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SPACE IN THE 20th CENTURY THEATRE

I THEATRE AND ARCHITECTURE

1 Theatre in the typology of architectural objects

Among many types of architectural objects, theatres have a distinct place. Or is it just our understanding – we might even say a preconception, which arises from contemplating about multifaceted spiritual and architectural programme of these edifices, their complex functional and technological structure, urban, social, and even ideological function. However, through in-depth research and evaluation of the contribution that theatre architecture has given to the very phenomenon of theatre on one side, and the place and the role of theatre structures in the history of architecture on the other side, we will come to very different conclusions.

The venues where scene events are to be performed in the modern era which almost coincides with the 20th Century, from Antoine to Stanislavski, Appia, Craig, Reinhardt, Copeau, Meyerhold or Brecht, till Brook, Schechner, Schumann, Grotowski, and Stein - is one of the basic themes of revising the construction of theatre. Nevertheless, the configuration of the stage and the auditorium, as the key point of theatre architecture, in almost all objects designed and built specifically for theatrical performances, is still based on one of tree conventions – baroque, Elizabethan or functionalistic.1 Transformations of conventional spatial models in contemporary theatre architecture are primarily a result of development of technical and technological resources and systems, their impact on the size, character and structure of space – first and foremost the space of the stage, and the auditorium.

At the same time, architectural significance and the character of modern purpose-built theatre houses as a whole, have not had much influence on the ideas, concepts, character, or even the artistic methods of modern theatre. It is understood that, when I am deliberating on the subject of houses designed and built for the purpose of housing theatre performances, I am not discoursing on the subject of so-called environmental theatre, nor am I talking about reconstructions and reutilizations of various "secular" spaces (railway and fire stations, warehouses, fairs and factory halls, power plants, and even abandoned
churches), or the phenomena of theatricalisation of the city, and the urbanisation of spectacles. All the while I do not question the impact (which is at present-day at some places even crucial) of these phenomena on the theatre, on architecture, and on the city itself.\footnote{2}

In view of that, the significance of theatres in the history and development of modern and particularly contemporary architecture has been unrecognised and marginalised.\footnote{3} The undisputable architectural value and significance of several outstanding buildings, such as the theatre in Cologne by Henry Van de Velde, Sydney Opera House by Jørn Utzon or the buildings in New York's Lincoln Centre by Eero Saarinen, Max Abramowitz, and Philip Johnson, is not at all based on the programme or functionality of the technology of theatres themselves, and even the ideas of theatre and the ideas of architecture of a theatre building, are set as entirely independent issues. The Glyndebourne Opera House by Michael Hopkins is the latest and, I believe, the most prominent example of that point.

Almost a century long reality has unambiguously confirmed the words of György Lukács from 1911. that the drama and stage have been separated from each other, and that "true new theatre exists only as an ideal, just as something that should be, but is not attainable."\footnote{4} At the same time, the theatre "of our time, in which rather diverse categories of education of human conciseness can dwell"\footnote{5} as an idea and the program, continuously draws attention of students and young architects, being the subject of numerous graduate theses, studies, and open competitions. It seems that the "dream of a new stage" is practically non-existent in institutional theatre (and theatre buildings are built only for institutional theatres), while the architecture becomes an issue only when the subject of theatre space becomes the subject of ideas, research and theoretical discussions. In our locale, perhaps due to the fact that in the twentieth century in Serbia only four new theatre houses were built (National Theatre of Moravia region in Niš by Vsevolod Tatarinov, 1939; The National Theatre of Užice by Stanko Mandić, 1962; Atelier 212 in Belgrade by Bojan Stupica, 1964; and the Serbian National Theatre in Novi Sad by Viktor Jackiewicz, 1981), this issue has for decades enticed special interest.

Project which has had, without a doubt, a most profound influence on thought, design and construction of contemporary architectural works designed for scene events, was the Totaltheater by Walter Gropius and Erwin Piscator from 1927, even if it was actually never built. This case, as do many others, proves once again that there is great significance and purpose in creating "paper architecture"\footnote{6}, which is often more inspiring and created with more thought than the houses that were actually built. However, we can find a more significant paradigmatic phenomenon in the fact that the central theme of this project is the variable configuration and the active role of stage-auditorium space, the technology serving the stage and the plays, but not all the other programme questions of architecture (utilitarian and functional technology of the facility,
morphological structure of the house, architectural language, attitude toward the urban context...). It becomes clear at this point, and it will be confirmed many times in the future, that the modern theatre unravels the theme of relationship between drama and the space in which the drama will be performed, but it omits, it does not even notice, the issue of the house as a whole.

Iain Mackintosh, who is at present day probably the most influential theatre consultant, without whom theatres virtually cannot be built in the UK, speaks about all this most directly in his highly acclaimed book: “Architecture, Actor and Audience.” In his work Mackintosh explores the "contribution of theatre architecture to the theatre experience" stressing that the “theatre architecture is one of the most vital ingredients of the theatrical experience" and, simultaneously, "one of the least understood." But Mackintosh decides not to deliberate on facades, entrances, foyers, halls and even the spaces behind the stage, since, as he says, there are so many textbooks for architects and technicians who want to learn "how to plan those vitally important but essentially secondary spaces." Of course, the thesis of "serviced" and "serving" area is not new, but it is highly hazardous to introduce it in theatre, a place of synthesis and "equality at work", and thus further promote the already proverbially fragmented and almost autistic access to individual areas, domains and specialties. Theatre has never been, nor could it ever become a subject independent of architecture. Correspondingly, the stage space is not, and should not be a separate issue, the subject of "consultants", but a crucial and equally worthy part of the complex, rich and consistent structure of the theatre house - as a whole. Rare, but significant examples of that are the works of Ledoux, Poelzig, Melnikov, Rossi or Stupica, and they clearly suggest that the synthesis of all aspects of theatre and architecture is not only possible but also necessary.

2 Theatre as a programme in architecture

The architectural programme of a theatre as a complex spiritual product is one of the most inspiring subjects for the research of venues, and designing structures for the spectacles in general. The main consideration of programme deliberations is the term of theatre itself which "simultaneously denominates theatrical art, the place where the performances are held, and the social act of attending the performance", as well as the challenging impossibility of unambiguously defining contemporary theatre. The fact “that there is no theatre of our time, there are different theatres which due to circumstance exist at the same time and space” and the contradiction between the almost daily volatility of theatre as an art form and the permanence of theatre buildings, puts an architect in a position to independently and almost autonomously anticipate the content, character, logic, expression, and the means of theatre for which he is designing space. In that way the architect is called upon to answer questions which in our epoch, as in the preceding, he is not and could not be sufficiently apt for. The irony is that,
on the other hand, architecture "is one of the human activities which has a supreme effect on the quality of life"\textsuperscript{13}, and the architect, by nature of his calling, tends to make decisions that, strictly speaking, do not belong within the domain of his contemplation.\textsuperscript{14} It seems to me that this is crucial for the focus and interest that architects lend to the field of theatre, all the while being the key reason for their rather limited range. The exceptions are the great reformers of architectural thought in general (Ledoux, Schinkel), authors who belong to the artistic movements at the same time grounded in the theatre and architecture (Melnikov, Gropius), the architects whose sensibilities and expression are driven by theatre and theatricality (Rossi), or those who belong to architecture as well as to theatre (Jouvet, Stupica).

All the while we must keep in mind that the presentation of theatrical performances is the most significant, but by no means the only functional or technological process of the theatre as a building, or even as an institution. Programme in the theatre includes a long and complex series of various functional processes and procedures, each closely linked and intertwined, which, in principle, take place in domains of artistic, technical and operational preparations, production and enactment of stage events. When I speak of theatre as a cultural institution, I infer that it contains all these functional and technological lines. Of course, their character and dimensions vary greatly, but in terms of quality and procedure, these processes can be viewed as fixed categories.

In terms of functional and technological processes and, after all, the theatre in general, dual nature of theatre and theatrical space is a permanent framework of thought, analysis and research. The "fourth wall convention" that divides the space of dramatic enactment from the space where it can be viewed from, physically and spiritually extends far beyond the stage and auditorium.\textsuperscript{15} One could speak of two arrays of programmes, functions and spaces, which have their own independent lives in temporal and spatial sense, and which are inevitably joined and united in the architectural configuration of the theatre hall and stage. The issue of a possible encounter of worlds in front of and behind the scenes, beyond the space or time of the enactment of the play, is a special one, and not a novelty. The obsessive need of the audience to make physical contact with the actors (and probably the need for their demystification) is easy to recognise through the extraordinary popularity of theatre lounges and cafés next to the theatre, which can also be understood as a special form of stage.

These phenomena, as well as the altered concepts of financing theatre, are the bases of the tendency to include various commercial programs - cafes, restaurants, bookstores, galleries, libraries and information centres, educational units, tourist points – into the part of the building intended for audience, which then becomes active during the entire day, and the theatre a venue develops into a form of a cultural centre. With the development and popularisation of stage technologies, as well as the expansion of educational programs and institutions
dealing with this field, and finally with the radical intensification of the influence of marketing and management in the arts - a complex of technical and administrative spaces behind the scenes also receives a public profile. Thus the theatre house in its entirety becomes a public facility and begins to develop its central function in the city. From this point of view, it is not only that the theatre has not lost its traditionally dominant urban position, on the contrary, that position is constantly evolving. Examples like the complex of the National Theatre in London, or Lincoln Centre in New York, bear witness to it.

3 Theatre as an art form

Theatre is "a complex art, which contains elements of all other arts, namely literature, music, painting, sculpting, architecture, and art of acting, which is not derived from any other art form, but is a specific feature of the theatre." Under the term "theatre" understood in terms of enactment of plays, I infer every arranged stage event based on a dramatic peace, which can be considered as a whole in terms of content and meaning, and where artists and viewers tend to share catharsis through mutual communication, as a "call to man in its totality."18

Viewed etymologically, the term "theatre" is derived from the Greek verb "watch", but refers to the phenomena addressed to the senses of seeing and hearing. Branko Gavela claimed that theatre is a form of artistic communication carried out by optical and acoustic means, which invites in viewers parallel psychophysical phenomena as a source of extraordinary emotional and cognitive experience. "We do not conceive the actor by listening and watching him. Listening and watching are only means of conveyance, we conceive the actor by employing in ourselves simultaneously with his actions all those organic elements, which in real life are the companions and regulators of these actions." Theatre, therefore, is not "a play for watching" (Schauspiel), nor is it "a play for hearing" (Hörspiel), but it is a joined play “omniplay” (Mitspiel), a complex phenomenon in which individual elements are lost, as evidenced by numerous intersections of meanings and the origin of words, such as the arena and the auditorium, for example.

The spectator, for whom an actor acts in a play, though an individual, is actually by definition a collective phenomenon, "plural phenomenon", not “accidentally quantitative”, but “plural by principle”. An actor in a theatre play does not act for specific, individual viewers, but for the “collective viewer”. The viewer, whom the theatrical performance itself will form, will not experience watching of a particular actor, but a new view of himself. “It will happen through the actor, and this process within the viewer requires the spatial separation of viewer and actor, finding the space that will best facilitate the experience of a viewer.” In that way the theatre puts the viewer in a spiritually active position. That, ultimately, means
realisation of itself through the introspective process of searching for the core values of existence. In this quite unique property of theatre, that the viewer in it always becomes a participant, lays the greatest value and importance of this artistic phenomenon.

If we look at the theatre for an anthropological point of view, then it can be defined as “the art of transformation into another being”\textsuperscript{21}, whilst the very concept of transformation becomes the issue of new definitions, referring not only to performers, but also to the spectators. Speaking of classic dramatic composition and the creation of dramatic tension, “prolonged strain which leads the viewer into a state of agitated anticipation of the end”\textsuperscript{22}, as well as its basic assumptions, even Aristotle considered the importance of the viewer, “his ability to watch and listen”\textsuperscript{23} and be influenced by the drama, “ultimately brought even to the ideal consequence - the transformation of the viewer.”\textsuperscript{24}

The language of theatre has been defined by Tadeusz Kowzan, in accordance to Lessing’s classification of arts to those that appear in space and those that occur in time (theatre being the one that incorporates both categories), as a system of thirteen different types of signs. Some elements of this language belong to communication in time (play, music ...), others are parts of communication in space (setting, costume, lighting ...), and the third set of elements are those that synthesise both fields, and are characteristic only of theatre, such as movement. Speaking of movement we are in fact considering an action that is intentional and consciously made (in theatre every movement, as a principle, is deliberate and conscious). Enactment of a play is a central concern of the theatre audience, the enacting is structured according to certain rules of composing a play with the aim of maintaining dramatic tension. Orientation toward action is explained by Demarsy\textsuperscript{25} as through the traditional existence of diachronic perception, where for the viewer everything that is happening on stage is a function of what is going to happen on stage.

Although the theatre was created by transforming religious rituals in the early communities, and “it bears in itself as a rudiment not only its sensationalism”, but also its “religious, ceremonial potency”\textsuperscript{26}, it is separated from the rituals and defined as a specific form of artistic, spiritual and social communication. For the distinction from the ritual and for establishing theatre, three basic elements are required: “speech or singing by the actors, regardless of the original choir singing in unison; element of conflict within the dialogue; and viewers emotionally involved in the action in which do not participate.”\textsuperscript{27} Theatre could, on that basis, be seen through a new triad: the system of resources that make the theatrical language of communication; artistic content created in response to the need to express through theatrical means, which is the subject of this communication; and the reasons for the existence of theatre as a social phenomenon, that is the answer to society’s needs for the theatre. In other words, the theatre is defined by answers to the questions: how it operates, what constitutes it and why does it exist.
The largest number of theoretical and philosophical assumptions about the purpose and function of theatrical art, from Aristotle to present day, is based on the understanding that theatre is oriented toward social elite. In these theories popular theatre, as opposed to art theatre, is seen as a form of mass entertainment. “Art is by nature aristocratic, and naturally selective in its effect on the audience. For even in its collective manifestations, like theatre and cinema, its effect is bound up with the intimate emotions of each person that comes to contact with the work”.28 “Maybe it is not too paradoxical to say that in the intellectual activities which are driven by most democratic intentions (teaching, moralizing) reside more aristocratic elements (by means of emphasis, though often unconsciously, on spiritual difference between the creator and particular recipients), than there are in the most aristocratic, mystical ceremony.”29

Correspondingly, the history of modern drama and modern theatre, or rather the complex and diverse structure of movements, schools, groups and authors in the theatre of the twentieth century, is the history of looking for the answer to the question of a social function and position of the theatre. "Is there, is modern drama possible: what does that question mean? Generally speaking: do the external circumstances offered by modern life allow the emergence of theatre and what might theatre be like? The question is: Are there such phenomena of social life, arising from modern life, which are suitable for expression in dramatic form, or which possibly directly require dramatic form as their perfect mode of expression?"30

Today “the word theatre has many meanings which are not distinct enough. In most of the world, the theatre has no exact place within the society, no clear purpose, it only exists in fragments: one theatre chases money, another chases glory, another chases emotion, another chases politics, another chases fun.”31 Tarkovsky wrote that it is not the role of art, not even the theatre, to teach, spread ideas, develop thinking, or to serve as an example. “It is obvious that art cannot teach anyone anything, since in four thousand years humanity has learnt nothing at all.... Art only has the capacity, through shock and catharsis, to make the human soul receptive to good.”32 And the theatre, based on interpersonal communications in real space and real time, provoking our experiences on the borderline between reality and illusion, and constantly questioning those boundaries, can possibly discover the "otherness of the real world"33, that is to "change the nature of the individual, in order to change the essence of the world."34 Drama, for which the "mythical rebuttal of the discomfort of death"35 is a hypothesis, uses "a symbolic image of the tragic death which can evoke the meaning of life."36 In a world without God, says Derrida, "only death can be a total theatre, a death that is by the logic of life the only real theatre."37
II SPACE IN THE THEATRE –
DETERMINATION, CONSEQUENCE AND ASSUMPTION

“Space concerns everyone connected with the theatre, from the architects who first design the building to the actors who play in it and the stage designers and directors who labour in it. Also (even if they are quite unaware of it) the audience, who we hope, will fill it.”

Sir John Gielgud 38

Interaction of literature, visual and performing arts as well as media, especially in the second half of the twentieth century, has substantially transformed the technical and artistic resources the theatre uses. At the same time, formal, technological39 and spatially-functional differences between certain types of public scene events have been greatly reduced. The term "spectacle" was extended to sports, political, promotional and other events thus making stadiums, sports halls, museums, galleries and even the public spaces of the city, from point of view of technical engineering, but also from the point of view of the programme, the "houses for spectacle" alongside the theatres, concert halls and cinemas. All these buildings and constructions are designed and equipped as typical venues for performing events. The typology of public events and the corresponding architectural structures and spaces is the subject of many studies at present day – from social and cultural, to theatrical and urban, but also one of the important aspects of planning and construction of houses and cities. This subject, however, which we would easily believe to be exclusively contemporary, was addressed in 15th century by Leon Battista Alberti in his "Ten Books on Architecture" (De Re Aedificatoria), devoting to it the seventh chapter of Book VIII (“Of the adorning Theatres and other Places for public Shows, and of their Usefulness.”)40 Parallel existence and mutual interaction of different public events and facilities, therefore, are the traditional and enduring issues.

However, at this point I wish scrutinise the drama theatre in the narrow sense of the term, as a construction and as an institution.

Quite specifically, this means that in respect to content, character, artistic and production resources, the concept of theatre for me is a collective of all the activities involved in preparing, implementing and performing public performing events based on drama as a primary art form. In relation to the programme, nature and structure of physical space, under the term theatre I infer a complete architectural project, thought through, designed and built for the preparation and performance of dramatic plays.
Today, when we speak of space in the theatre, which still is a special phenomenon and a specific realm of human life, “the last public place where idealism is still an open issue”\(^41\), the centre of our attention points to the articulation of space of theatre play - stage and auditorium. This spatial organisation is the result of institutionalisation of theatre arts, and it can progress and change based on the transformation of ideas about theatre, artistic and scenic resources, and also stage techniques and technology. However, we must always keep in mind the fact that the stage-auditorium space is only one of the elements in a complex physical structural system of the theatre. Theatre house, as a spatial result of this system, is not just a "tool for the spectacle"\(^42\), but also responds to many diverse needs defined by dozens of functionally-technological lines (not just utilitarian), which, in turn, define theatre as an art form, as a production institution, as a social phenomenon, and as a programme in architecture. In broadest terms, any consideration of theatre space has to be placed in the context of another trinity relationship – the theatre as an artistic being, the architectural body of the theatre and the overall urban structure.

On the other hand, based on many definitions of theatre it is quite clear that the physical space within which any theatrical performance is to be enacted is the presumption of existence of theatre and scene arts. History of theatre, as well as theoretical and practical research on the subject of theatre of our time, in which the play has become "the only true subject of theatrology research"\(^43\), presents us with the task of articulating the place of theatre performance – stage, and the place from which it is viewed from - the auditorium, as one of the basic defining features of physicality and spirituality of theatre in general. The questions of architectural structure of theatre houses have to be introduced in the whole discourse. Theatre event in the narrow sense of the term, everything that happens in the theatre in the area that we call the space of performance, and everything that happens during the time, metaphorically speaking, between raising and lowering the stage curtains at the end of the performance, is without a doubt the key issue of the theatre and of theatre architecture. But the theatre reduced only to the matter of performance might actually be, at least in relation to its physical aspects, "the most futile of all our efforts" and "the very image of what awaits all crafts, sooner or later, in the course of time."\(^44\)

The theatre performance has never been, nor can it be at present day, the only true subject of reflection on the theatre and its "contrast, intangible nature."\(^45\) Theatre performance, as well as all the other scene events, falls into the category of works of art that create "an artificial world, but aware of its artificiality and unswerving in its artificial nature, and so, therefore, also truthful."\(^46\) The performance is not a material product, so it is not possible to preserve it. Artefacts used to furnish the stage, although material objects, reveal their entire worth exclusively on the stage, during the time of the performance. Thus, even in ideal conditions in the gallery it is not possible to completely represent the elements, and especially not the entirety of a theatrical set design, for example,
no matter how technologically complex and well supported the gallery exhibition might be\textsuperscript{47}. The means by which the performance can be documented (photographs, audio and video recordings, models, documentation following the making of set design, books of directors and writers actions, newspaper reviews and expert appraisals ...) belong to separate domains and media, they have a purpose, language and rules, they exist to support the theatre performance and its evaluation, but generally they are not adequate representatives neither of the means, nor of the language or the laws of theatre. In addition, the documentation does not include the conditionality and the conventions that govern the process of creating a theatre performance by definition and form the basis of perception, experience and readings of theatrical works. “You see it, and it is no more: the dramatic text itself will never tell a completely identical story, and the set design and props are not enough to set up a scene. Since the theatre does not have a physical bequest, the theatre house remains its only creative legacy”\textsuperscript{48}.

However, the most important legacies of the theatre are the ideas about the theatre, “what is the counterpoint in music - nothing by itself, but the sine qua non for all.”\textsuperscript{49} The idea of theatre is conveyed through houses, books, research documents, history and theory, but it is also conveyed through "theatre people". This concept, can be and must be understood the two ways: as a guideline for a highly heterogeneous and inarticulate “global tribe”, and at the same time, as the common name for members of a particular theatre - the theatre as a troupe, or theatre as a movement, but mostly the theatre as an institution of what we often call “the theatre house”. In this phrase the term "house" has a direct and a metaphorical meaning. And that is one of the most complex aspects of existence and interpretation of theatre at all times, in all the traditional lines of development and in all meridians. Thus, the causal system of relationships between the theatre house, theatre people and theatre as an idea (or the idea of theatre) is the central theme of my understanding of the definitions, values and purpose of theatre.

\textsuperscript{1} The conventions in theatre are without a doubt one of the core assumptions that this artistic phenomenon is based upon. During the development of theatre, several independent systems of conventions have emerged, which were different in type and levels of complexity, and which are used as a base for creating and read the theatrical act. There is a particular topic of systems of conventions for reading of stage spaces and stage changes. Besides the two traditional (Baroque and Elizabethan) systems of conventions, in the twentieth century a functionalist system of conventions has been established, based in part on the various conventions of theatre of the Far East. Here, the stage itself, its structure, physical organisation and character, as well as artistic and technical means of theatre play (scene changes, lighting, sound, movement ...) become semantic treasure in itself, a special model of the theatre being based almost exclusively on the demand for perfect functioning of all of the above (one might say, even the formal) manifestations of theatrical events.

\textsuperscript{2} This topic has been specifically addressed at the cycle of international symposia entitled “The spectacle - City - Identity” organised by YUSTAT, since 1996 till the year 2000. The
papers were published under the same title (YUSTAT, 1998) and in the book "Urban Spectacle" (YUSTAT and Clio, 2000).

3 In history books, encyclopaedias, and problem-oriented studies of contemporary architecture theatre facilities are barely mentioned. So Kenneth Frampton in his *Modern architecture*, among hundreds of examples (336 illustrated) mentions seven theatres, Alberto Lampugnani in his *Encyclopaedia of 20th Century Architecture* presents some 500 objects, including 12 theatres, Charles Jenks in the *Modern Movements in Architecture* analyses three, and in the *Language of postmodern Architecture* he analyses two examples; out of 441 illustrations in William J. Curtis’s *Modern Architecture* five are theatres, as well as in *A Short History of Western Architecture* by R. Furneaux Jordan (out of 432 illustrations). Ranko Radovic has included in his *Contemporary Architecture* examples of eight theatres out of 490 illustrated examples, of which at least three with an ironic attitude. This phenomenon does not belong only to contemporary architecture, which is confirmed in the referent *History of Architecture* by Sir Banister Fletcher in which among the thousands of (unnumbered) illustrations on 1621 page of text a total of 19 theatres can be seen.


6 „The era of papir architecture, as the constructivists themselves are writing, and not without certain nostalgia (бумажная архитектура)...” (Ranko Radović, in the preface of a book by Jakob Chernikov *The constructions of Architectural and Mechanical Forms*, Građevinska knjiga, Belgrade, 1989, pp. VIII)

7 Whilst talking about structure, I always have in mind the term „which simultaneously defines the entirety, parts of that entirety and the relations between those parts“ (Umberto Eco, *Culture, Information, Communication*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1973, pp. 274).


9 Louis Kahn’s partitioning of space by the criteria of which are "serving" which are “being served” is mentioned on page 132nd of Ranko Radovic’s book *Contemporary Architecture* (Faculty of Engineering - Stylos, Novi Sad, 1998). For more information on ideas of Louis Kahn see the records of his lectures, published in Richard Saul Wurman’s newsroom entitled "What Will Be Has Always Been" (University of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, 1986).

10 Miloš Crnjanski, *The former theatre*, 1924.

11 *Dictionary of Literary Terms*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1986, pp 589


14 This desire was expressed in almost every architectural project, and may be subject to separate studies in various typological units and series. Among the most impressive examples of the buildings and complexes for living in "special circumstances" - homes for children and the elderly, special hospitals and sanatoriums, barracks, prisons. Even further, controlled residential areas (ghettos), refugees, prison, penitentiary and concentration camps - which were, unfortunately, also the works of architects. In the
context of our work, there is a particularly interesting example of the fortress Terezin (Terezín; Theresienstadt) in the Czech Republic, where the Nazi government in 1941 and 1942 deported the entire population of a small town (see the Encyclopaedia Britannica, CD-Rom edition, 2001), in order to organize the life of the Jewish ghetto. This town has, in fact, been like a great theatrical performance, in which the German authorities toward Jews was portrayed the Red Cross delegation.

"The task of the theatre architecture is to find the most ideal combination of space, actors movement and speech, and the one area which must include the viewer. The viewer's space has in turn its own requirements. It must be determined by the number of spectators and must provide them with the contact with the actor that is as close as possible. The viewer still must not interfere with the actor. Particular sphere of the actor representative presentation must not be violated. The main problem of theatre architecture lies in the particular requirement of seeking the presence and absence of spectators. The actor must be completely free in his movements. It is indeed moving for the sake of the viewer, but as if the viewer does not exist."

(Branko Gavela, Actor and Theatre, Sterijino pozorje, Novi Sad, 1967, pp. 166)

Dictionary of Literary Terms, pp. 589.

Catharsis (κάθαρσις) is the basic mean of emotional purification which is created in the viewer through „evoking empathy and fear” (Aristoteles, Art of Poetry).

Peter Brook, Empty Space, Lapis, Belgrade, 1995, pp. 146

Branko Gavela, Actor and Theatre, pp. 151.


Dictionary of Literary Terms, pp. 589.


György Lukács., Op. cit, pp. 65

Ibid, pp. 55.


Branko Pleša, at the international siposium *Stage design at the end of the 20th Century* which was held within the Sterijino pozorje festival in 1998. (information about the symposium can be found in the text by Jovan Ljustanovic Virtual actor and the essence of theatre in the magazine Scene, no. 4-5, 1998, pp 74).


Branko Gavela, Novosti, Zagreb, br. 30, 29. I 1941, pp. 18.


Under the term „technology” in this context i do not think of the “application of scientific knowledge for practical purposes” (*The New Oxford Dictionary of English*, CD-Rom, 2001), but of a „system of practical approaches, ... the entirety of resources that people employ to provide the objects of material culture”. (*Webster’s Third New International Dictionary*, str. 2348).

The theme of different views on the relationship between technology and the space was thoroughly deliberated on the Yugoslav symposium titled Architecture and Technology, which the Chair for the development of architecture and arts has organized at the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade in 1991. (see the Journal of history and theory of architecture and town De re Aedificatoria, No. 2, 1991)

Alberti writes of those “whose job it is to give good example to others” through public events for which the key subject is “peace and leisure” (and they are dealing with poets, actors and musicians) as well as those related to war (wrestling, pugilism, shooting, jumping, running and „everything that fits the practical exercises of wa force “). These events require different buildings, because they have different names - for poets, comedians, dramatists “and alike”- the theatre; for “noble youths” who are running coaches – circuses; and lastly, to fight with wild animals - amphitheatres. (*The Ten Books of Architecture*, Dover, New York, 1986, pp. 175-6)


Brunelleschi (*una macchina per lo spettacolo*), according to Ranko Radović, *Contemporary Architecture*, pp. 124.


Years of experience in the presentation and evaluation of performing arts in the past six “editions” of the Biennial of Stage Design, a major national events in the domain of set design, costume design, theatre architecture, applied performing arts, crafts and promoting events, clearly proved that the relevant attitude towards these works can be formed only through direct personal experience of theatrical performance and its overall structure. The experience of all previous selectors of the Biennale confirms that documents have value only as a supplement, and not as a substitute for direct insight into the theatre production.


By the end of the nineteenth century Great Britain was abandoning the aims of peace and retrenchment proclaimed by the Liberals. Foreign affairs were deeply affected by the coming of imperialism. As the world was divided up amongst imperialist powers, the newer powers, rapidly coming into the first rank of capitalist states, found themselves left behind in the race for colonies. As a critical realist he thought the scientific-technological revolution was incompatible with the dominant role of a parasitic class, though his plans, both social and political, were Utopian. His various concepts of world reconstruction and the vagueness of his ideal are typical of a democratic-minded intellectual who was far from the working-class struggle. Western theatre - Western theatre - Theatre of the 20th century and beyond: The achievements of realism at the end of the 19th century continued to resonate through the turn of the 21st century, but the most influential innovations in early 20th-century theatre came from a vigorous reaction against realism. Just as the visual arts exploded into a chaos of experiment and revolt, generating numerous styles and écoles, so the theatre seized upon a variety of sources to express the contradictions of the new age. The beginnings of the revolt against realism were already hinted at before the 19th century was over, sometimes in the works of the realist writers themselves. Theater (AE) or Theatre (BE and widespread usage among theatre professionals in the US) is that branch of the performing arts concerned with acting out stories in front of an audience using combinations of speech, gesture, music, dance, sound and spectacle - indeed any one or more elements of the other performing arts. In addition to the standard narrative dialog style, theatre takes such forms as opera, ballet, mime, kabuki, Chinese opera, and pantomime. Here is a list of acting terms. Table of contents. Theatre Director 11 20th Century German Language Theatre Directors 12 Awards 13 Theater building. "Drama" is that branch of theatre in which speech, either from written text (plays or "dramatic literature") or improvised, is paramount.