White, C. (2006). Smart Laboratories: New Media. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

White, M. (2004). The attractions of television: reconsidering liveness. In N. Couldry & A. McCarthy, Eds. *Mediaspace: Place, Scale and Culture in a Media Age.* London: Routledge.

Wiens, B. (2010). Christopher Kondek, Dead Cat Bounce (2005). In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Wiens, B. (2010b). Spatiality. In S. Bay-Cheng, C. Kattenbelt, A. Lavender, and R. Nelson, Eds. *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*, Amsterda: Amsterdam University Press.

Wood, N. (2006). Flatness and Depth: Reflections. In A. Oddey and C. White, Eds. *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Wulfman, C. E. (2007). Woolf and the Discourse of Trauma: The Little Language of The Waves. In S. Henke & D. Eberly, Eds. *Virginia Woolf and Trauma: embodied texts*. New York: Pace University Press.

8. BOOKS

Allen, R. (1997) *Projecting Illusion: film spectatorship and the impression of reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auslander, P. (2008) *Liveness: Performance in a mediatised culture*. London: Routledge. 1st edition 1999.

Auslander, P. (1997). *From Acting to Performance: essays in modernism and postmodernism.* Trowbridge: Routledge.

Auslander, P. (1992). *Presence and Resistance: Postmodernism and Cultural Politics in Contemporary American Performance*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Augé, M. (1995) *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. London: Verso. 1st Ed. 1992.

Armstrong, T. (2005). *Modernism: A Cultural History.* Cambridge: Polity.

Aronson, A. (2005). *Looking into the Abyss.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bailes, S. (2011). *Performance Theatre and the Poetics of Failure: Forced Entertainment, Goat Island, Elevator Repair Service.* New York: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image Music Text.* Fontana Press.

Bates, B. (2004). *Game Design*. Boston: Premier Press.

Barker, J. M. (2009). *The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience.* London: University of California Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1981) *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. Translated by C. Levin. St. Louis: Telos Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1983a). *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities.* Translated by P. Foss, J. Johnston and P. Patton. New York: Semiotext(e).

Baudrillard, J. (1983b). *SIMULATIONS.* Translated by P. Foss, P. Patton, and P. Beitchman. New York: Semiotext(e).

Baudrillard, J. (1993) *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. Translated by I. H. Grant. London: Sage Publications. 1st published 1976.

Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths & Structures.* London: Sage Publications. 1st published in French 1970.

Baudrillard, J. (1988). *The Ecstasy of Communication.* Translated by B. Schutze, C. Schutze, and S. Lotringer. New York: Autonomedia. First published in French 1987.

Baudrillard, J. (1995). *The Gulf War did not take place.* Translated by P. Patton. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. 1st edition in French 1991.

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *The Illusion of the End*. Translated by C. Turner. Cambridge: Polity. 1st published in French1992.

Baudrillard, J. (1975). *The Mirror of Production*. Translated by M. Poster. St Louis: Telos Press. First published in French 1973.

Baugh, C. (2005). *Theatre, Performance and Technology: the development of scenography in the twentieth century.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beacham, R. C. (1994) *Adolphe Appia: artist and visionary of the modern theatre.* Philadephia: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Beacham, R. C. (1993) *Adolphe Appia: texts on theatre.* London: Routledge.

Beacham, R. C. (1987) *Adolphe Appia, theatre artist.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beckerman, B. (1990) *Theatrical Presentation: Performer, Audience and Act.* London: Routledge.

Bell, A. O. (Ed.) (2008). *Virginia Woolf*, *Selected Diaries*. London: Vintage Books.

Bellman, W. F. (1977). *Scenography and Stage Technology: An Introduction*. London: Crowell.

Benjamin, W. (1970). *Illuminations*. Translated by H. Zohn. 1st edition 1955.

Bennett, S. (1990). *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception.* London: Routledge.

Bijker, W. E., Pinch, T. J. and Hughes, T. P. Eds. (1987)*The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology.* Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Birringer, J. (1998). *Media & Performance Along the Border.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blair, R. (2008). *The Actor, Image, and Action: Acting and cognitive neuroscience*. London: Routledge.

Blau, H. (1982). *Blooded Thought: Occasions of Theatre.* New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Blau, H. (1982). *Take up the Bodies: Theater at the Vanishing Point.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Blau, H. (1990). *The Audience.* London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blau, H. (1992). *To all appearances: ideology and performance.* London: Routledge.

Bleeker, M. (2008). *Visaulity in the Theatre: The Locus of Looking.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brandensky, J. (2007). Ed. *Czech theatre design in the twentieth century : metaphor & irony revisitEd.* Iowa: University of Iowa Press.

Braudy, L. & Cohen, M. (2004). *Film Theory and Criticism, Sixth Edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Braun, E. (1996). *The Director and the Stage: From Naturalism to Grotowski*. London: Methuen Drama: London. 1st Edition 1982.

Brewster, B. and Jacobs, L. (1997). *Theatre to Cinema: Stage Pictorialism and the Early Feature Film.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brook. P. (1990). *The Empty Space.* London: Penguin. 1st edition 1968.

Bulson, E. (2007). *Novels, Maps, Modernity: the spatial imagination.* London: Routledge.

Burian, J. (1971). *The Scenography of Josef Svoboda*. Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press.

Bolter, J. D. and Grusin, R. (1999) *Remediation: Understanding New Media.* Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Branigan, E. (1992). *Narrative Comprehension and Film.* London: Routledge.

Broadhurst, S. (2007). *Digital Practices: aesthetic and neuroesthetic approaches to performance and technology.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Broadhurst, S. and Machon, J. (2009). *Sensualities/textualities and technologies: writings of the body in 21st century performance.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Broadhurst, S. and Machon, J. Eds. (2006). *Performance and Technology: practices of virtual embodiment and interactivity*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Cadena, (2002). *Focus on Lighting Technology*. Royston: Entertainment Technology Press.

Cardullo, B. (2006). *Screening the Stage: Studies in Cinedramatic Art*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Cardallo, B. and Knopff, R. Eds. (2001). *Theater of the Avant-Garde 1890-1950*. London: Yale University Press.

Cardwell, S. (2002). *Adaptation RevisitEd.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Carnegy, P. (2006). *Wagner and the Art of the Theatre*. London: Yale University Press.

Carver, R. K. (2009). *Stagecraft Fundamentals: A Guide and Reference For Theatrical Production.* London: Focal Press.

Causey, M. (2006). *Theatre and Performance in Digital Culture: From simulation to emeddedness.* London: Routledge.

Chaikin, J. (1971). *The Presence of the Actor.* New York: Atheneum.

Chandler, G. (2009). *Film Editing: Great Cuts Every Filmmaker and Movie Lover Must Know.* Studio City, CA: Michael Wiese Productions.

Chatzichristodoulou, M., Jefferies, J. and Zerihan, R. *Eds.* (2009). *Interfaces of Performance*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Chapple, F. and Kattenbelt, C. Eds. (2006) *Intermediatlity in Theatre and Performance*. Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Churcher, M. (2003). *Acting for Film: Truth 24 Times a Second.* London: Virgin Books.

Cole, D. (1975). *The Theatrical Event: A Mythos, A Vocabulary, A Perspective*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Conroy, C. (2010), *Theatre & the Body.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Couldry, N. and McCarthy, A. Eds. (2004). *Mediaspace: Place, Scale and Culture in a Media Age.* London: Routledge.

Craig E. G. (1968a) *SCENE.* 1st edition, 1923.

Craig E. G. (1968b). *On the Art of the Theatre.* London: William Heinemann Ltd. 1st Edition 1911.

Craig,E. G. (1963). *The Theatre Advancing.* New York: Benjamin Bloom. 1st Edition 1947.

Cremona, V. A., Eversmann, P., Van Maanen, H., Sauter, W. & Tulloch, J. (2004). *Theatrical Events: Borders, Dynamics, Frames.* New York: Rodopi.

Crittenden, R. (2008). *Fine Cuts: The Art of European Film Editing.* London: Elsevier Focal Press.

Crittenden, R. (1981). *The Thames and Hudson Manual of Film Editing.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Dancyger, (2002). *The technique of film and video editing: history, theory, practice.* London: Focal Press.

Davis, T. C. and Postlewait, T. Eds. (2003). *Theatricality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Toro, F. (1995). *Theatre Semiotics: Text and Staging in Modern Theatre.* Translated by J. Lewis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. First published in Spanish 1987.

Dipietro, C. (2006). *Shakespeare and Modernism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, S. (2007). *Digital Performance: a history of new media in theater, dance, performance art, and installation.* London: MIT Press.

Dundjerović, A. (2007). *The Theatricality of Robert Lepage.* London: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Enticknap, L. (2005). *Moving Image Technology: From Zeotrope to Digital.* London: Wallflower.

Epstein, J., Davidson, L., Burne, R., Burger, R. and Sawyer, D. (1970). *The Black Box: An Experiment in Visual Theatre.* London: Latimer Press.

Essif, L. (2001). *Empty Figure on an Empty Stage: The Theatre of Samuel Beckett and His Generation.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Fairservice, D. (2001). *Film Editing: History, Theory And Practice.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Favorini, A. (2008). *Memory in Play: From Aeschylus to Sam Shepard.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fuerst, W. R. & Hume, S. J. (1928) *XXth Century Stage Decoration.* London: Alfred, A. Knopff.

Giesekam, G. (2007). *Staging the Screen: The Use of Film and Video in Theatre.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Glassman, R. M. and Swatos Jr, W. H. (1986). *Charisma, History, And Social Structure.* London: Greenwood Press.

Goldman, A. and Sprinchorn, E. (Eds.) (1964). *Wagner on Music and Drama*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Goodwin, J. (1989) Ed. *British Theatre Design: The Modern Age*. London: George Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd.

Gane, M. (Ed.) (1993) *Baudrillard Live: Selected Interviews*. London: Routledge.

Giannachi, G. (2004). *Virtual Theatres: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1986). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Boston: Northeastern University Press. 1st edition 1974.

Goldman, J. *The Cambridge Introduciton to Virginia Woolf*, (Cambridge, 2006)

Goodall J. (2008). *Stage Presence: the actor as mesmerist*. New York: Routledge.

Grehan, H. (2009). *Performance, Ethics and Spectatorship in a Global Age.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grotowski, J. (1991). *Towards a Poor Theatre*. London: Methuen (1st Ed. 1968).

Hedges, I. (1991). *Breaking the Frame: Film Language and the Experience of Limits*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Hill, L. & Paris, H. (2006). *Performance and Place.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hodge, F. (Ed.) (1972) *Innovations in stage and theatre design,* New York: American Society for Theatre Research.

Humphrey, R. (1954). *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*. London: University of California Press.

Innes, C. (1998). *Edward Gordon Craig: A Vision of Theatre*. Singapore: Harwood.

James, D. E. Ed. (2005). *Stan Brakhage: filmmaker*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jones, R. E. (2004) *The Dramatic Imagination: reflections and speculations on the art of the theatre,* London: Routledge.

Jones, R.E . and Macgowan, K. (1923), *Continental Stagecraft,* London: Benn Brothers.

Kane, D. (2009). *We Saw the Light: Conversations between the new American Cinema and Poetry*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Keller, M. (2006). *Light Fantastic: The Art and Design of Stage Lighting*. Munich: Preset Verlag.

Katz, S. (1991). *Film Directing Shot by Shot: Visualizing from concept to screen*. Michigan: Michael Wiese Productions.

Kern, S. (1983). *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Kirby, E. T. (1969). *Total Theatre: A Critical Anthology*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Kirby, M. (1966). *Happenings.*

Knowles, R. (2004). *Reading the Material Theatre.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krasner, D. and Saltz, D. Z. Eds. (2006). *Staging Philosophy: intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Kumar, S. K. (1962). *Bergson and the Stream of Consciousness Novel*. London: Blackie & Son LimitEd.

Leach, E. (2004). *Makers of Modern Theatre: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Leacroft R. and Leacroft H. (1984). *Theatre and Playhouse: An illustrated survey of theatre building from ancient Greece to the present day.* London:Methuen.

Leacroft, R. (1973). *The Development of the English Playhouse*. London: Methuen.

Leeper, J. (1948). *Edward Gordon Craig: designs for the theatre.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lehmann. H, (2007) *Postdramatic Theatre* (1st English edition 2006; 1st edition in original German, 1999)

Lothe, J. (2000). *Narrative in Fiction and Film: An Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mayne, J. (1993). *Cinema and Spectatorship.* London: Routledge.

McAuley. G (Ed.) (2006). *Unstable Ground: Performance and the Politics of Place*. Brussels: P.I.E Peter Lang.

McAuley, G. (1999). *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

McCandles, S. (1939). *A Method of lighting the stage*. New York: Theatre Arts Inc. 1st edition 1932.

McKinney, J. & Butterworth, P. (2009) *The Cambridge Introduction to Scenography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, K. (2009). *The Director's Craft: a handbook for the theatre.* London: Routledge.

Mitchell, K. (2008). *Waves : a record of the multimedia work devised by Katie Mitchell and the company from the text of Virginia Woolf's novel The Waves*. London: Oberon Books.

Mulvey, L. (2006). *Death 24x a Second: Stillness and the Moving Image.* London: Reaktion Books.

Murphy, P. D. Ed. (1992). *Staging the Impossible: The Fantastic Mode in Modern Drama*. London: Greenwood Press.

Oddey, A. and White, C. (Eds.) (2006). *The Potentials of Spaces: the theory and practice of scenography & performance*, Bristol: Intellect Books: Bristol.

Orpen, V. (2003). *Film Editing: The Art of the Expressive.* London: Wallflower.

Parsons, D. (2007). *Theorists of the Modernist Novel: James Joyce, Dorothy Richardson, Virginia Woolf.* London: Routledge.

Pavis, P. (1992). *Theatre at the crossroads of culture*. Translated by L. Kruger. London: Routledge.

Pavis, P. (1982). *Languages of the stage: essays in the semiology of the theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal.

Phelan, P. (1993). *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance.* London: Routledge.

Piscator, E. (1980)*The Political Theatre*. translated, with chapter introductions and notes, by H. Rorrison. London: Eyre Methuen. 1st Ed. 1929. *Das Politische Theater*, Berlin: Adalbert Schultz Verlag.

Power, C. (2008). *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre.* New York: Rodopi.

Quick, A. (2007). *The Wooster Group Work Book.* London: Routledge.

Rancière. J. (2009). *The Emancipated Spectator.* London: Verso.

Read, A. (2008). *Theatre, Intimacy & Engagement: The Last Human Venue.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rees, T. (1978). *Theatre Lighting in the Age of Gas*. London: Society for Theatre Research.

Reynolds, P. (1993). *Novel Images: Literature in Performance*. London: Routledge.

Reid, F. (1998). *Stages for Tomorrow*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Reid, F. (2006). *Theatre Space: A Rediscovery ReportEd.* Cambridge: Entertainment Technology Press.

Reisz, K. and Millar, G. (1968) *The Technique of Film Editing: 2nd Edition.* London: Focal Press.

Roach, J. (1985). *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting.* London: Associated University Presses.

Roberts, I. (2008). *German Expressionist Cinema: The World of Light and Shadow*. London: Wallflower.

Rose. E. (1931). *Gordon Craig and the Theatre: A Record and an interpretation*. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co, Ltd.

Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and Appropriation.* London: Routledge.

Sauter, W. (2000). *The Theatrical Event: Dynamics of Performance and Perception.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Schivelbusch, W. (1986). *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the 19th Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1st Edition 1977.

Shepherd, S. (2006). *Theatre, Body and Pleasure.* London: Routledge.

Sobchack, V. (1992). *The Address Of The Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spottiswood, R. (1950). *A Grammar of the Film: An Analysis of Film Technique*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Stourac R,and K. McCreery, (1986). *Theatre as a Weapon*. London: Routledge.

Svoboda, J. (1993). *The Secret of Theatrical Space*. New York: Applause Theatre Books.

Taxidou, O. (2007). *Modernism and Performance: Jarry to Brecht*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Taxidou, O. (1998). *The Mask: A Periodical Performance by Edward Gordon Craig*. Amsterdam: Harwood.

Tidworth, S. (1973). *Theatres: An Illustrated History*. London: Pall Mall Press.

Tudor, A. (1974). *Theories of Film.* London: Secker and Warburg Ltd

Ubersfled, A. (1999). *Reading Theatre.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Walton, J. M. Ed. (1999). *Craig on theatre*. London: Methuen Drama. 1st edition 1983.

Watt, S. (1998). *Postmodern/Drama: Reading the Contemporary Stage*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press

Weber, S. (2004). *Theatricality as Medium.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Weber, A. N. (2006). *Upstaged: Making Theatre in the Media Age*. London: Routledge.

Wesley Balk, H. (1991). *The Radiant Performer: The Spiral Path to Performing Power*. Oxford: University of Minnesota Press.

Wheeler, P. (2009). *High Definition Cinematography*. London: Focal Press. (1st Ed. 2003).

Wickstrom, M. (2006). *Performing Consumers: Global capital and its theatrical seductions.* London: Routledge

Wilfred, T. (1965). *Projected Scenery: A Technical Manual*. New York: Drama Book Specialists.

Willet, J. (2001). Ed. *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. London: Methuen. *1st Ed. 1978*

Wilmer S. E, (2008). Ed. *National Theatres in a Changing Europe.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wollen, P. (1998). *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema.* London: BFI.

Woolf, V. (2004). *The Waves.* London: Vintage.

Wurtzler, S. J. (2007). *Electric sounds: technological change and the rise of corporate mass media.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Wyver, J. (1989) *The Moving Image: An International History of Film, Television & Video.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.

Yewdall, D. L. (2007). *Practical Art of Motion Picture Sound: Third Edition*. London: Focal Press.

Youngblood, G. (1970). *Expanded Cinema*. London: Studio Vista.

Zarrilli, P. B. (2008). *Psychophysical Acting: an intercultural approach after Stanislavsky.* Abingdon: Routledge.