

 NEW BULGARIAN UNIVERSITY

SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN CENTER
FOR SEMIOTIC STUDIES

DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN SEMIOTICS

IVAYLO ALEKSANDROV

THE THEATRE PERFORMANCE IN A SEMIOTIC PERSPECTIVE

/Detailed Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy/

A scientific adviser: Prof. Ivan Kasabov

SOFIA 2009

Research Object

- Theatrical art ⇒ aesthetical, philosophical, ethical and social problematics ⇒ visual figures and concrete objects of intellectual discussion.
- Theatrical performance ⇒ symbol of histrionics ⇒ basic structural categories and functions of stage signification.
- Denotation of concrete senses and meanings ⇒ cultural discourse of performance ⇒ theatrical sign interaction ⇒ active semiosis.

Object:

- Theatrical performance ⇒ multi-layered of significant elements ⇒ visual / intelligible image of every *secondary / other* reality ⇒ stage / perceiving subject.

Immediate Tasks of Research

- Specification of the question about the semiotic perspective of *théatralité*.
- Decreeing of the theatrical performance as *signifier* and formulating of the signs and the signs' constructions on the stage.
- Argueing the question concerning the *stage figure* as a basic sign attribute of *reincarnation / transformation* within theatrical reality.
- Structuring of the problem concerning theatrical communication and theatrical code as basic components in the process of activating the contents of *sense/meaning* in the mind of the perceiving spectator.
- Clarifying the systematics of *absence / presence* of signs on the stage.
- Defining the mechanism of *linguistic / paralinguistic* interaction of the performance's components in the process of creation of an active signifying convention.
- Formulation of the aesthetics of the theatrical performance as a *theatrical text*.
- Determination of the actor's radical significance in the overall semiotic discourse of the performance.
- Clarifying the concrete semiotic function of the stage space as a basic component equal to the actor's presence (actor ⇒ stage space ⇒ theatrical performance).
- Defining the character of *mise-en-scène* as a basic representative principle for the creation of a signifying stage convention.

Remarks on the Semiotic Character of *Théatralité*

- A theatrical text, as literature, is an object of hermeneutic research; a theatrical performance as an action, exists in consequence of that hermeneutics, this is the prime cause of its appearance.

- Theatrical performance ⇒ a product of triple-hermeneutical dependency ⇒ an audience interprets already interpreted essences, senses and meanings, which transforms them into different essences, senses and meanings.
- Constituting a theatrical *performance* ⇒ primary text (author), a hermeneutical discourse on this text-interpretation (director), secondary hermeneutical discourse on the interpretation that has already appeared – over-interpretation (spectator).
- Theatrical act ⇒ multiformity of sign-communicative systems ⇒ linguistic constructs.
- Theatricality (*théatralité*) ⇒ availability of different components ⇒ verbal expression, gestures, mimics, affectations, body and psychological conditions, visual imagery, musical and sound environment.
- Basis of communication ⇒ perceived by the contemplator (spectator) and existing as a reality on a psycho-cognitive level ⇒ *performative text*, constructed from multiple sign structures.

PART I

THEATRICALITY AND SEMIOTICALITY

Signs and Sign Configurations – The Performance Space as *Signifier*

Foundation:

- Semiotic investigation of the foundation qualities of the sign in a practically endless semiosis.
- Basic conception of the types of theatrical signs.

Theatrical signs:

- *linguistic* (verbal) / *non-linguistic* (non-verbal) (in Fischer-Lichte 1992 figured as *linguistics* and *paralinguistics*, De Toro 1995 follows Peirce, subdivided the signs as *Icon*, *Index*, *Symbol* corresponding with a verbal/non-verbal dimension)
- linguistic ⇒ *auditory* and *visual* / *durable* and *ephemeral*
- non-linguistic ⇒ *ephemeral* and *durable* / *visual* and *non-visual* (in non-verbal category)
- summary subdivision ⇒ *verbal* and *non-verbal*

Inference:

- Semiotic approach ⇒ micro-world, constructed through the specific theatrical mechanism of signification.
- Specific qualities of the theatrical sign ⇒ detailed position within the stage environment ⇒ mutual penetration from one sign structure to another.
- Specific sign characteristics ⇒ aesthetics of *signification* ⇒ the theatrical act as a unique phenomenon which is the product of sign interaction.

Semantics of Transformation – The Stage Figure within the Context of Performance

- *Stage figure* ⇒ complex product which is a consequence of interrelation between *dramatis personae* towards *represented character* (Veltruský 1976, 1977, 1983, also in Mukařovský 1931, 1978 - *dramatic figure*, in Zich 1931, 1995 – *actor's figure*).
- Stage figure ⇒ actor's sign ⇒ complicated structure, synthesis of elements, *linguistic* and *paralinguistic signs* ⇒ a system within the system of the entire corpus of the performance.
- Semiotic perspective of what is being *presented* on the stage ⇒ *transformation* / basic structural element of the performance.
- Theatrical action as *signatum* ⇒ producing of *signantia* (Veltrusky 1976: 593).
- An actor's presentation on the stage as a *sign of the signs* ⇒ foundation of the *acting sign* ⇒ constituting the veritable *théâtralité*.
- Theatricality ⇒ open system of *transformation/reincarnation* ⇒ transformation of *the thing* into *something different* (in Bogatyrev 1976: 31 – *transforming in a different form*).
- Systematization of sign components on the stage and constructing of the stage semiosis ⇒ actor, transformed into *image* / stage space / costume / musical environment / communication with the spectator / audience's interpretation.

Theatrical Communication and Theatrical Code – Aesthetical Sign Convention and Spectator's Perception

- What is being *transformed* and its basic role for the constructing of the stage semiosis ⇒ analysis of the stage–spectator communicative system ⇒ coding/decoding of the stage-performative theatrical code by the perceiving spectator.
- Presence of a theatrical convention ⇒ relatively uniform communicative language and relatively identical encoding/decoding matrix ⇒ constituting the communicative environment between *encoder* and *decoder*.

- Every convention as much as it is possible within the artistic act is subject to demolition in the stage reality, depending on the level of that encoding/decoding.

Inferences:

- Spectators' perception ⇒ dynamics of the theatrical signs ⇒ aesthetics of the theatrical signs ⇒ projection of the personal conscious artistic impulse of the perceiver.
- Sign environment on the stage ⇒ spectators' perception of objects, sounds and action ⇒ sign systems, of no value communicatively, out of the scope of the spectators' perception.
- Open theatrical communication ⇒ brightness of the code and the theatrical situation ⇒ degree of accepting/disturbing of the convention ⇒ level of reproduction of reality on the stage towards level of understanding of the perceiver ⇒ envelopment and complicity of presentation of the cultural situation itself.

Reflection of the Domination – The Sign as *Absence/Presence*

- Semiotics of the theatre ⇒ the basic role of the audience in the process of perceiving the performance ⇒ *absent* and *present* signs on the stage.
- Semiotics of the theatrical performance ⇒ interpretation ⇒ presence of significant process.

“The problem with semiotics is that in addressing theater as a system of codes it necessarily dissects the perceptual impression theater makes on the spectator” (*Bert O. State 1985: 7*)

- Sign hierarchy within the performance system ⇒ active interaction on the level of sign reflection with the spectator's overall competence (De Merinis 1993).
- Dynamics of absence/presence of the sign ⇒ distribution of sign process on the stage ⇒ spectator's perception ⇒ act of dynamic reflection of the spectator's semiotic awareness.
- Within the hierarchy of the arrangement of the theatrical signs a domination of one or a few sign systems is possible (Fischer-Lichte 1992).
- Semiotic domination of a separate sign or configuration/group of signs on the stage ⇒ distinguishing/decoding process concerning the sign systems on the stage.
- Presence of a concrete norm / criterion ⇒ commonly accepted level of perceiver's conventionality/competence.

- Permanent re-formulating of content and domination conditions of the theatrical sign ⇒ momentary presenting and distinguishing of a concrete sign on the stage.

Inference:

- Higher degree of mobility and interchangeability of theatrical signs ⇒ complexity in determining the hierarchical mutual dependency ⇒ theatrical signs are not only physically presented on the stage, they are dependent on the dualistic game of *absence/presence*.

Linguistic and Paralinguistic Interaction – Sign Transmission, Representation, Active Convention

- *Linguistic/paralinguistic* interaction of theatrical signs in three aspects of representation ⇒ verbal - verbal, non-verbal – non-verbal, verbal – non verbal and vice versa.
- Dependency of the signs on the active convention within a concrete sign system and at a given moment during the development of the performance.
- Verbal/non-verbal performance sign environment ⇒ principle of theatrical signs interaction as transmission of images (integration of the content *image* ⇒ *icon*) and words (also *images* ⇒ *icons*).
- Images (as an iconic element of static/dynamic non-verbal representativeness) ⇒ words (as a product of the linguistic verbal environment) ⇒ bearers of different variations of communicative messages.
- Complex interaction (verbal/non-verbal in unified convention) ⇒ the possible variations of sign messages significantly exceed their independent correlations.
- Complex interaction of verbal and non-verbal signs in the theatrical performance ⇒ variation of the possible significant effects ⇒ active levels of representation.
- Manipulation of a sign-image independently or in combination with a sign-word ⇒ basic principle of transmission of sense in the desired message ⇒ perceptive expression of signification within the consciousness of the perceiving spectator on a semiotic level (linguistic or paralinguistic).

PART II

PERFORMANCE AND SIGNIFICATION

The Performance as a Theatrical Text – Morphology of a Stage Signification

- Showing of a *sense* and *meaning* in a theatrical environment ⇒ analysis of the signification/communication process in a theatrical stage reality.
- Semiotic perspective ⇒ an idea for the theatrical performance as a *theatrical text* ⇒ two aspects of signification: *linguistic/non-linguistic* and *performative* (physically active) ⇒ diversity of signification on the stage.
- Theatrical performance ⇒ a defined codes complex (over-theatrical cultural codes) ⇒ secondary sign systems of performance – literature, music, fine arts, mythology, religion, the theatre itself as an art.
- The performative codes (sign systems) within the performance function simultaneously (*paradigmatic*) or linear (*syntagmatic*) ⇒ producing of signification (De Toro 1992: 52).
- Signs ⇒ sign systems in variations ⇒ spectator ⇒ principle of simultaneously/ syntagmatic relation ⇒ signification.
- De Marinis (1993) / De Toro (1995) ⇒ performative text categorization as a *macrotext* or *text of the text* (De Merinis 1993: 47-59), which is the result of the variations of partial performative texts ⇒ utterance, music, costumes, gestures, dance, graceful body movements.

Inference:

- The Elements of the general performative text interact and show themselves in a united sense ⇒ constructing of the theatrical text as a performative expression.

The Actor within the Stage Space – Semantics of Transformation

- Semantics of the actor's transformation ⇒ Aristotle's Poetics and Diderot's Paradox? of Acting ⇒ *pre-semiotics acting theories* (Quinn 1989) ⇒ basic mediators of the stage figure's concept.
- Actors' transformation (*mimesis*) ⇒ communicative channel and representative language ⇒ language presenting form / *narrative* with relation to the spectator ⇒ *stage figure*.
- Stage figure (in Otakar Zich - *actor's figure*) is a dichotomy between the perception of the actor (*dramatic character*) and the perception of the audience (perception of the *stage figure*) ⇒ dynamic dichotomy between a

material object and a sign (in the tradition of general semiotics/ the Prague School).

- The actor playing a role (*dramatic character*) transforms a dual diegetic structure ⇒ *representative* or *sign* (also in Aristotle and Diderot) ⇒ *mimetic construct* (*stage figure* of the Prague School, exists also in the practical actor's techniques of Stanislavskii 1936, Chekhov 1953, Grotowski 1968 etc.)

Inference:

- The theatrical performance is constructed in line with the principles of transformation or *mimesis* ⇒ an actor imitates/transforms and represents the stage figure ⇒ concrete semiotic system, structured from multiple semiotic units (signs/codes).

Semiotics of the Stage – ME within the Stage Space

- Stage space semiotical uniqueness ⇒ intellectually measurable environment concerning an actor and an audience ⇒ it isn't only a material symbol of the performative text.
- The stage space is burdened with a specific internal sense ⇒ has the entire sign characteristics of stage architectonics, including in its sign structure the scenography itself ⇒ in open context it is a *dramatic space* (in its forms: *onstage* and *offstage* [*mimetic* and *diegetic*], as well as *intra-diegetic* and *extra-diegetic* [presented by the actor chiefly on the level of *utterance* and active on the level of *awareness/imagination* considering the actors and the spectators]).
- The stage space as „constructed *in relation to the actor*” (Ubersfeld 1999: 119) ⇒ intellectual environment in the context of sign semiosis of the performance (*performance text*) ⇒ interaction between (actor/stage space) and audience in the frames of theatrical reality.
- Interactivity between the stage space and the actor ⇒ representative sign transfer between stage space/actor and in relation to the spectator ⇒ gradual visual formation of the stage illusion ⇒ significant referential function in the context of *imaginary world* of the performance.

Inference:

- On the level of theatre semiosis a *signification* in the field of a visual and sense text has been engendered:
 - a) through the interaction of the actors in/with the stage space
 - b) through the interaction of the actors in/with the stage space and with the audience in the theatrical space.

Mise-en-Scène – The Representative Convention of the Performance

- Analysis of the theatrical mechanism of transformation ⇒ *mise-en-scène – to-stage/transform-something-on-the-stage*.
- *Mise-en-scène* is a structural formation, theoretical construct and radical object of knowledge ⇒ it is not a profane result of the director's (artistic) intervention concerning the dramaturgical and/or performative text.
- Theatrical performance ⇒ dualistic function of the actor in the process of sign producing (*actor's discourse*) ⇒ semiotic reflection in relation to the stage space action (*stage performance*).
- Reconstruction of the performative text ⇒ a spectator perceives the entire corpus of the system which is configured by separate sign subsystems with all of the action's components – utterance, gesture/mimics/movement, stage mechanization, sound.
- Theatrical presenting ⇒ semiotic code of the creator's artistic world (director, actors, stage designer, composer, choreographer) presented as *mise-en-scène* and represented as *performative text* (an active matrix for producing sense).
- *To-stage/transform-something-on-the-stage* ⇒ existence of preliminary knowledge and built-up experience which is transformed by the creator of the performance and is supposed as understanding (i.e. what exactly will be understood by the perceiver).
- Convention: primary semiotic practice of the theatrical performance ⇒ transformation of all presented objects into signs / sign configurations of which the spectator could become aware.
- The role and influence of the collective cultural archetypes over the individual artistic activity and perception; treating of those archetypes from the aesthetical perspective.
- The aesthetics of *mise-en-scène*, in the contemporary theatrical practice, is based on the cultural experience which is stratified in the personal consciousness/unconsciousness of the theatrical artist and spectator.

Inference:

- Archetypical reflection of *mise-en-scène* ⇒ harmonization of the roles of individual and collective unconsciousness (or consciousness) ⇒ a complex of mutually supplementing perspectives of an optimal sign semiosis ⇒ semiotic perspective on the stage ⇒ coordinated action and strict geometry of the movements ⇒ orderly performative line and technical vision ⇒ significant essence of the theatrical performance as a process of communication and representation.

The Theatrical Performance in a Semiotic Perspective – Conclusion

- Theatrical performance in a semiotic perspective ⇒ materialization of the sign ⇒ direct creation of visual conception for the *presented* on the stage.
- Co-ordination in the process of analysis of the end-product and perceiving of a sense ⇒ a clear stand of a sign as a basic means of research of the performance's wholeness.
- This research project has clarified the question concerning the semiotic perspective of a theatrical performance and opens a new space for a future research initiative.
- Domination of the idea of the fundamental role of the audience in creating and promoting stage semiosis ⇒ future semiotic approach to *théâtralité* ⇒ investigation of spectator's awareness/perception of theatrical reality.
- Dissection of the *signifying process* at the theatre ⇒ fundamental role of the audience ⇒ the problem of perceiving theatrical reality ⇒ „...a new trend in the semiotic study of the theatre to be further developed” (Carlson 1980).
- Future perspective ⇒ dynamics of the spectator's perceiving as an object of research ⇒ „...the analysis of the audience's role in the spectacle, both the pure and simple decoding of the performance sign and the vastly more complex process of interpretation, has been the most neglected area of theatre semiotics and needs much more attention.” (De Marinis 1979).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Bibliography - Bulgarian language

Б

1. Борхес, Хорхе Луис 1989, *“Търсенията на Авероес”* във *Вавилонската библиотека*, превод – Анна Златкова, Народна култура, София, стр. 122

Е

2. *Евангелие от Тома (Словата на Иисус)* 2000, превод от коптски на английски – Марвин Майер, превод – Елика Рафи, Кибеа, София, стр. 13, 37

Д

3. Дерида, Ж. 1996, *Гласът и феномена*, София, превод – Тодорка Минева, Лик, София, стр. 27
4. Дьо Сосюр, Фердинант 1992, *Курс по обща лингвистика*, превод – Живко Бояджиев и Петя Асенова, Наука и изкуство, София, стр. 96-97

И

5. *Интерпретация и свръхинтерпретация – Умберто Еко в дискусия с Ричарт Рорти, Джонатан Калър и Кристин Брук-Роуз* 1997, превод – Надя Дионисиева, Наука и изкуство, София, стр. 35

К

6. Калапиетро, Винсент 2000, *Речник по семиотика*, превод – Иван Младенов, Хейзъл, София, стр. 48, 102, 224, 225

Л

7. Лотман, Юрий 1992, *„Семиотиката на сцената”* в *Култура и информация*, превод – Лиляна Терзийска, Наука и изкуство, София, стр. 257

Т

8. Тодоров, Цветан 2000, *“Типология на смисловите факти”* в *Семиотика, Риторика, Стилистика*, превод – Красимир Кавалджиев, София, Сема – Р.Ш., стр. 87

Х

9. Хабермас Юрген 1999, *Философия на езика и Социална теория*, превод – Стилиян Йотов, Лик, София, стр. 55

Bibliography - foreign languages

A

10. Alter, Jean, 1990, *A Sociosemiotic Theory of Theatre*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 23, 265)
11. Appia, Adolphe 1960, *The Work of Living Art*, trans. H. D. Albright, Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press
12. *Approaching Theatre* 1991, g. ed. Thomas A, Sebeok, under the direction of André Helbo, J. Dines Johansen, Patrice Pavis, Anne Ubersfeld, with the collaboration of Marvin Carlson, Marco de Marinis, Sven Erik Larsen, Ane Østergaard, Franco Ruffini, Lars Seeberg, Indiana University Press
13. Aristotle 1927, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Arts*, trans. S.H. Butcher, London: Macmillan and Co
14. Artaud, Antonin, 1958 (1932), *The Theater and Its Double*, New York: Grove Press Inc.
15. Aston, Elaine and Savona, George, 1991, *Theater as Sign – System*, Routledge, p. 99

B

16. Barba, Eugenio 1995, *The Paper Canoe. A Guide to Theatre Anthology*, trans. Richard Fowler, London: Routledge
17. Barthes, Roland, 1969, *Literatur und Bedeutung in Literatur oder Geschichte*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, p. 103
18. Barthes, Roland 1977, „Rhetoric of the Image”, in *Image, Music, Text*, New York: Hill&Wang, 33-41
19. Bennett, Benjamin 2005, *All Theatre is Revolutionary Theatre*, Cornell University Press
20. Bennett, Susan 1997, *Theatre Audiences. A Theory of Production and Reception*. London: Routledge
21. Bogatyrev, Peter, 1976 (1938), *Semiotics in the Folk Theater in Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik, The MIT Press, p. 38
22. Bogatyrev, Peter 1982, “A Contribution to the Study of Theatrical Signs”, in *The Prague School: Selected Writings, 1929 – 1946*, ed. Peter Steiner and trans. John Burbank, Austin: University of Texas Press
23. Brušák, Karl 1991, “Imaginary Space in Drama”, in *Drama und Theatre: Theorie, Methode, Geschichte*, eds. Herta Schmid and Hedwig Král, Munich: O. Sagner
24. Bühler, Karl 1990, *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*, trans. Donald Fraser Goodwin, Amsterdam: John Benjamin's
25. Buysens, E., 1967, *La communication et l'articulation linguistique*, Paris

C

26. Chekhov, Michael 1953, *To the Actor: On the Technique of Acting*, New York: Harper.
27. Corvin, M. 1973, "Approches sémiologiques d'un texte dramatique. La parodie d'Arthur Adamov". *Littérature* 9, 86-110, in Fischer-Lichte 1992: 131-132)
28. Corvin, Michel 1985, *Molière*, Lyon, Presses universitaires de Lyon
29. Culler, Jonathan, D. 1986, *Ferdinant de Saussure*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press

D

30. Deak, Frantisek 1976, "Structuralism in Theatre: The Prague School Contribution", *The Drama Review*, 20.4: 83-94
31. Deleuze, Gilles 1968, 1994, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Poul Patton, New York: Columbia University Press, 11-26
32. De Marinis, Marco 1980, "Le spectacle come text", In *Sémiologie et theater*. Lyon: Université de Lyon II, CERTEC, pp. 195-258, In De Toro 1995: 52
33. De Marinis, Marco, "Towards a Cognitive Semiotic of Theatrical Emotions". *Versus*, 41 (May-August 1985), 5-20
34. De Marinis, Marco, "Theatrical Comprehension: A Socio-Semiotic Approach", *Theatre*, XV, 1 (Winter 1985), 12-17
35. De Marinis, Marco, 1989, "Cognitive Processes in Performance Comprehension: Frames Theory and Theatrical Competence" in *Alto Polo. Performance. From Process to Product*. Edited by Tim Fitzpatrick, Sydney: University of Sydney, 1989
36. De Marinis, Marco, (1982) 1993, *The Semiotics of Performance*, Translated by Aine O'healy, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
37. De Marinis, Marco 2004 (1993), "The Performance Text", in *The Performance Studies Reader*, ed. Henry Bial, Routledge: London-New York, 234, from *The Semiotics of Performance*, translated by Aine O'Healy, pp.47-59, 1993 by Indiana University Press, 234)
38. De Toro, Fernando, 1995, *Theatre Semiotics: Text and Staging in Modern Theatre*, University of Toronto Press, 106-107
39. Diderot, Denise 1957, *The Paradox of Acting*, trans. Walter Pollock, New York: Hill and Wang
40. Doležel, Lubomir 1998, *Heterocosmica: Fiction and Possible Worlds*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press
41. Drost, Mark, P. 1986, "*Nietzsche and Mimesis*", *Philosophy and Literature*, 10: 309-317
42. Durand, R., 1975, "Problèmes de l'analyse structurale et sémiotique de la forme théâtral.", In *Sémiologie de la représentation*. André Helbo, ed. Brussels: Editions complex, 21-112, In Fischer-Lichte 1992: 132)

E

43. Eco, Umberto, "Semiotics of the Theatrical performance" in *The Drama Review*, v.21/n.1, March, 1977, p. 113, 114, 115
44. Eco, Umberto, (1976) 1979, *A Theory of Semiotics*, Indiana University Press – Bloomington, p. 7
45. Eco, Umberto 1984, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press
46. Eco, Umberto 1986, *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*, Indiana University Press
47. Eco, Umberto 1994, "Aristotle: Poetics and Rhetorics", in Sebeok, Thomas, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
48. Elam, Keir 2002, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London: Routledge, 4
49. Erlich, Victor 1969, *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrie*, The Hague: Mouton

F

50. Fischer-Lichte, Erika, 1992 (1983), *The Semiotics of Theater*, Indiana University Press, 93 – 137

G

51. Gadamer, Hans –Georg, *Truth and Method*, Sheed&Ward, London, 1993, 108-114
52. Gans, Eric 1995, "Mimetic Paradox and the Event of Human Origin", *Anthropoetics*, 1:2
(<http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0102/mimesis.html>)
53. Gossman, Leonel & MacArtur, Elizabeth 1984, "Diderot: Displaced Paradox", *Diderot. Digression ad Dispersion: A Bicentennial Tribute*, eds. Jack Unbank and Herbert Josephs, Lexington: French Forum, 106-120
54. Green, André, 1969, *The Tragic Effect*, London, Cambridge Univ. Press, p. 243
55. Greimas, Algirdas, and Jean Cortès 1979, *Sémiologie*, Paris: Hachette, in Pavis, Patrice 1982, *Language of the Stage*, New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 114
56. Grotowski, Jerzy 1968, *Towards a Poor Theatre*, New York: Simon and Shuster

H

57. Helbo, A., 1975, ed. *Sémiology de la representation. Théâtre, television, bande dessiné*. Brussels: Editions complexes

58. Helbo, A. 1982, *Actes du colloque Sémiologie du Spectacle, Degrés 29, Modèles théoriques*, pp. 1-9, In Fischer-Lichte 1992: 179
59. Helbo, André 1987, *Théâtre: Modes d'approche*. Paris: Méridiens-Klincksiek
60. Hinz, Evelyn J 1992, "Mimesis: The Dramatic Lineage of Auto/Biography", in *Essays on Life Writing: From genre to Critical Practice*, ed. Marlene Kadar, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
61. Honzl, Jindřich, 1976 (1943), *The Hierarchy of Dramatic Devices in Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik, The MIT Press, p. 123
62. Howard, Pamela 2001, *What is Scenography?*, Routledge: 15
63. Huizinga, Johan, *Homo Ludens*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston and Henley, 1980
64. Husserl, Edmund 1964, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, trans. William P. Alston and George akhnikian, The Hague: Nijhoff

I

65. Issacharoff, Michael 1989, *Discourse as Performance*, Stanford University Press

J

66. Jakobson, Roman 1976, "Is the Cinema in Decline" in *Semiotics of Art*, eds. Ladislav Matejka and Krystyna Pomorska, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 82-92
67. Jakobson, Roman 1987, *Language of Literature*, eds. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy, Cambridge: Belknap Press, 469-472
68. Jansen, Steen, 1972, "Entwurf einer Theorie der dramatischen Form", in J. Ihwe. Ed., *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, vol. 2, Frankfurt/Main, 223, In Fischer-Lichte: 133)
69. Jung, Carl Gustav 1959, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, ed. Violed Staub De Laszlo, New York: Modern Library

K

70. Kant, Immanuel 1959, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, intr. A. D. Lindsay, London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. & New York: E. P. Dutton & co Inc.
71. Kirby, Michael 1987, *A Formalist Theatre*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
72. Kowzan, Tadeusz, *Littérature et spectacle in Analyse sémiologique du spectacle théâtral*, Lyon: Centre d'études et de recherches théâtrales, Université de Lyon II, 1976, p. 215
73. Kowzan, Tadeusz 1988, "Spectacle, domaine significant", *Semiotica* 71, ½

L

74. Lotman, Jurij 1977, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*, University of Michigan Press
75. Lecoq, Jacques 2000, *The Moving body*, trans. David Bradby, London: Methuen

M

76. Melrose, Susan 1994, *A Semiotics of the Dramatic Text*, The Macmillian Press Ltd.
77. Manetti, Giovanni 1993, *Theories of the Sign in Classical Antiquity*, trans. Christine Richardson, Bloomington: Indiana University Press
78. McAuley, Gay 1999, *Space in Performance – Making Meaning in the Theatre*, The University of Michigan Press: 5-92
79. *Mimesis, Masochism, & Mime – The Politics of Theatricality in Contemporary French Thought* 1997, The University of Michigan Press
80. Monin, G., 1970, “*La communication théâtral*” in *Introductions á la sémiologie*, Paris: Editions de Minuit, 87-94
81. Mukařovský, Jan 1964, “*Čapek’s Prose as Lyriical Melody and as Dialogue*”, in *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, Ed. And trans. Paul L. Garvin, Washington: Georgetown University Press
82. Mukařovský, Jan, (1936) 1976, *Art as Semiotic Fact in Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*, eds. Ladislav Matejka and Irwin R. Titunik, The MIT Press, p. 4, 9
83. Mukařovský, Jan 1977, *The World and the verbal Art*, eds. and trans. John Burbank and Peter Steiner, New Haven: Yale University Press
84. Mukařovský, Jan 1978, *Structure, Sign and Functions. Selected Essays by J. Mukařovský*, eds. And trans. John Burbank and Peter Steiner, New York: Yale University Press

N

85. Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Will to Power*, edited by Walter Kaufmann, Vintage Books, A Division of Random House: New York, 1968

P

86. Pavis, Patrice 1982, *Language of the Stage – Essays in the Semiology of the Theatre*, New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 114
87. Patrice, Pavis, 1983, “Productions et receptions au theater: la concretization du texte dramatique et spectaculaire”, *Revue des sciences humaines*, LX, 189 (janvier-mars 1983), 51-88
88. Pavis, P. 1988, “From Text to Performance”, in *Issacharoff and Jones*, pp. 86-100

89. Pavis, Patrice 1992, *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, trans. Loren Kruger, Routledge, 25
90. Pavis, Patrice 1998, *Dictionary of the theatre: Terms, concepts and Analysis*, trans. Christne Shantz, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
91. Pavis, Patrice 2003, *Analyzing Performance: Theatre, Dance and Film*, The University of Michigan Press
92. Polti, G., 1944, *The Thirty-Six dramatic Situations*, tr. L. Ray, Boston, In Fischer-Lichte 1992: 133)

Q

93. Quinn, Michael 1989, "The Prague School Concept of the Stage Figure", in *The Semiotic Bridge: Trends from California*, eds. Irmengard Rauch and Gerald F. Carr, Berli: Mouton de Gruyter, 80
94. Quinn, Michael 1990, "Celebrity and the Semiotics of Acting", *New Theatre Quarterly*, 22:154-162
95. Quinn, Michael 1995, *The Semiotic Stage*, New York: Peter Lang, 49

R

96. Ruffini, Franco 1974, "Semiotica del teatro: Riconoscimenti degli studi.", *Biblioteca teatrale 9*
97. Ruffini, Franco, 1975, "Semiotica del teatro: la stabilizzazione del senso. Un'apocione informazionale", *Biblioteca teatrale 12*, 205-239, In Fischer-Lichte 1992: 132)
98. Ruffini, Franco 1978, *Semiotica del testo: l'esempio teatro*. Rome: Bulzoni

S

99. Saussure, Ferdinand de 1959, *Course in general Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin, New York: McGraw-Hill
100. Searle, J. R. 1969, *Speech acts*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969 – 20
101. Searle, John 1982, "Le statut logique du discours de la fiction", in *Sens et Expressions*, Paris, 101:19, in Pavis 1992: 28
102. Sebeok, Thomas 2001, *Global Semiotics*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press
103. Sidnell, Michael 1999, "Authorizations of Performative", in *The Performance Text*, ed. Domenico Pietropalo, New York: Legas, 98 -97-112
104. Souriau, E., 1950, *Les deux cent milles situations dramatiques*, Paris, In Fischer-Lichte 1992: 133)
105. Stanislavskii, Konstantin 1987 (1963), *An Actor's Handbook*, trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood, New York: Theatre Arts Books
106. Stanislavskii, Konstantin 1989 (1936), *An Actor Prepares*, trans. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood, New York: Theatre Arts Books

107. States O., Bert, 1985 (1929), *Great Reckonings in Little Rooms: On The Phenomenology of Theater*, University of California Press, 181-183
108. Suvin, Darko, 1985, "The Performance Text as Audience-Stage Dialog, Inducing a Possible World.", *Versus* 42

T

109. The Performance Studies Reader 2004, Edited by Henry Bial, Routledge
110. Torop, Peter 1995, *Total'nyi perevod*, Tartu: Tartu University Press

U

111. Ubersfeld, Anne 1982, *L'École du spectateur*, Editions Sociales, Paris
112. Ubersfeld, Anne 1981. *L'école du spectateur. Lire le theater 2*. Editions Sociales
113. Ubersfeld, Anne 1991, "Analysis of the Performance", In *Approaching Theatre*, g. ed. Thomas A, Sebeok, ed. André Helbo, Indiana University Press
114. Ubersfeld, Anne 1999, *Reading Theatre*, trans. Erank Collins, eds. Paul Perron and Patrick Debbèche, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

V

115. Veltruský, Jiří, 1964, "Man and Object in the Theater", in *A Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, ed. Paul L. Gervin (Washington:Georgetown Univ. Press. p. 84
116. Veltruský Jiří 1976, "Contribution to the Semiotics of Acting", in *Sound, Sign and Meaning*, ed. Vladislav Mateika, Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Languages and Literature, University of Michigan, 553-605
117. Veltruský, Jiří 1977, *Drama as Literature*, Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, 108-109
118. Veltruský Jiří, 1981, "Prague School Theory of Theatre", *Poetics Today*, 2:3, p. 228
119. Veltruský, Jiří 1983, "Puppetry and Acting", *Semiotica* 47. 1/4: 69-122

W

120. Witkiewicz Stanislaw Ignacy, 1959 (1919), *Nowe formy w malarstwie*, Panzwowe wydawnictwo naukowe

Z

121. Zich, Otakar, 1986 (1931), *Estetika dramatické umění (Aesthetics of Dramatic Art)*, Prague: Panorama