

University of Wollongong

Research Online

Faculty of Creative Arts - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Arts, Social Sciences & Humanities

1-1-2008

Postdramatic theatre & Australia: a 'new' theatre discourse

Margaret M. Hamilton

University of Wollongong, margham@uow.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/creartspapers>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hamilton, Margaret M.: Postdramatic theatre & Australia: a 'new' theatre discourse 2008, 3-23.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/creartspapers/236>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Postdramatic Theatre and Australia: A 'New' Theatre Discourse

Margaret Hamilton

The penultimate year of the twentieth century marked the publication of two highly significant books contributing to the development of local and international theatre history and theory. In 1999 Currency Press, in association with *RealTime*, published *Performing the unNameable*, the first anthology of Australian performance texts to appear in Australia, and Verlag der Autoren published Hans-Thies Lehmann's landmark contribution to the understanding of 'new' forms of theatre, *Postdramatisches Theater*. The long-awaited English translation of Lehmann's book by Karen Jürs-Munby, *Postdramatic Theatre*, appeared in early 2006. Prior to its availability to an Anglophone readership, Lehmann's monograph had emerged as a groundbreaking reference in debate and discussion in an international context,¹ and it has had an immediate impact in Australia. At the annual conference of the Australasian Association for Theatre, Drama and Performance Studies (ADSA), held just a few months after the release of the English edition, a number of papers referred to Lehmann's term. Denise Varney, for example, specifically explored the effectiveness of performances she positioned at opposite ends of a spectrum – which she described as the dramatic/postdramatic theatre divide – to question the political viability of postdramatic theatre form. Like Australia, the international theatre scene has been characterised by the need for a discourse that adequately accounts for recent directions in theatre practice and the relationship of these forms to drama. What Lehmann offers is a comprehensive theory of new forms of theatre that have arguably suffered not simply from derisory language typically embodied in a series of antonyms, but the economic consequences that result from this 'anti' or oppositional positioning and the inability to articulate the shift from a text-based dramaturgy to a dramaturgy of image and sound.

Performing the unNameable attests not only to a significant change in approaches to the theatre medium, but to the difficulty inherent in describing the work of recent theatre practitioners frequently marginalised as 'experimental'. As a consequence, the collection constitutes a pertinent entry point for a discussion of the application of the term 'postdramatic theatre' to Australian material. Only two of the seventeen 'fragments of live works' in *Performing the unNameable*, to use the editors' description of its contents,

originated from a script completed prior to rehearsal² and correspond to an understanding of dramaturgy as a literary activity. Instead, the majority of the anthology reflects material prepared by artists interested in production processes that depart from the hierarchy intrinsic to established theatre tradition and, more specifically, deviate from dramatic theatre's privileging of the text. The collection includes manuscripts constituting a record of improvisations, actions and images, for example, as opposed to the dialogue and character form familiar to dramatic literary convention. In this respect, these records can be broadly understood as 'documents of aesthetic performance', to use the classificatory terminology developed by the discipline of Performance Studies, which sets out to describe social, cultural and aesthetic phenomena. 'Aesthetic performance' designates practice created to be observed and experienced by performers and spectators, and can be differentiated from 'direct theatre' and 'social or cultural performance' activity.³ 'Direct theatre', a term theorised by Richard Schechner, accounts for carnivals, festivals and events such as demonstrations organised according to political intent. In contrast, 'social or cultural performance' implies everyday performative behaviour and modes of cultural expression exemplified by the Olympic Games or the Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras in Sydney.

'Performance' subsequently constitutes an expanded field of study, and its category of 'aesthetic performance', similarly, implies a broad spectrum of performing arts activity from traditional drama to interdisciplinary work. Within this framework theorists have used a range of terms to describe activity that blurs the boundaries between the disciplines of performance art, music, theatre, dance and opera. Elinor Fuchs, for example, applied the term 'performance theatre' to discuss artistic practice indebted to conventional theatre and performance art,⁴ and the term 'postmodern' is frequently ascribed to contemporary work. In this context, and in light of the relatively late translation of Lehmann's book into English, Varney understands the merit of the German theatre scholar's publication, *Postdramatic Theatre*, as the substitution of the 'operative term postmodern with postdramatic' and the re-positioning of this theoretical discourse within theatre history.⁵ While Varney's thorough appraisal of Lehmann's book acknowledges the fact that scholars have been adroit in their application of postmodern theory to performance practice, her reading of the term 'postdramatic' as a replacement for 'postmodern' tends to underestimate the significance of Lehmann's discipline-specific approach to explicating developments in the theatre medium. Lehmann theorises the aesthetic experience of theatre and, in doing so, offers a methodology that contrasts markedly to the application of a general cultural theory to theatre – a point I return to later. As a consequence, what Varney identifies as a 'sparing use of theory' and a preference for the theatre theoreticians Artaud and Grotowski, as opposed to other academic scholars,⁶ reflects a method of analysis that emphasises praxis

in its attempt to articulate a history of relationships fundamental to the form in the context of a culture of new media. In this respect, Lehmann's approach acknowledges the engagement of artists as a community of peers in dialogue with a body of work, contemporary and historical. It is a dialogue increasingly important to consider in view not only of the emergence of Performance Studies as a scholarly discipline and the question of theatre within this paradigm, but of funding structures for local practice and the relationship of this practice to international development.

For Gay McAuley, theatre is central to Performance Studies and, like Philip Auslander, McAuley doubts it is possible to think of performance and not theatre.⁷ However, it is arguably equally impossible to reflect on theatre without thinking of drama. In Lehmann's opinion, '*the concept of drama has survived as the latent normative idea of theatre*', despite major developments in the field.⁸ No doubt this is why theatre – ostensibly in an Anglo-American context – appears synonymous with a text-based drama dependent upon narrative and character; and it is a reduction that has contributed to the dichotomy that has emerged between performance and theatre as objects and disciplines of study. The consequence, for scholars like Jon McKenzie and Stephen Bottoms, is a paradigmatic shift from Theatre Studies to Performance Studies that aligns performance to the notion of efficacy and theatre to entertainment.⁹ It is not surprising from this perspective that Bottoms objects to definitions of theatre that delimit the medium to the acting out of dramatic literature in a venue designed for this activity. However, discussion of the implications for theatre as a result of a shift in terminology is not restricted to proponents of 'and/or' in the Theatre Studies field. McAuley, key to the establishment of Performance Studies at the University of Sydney, similarly questions what she terms the 'reductionist slippage' manifest in an understanding of theatre as text-based drama largely deriving from the European tradition in her article opening the *Australasian Drama Studies* issue focusing on Performance Studies in Australia in 2001.¹⁰ With this 'slippage' in mind, the concept of 'postdramatic theatre' emerges as a highly useful term to distinguish and discuss new forms of theatre that hold interest both for scholars in Theatre Studies and for scholars in Performance Studies specifically focused on aesthetic performance in Australia.

Lehmann's conception of postdramatic theatre arguably circumvents the performance/theatre dichotomy to specifically encapsulate the development of the new theatre 'text' – that is, forms of composition 'no longer dramatic' insofar as text operates as one of a number of elements and is deprived of its 'codified royalty', to use the words of Italian director Romeo Castellucci.¹¹ From this perspective, the term 'postdramatic theatre' has the potential to operate as a precise catchphrase for both the academy and industry, and this is not to reduce Lehmann's theory to a slogan. By pointing to and, more accurately, applying a term that acknowledges the dramatic model and subsequently theorises departures from this mode of performance, Lehmann

arguably avoids what Bottoms refers to as the etiolation of the 'theatrical' in light of the application of the 'performative' theoretically.¹² In doing so, Lehmann recognises the contribution of Performance Studies to understandings of the performance text:¹³ that is, the relationship between the performer and spectator, the temporal and spatial situation, and the performance situation and the social field. At a time when David Savran championed the adoption of the 'expansive, universalising definition of performance' by Performance Studies to argue that the discipline is 'a lot sexier than theatre history and far more compatible with new developments in literary and cultural studies',¹⁴ Lehmann's approach to the study of the aesthetics of contemporary theatre countered the tendency by performance theorists to conflate performance, as opposed to theatre, with the ephemeral. For Lehmann, the present of postdramatic theatre can be conceived as a fading presence delving into a realm 'beyond representation'.¹⁵ Furthermore, *Postdramatic Theatre* accounted for new forms of theatre in terms not only of drama theory and the history of theatre and the avant-garde, but also of the concepts developed by a number of thinkers key to cultural studies, including Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Jean-François Lyotard, Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, and the author of *The Production of Presence* (2004), Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht.

What Lehmann offers is a concept that resists the anti-theatrical predispositions instituted by Plato, and more recently reinvigorated by art historian Michael Fried in his influential objection to 'theatricality' in a 1967 essay 'Art and Objecthood'. For Fried, 'Art degenerates as it approaches the condition of theatre',¹⁶ and for Peggy Phelan, performance ontologically defies reproduction and, subsequently, the circulation of capital.¹⁷ In an effort to distance 'performance' from theatre, these approaches limit – if not assimilate – theatre to text-based illusion. All theatre is not text-based and this is not to conclude that 'postdramatic theatre is theatre without text'.¹⁸ Instead, theatrical sign usage, as Lehmann points out, has changed – and not surprisingly so, in light of the emergence of technologies and the subsequent shift in modes of perception instituted by new media.¹⁹ This does not suggest the end of classical or modern drama – and the presence of the dramatic theatre text in repertoires around the globe attests to this fact – nor does it assert the end of 'performance' or the currency of this term. However, Lehmann's study of the aesthetic logic of new forms of theatre offers a new perspective to existing discourses and the set of organising concepts specific to European theorists and Anglo-American thought broadly expressed as 'theatricality' and 'performativity' respectively. German theatre scholar Erika Fischer-Lichte, for example, acknowledges that the term 'theatricality' applies to the medium of theatre, as well as to cultural processes and everyday life,²⁰ and, in her article 'The Politics of Discourse: Performativity Meets Theatricality', Janelle Reinelt charts the different usages of the terms 'performance', 'performative', 'performativity' and 'theatricality' in an

attempt to critically demonstrate the possibilities for analysis emerging from their interaction. For Fischer-Lichte, however, 'if everything is "theatre" the concept becomes so wide that it loses any distinctive or cognitive capacity'.²¹ This is arguably the dilemma for 'performance', and why Lehmann's term finds specificity despite the heterogeneity of forms described as 'postdramatic'.

From the 'new wave' to the 'unnameable': practice, discourse and industry

This is not, however, to imply an ubiquitous use of the concept of postdramatic theatre in relation to the Australian experience and performing arts landscape. The term 'postdramatic theatre' is not intended as a discourse to signify all practice that is not 'drama'. In the 1980s and 1990s a number of Australian artists from a variety of disciplines – theatre, dance, opera and the visual arts – created a discrete body of work 'loosely referred to as performance, or contemporary performance or live art'.²² This period constituted a critical time in terms of the emergence of a field of practice that involved the partial invigoration of avant-garde forms by artists interested in addressing recent developments in philosophy, changes in everyday culture and different conceptions of social and political expression. It was a creative phase influenced by the art practices of the late 1960s and 1970s, and specifically by the shift undertaken by a number of artists to work beyond the institutional structures of the theatre and the art museum. In addition, other 'revolutions' – and most notably, for Helen Gilbert, the rise of Aboriginal theatre – challenged not only the hegemony of Anglo-European perspectives, but also Anglo-European modes of representation.²³ While these artists produced performances that departed from the dramatic model, this is not to suggest that this material necessarily constitutes postdramatic theatre form. The Marrugeku Company, for example – which consists of Western Australian urban Indigenous dancers, musicians, non-Indigenous physical theatre practitioners from Stalker Theatre Company, and Kunwinjku dancers, story-tellers and musicians from Kunbarlanjanja, a remote community in the Northern Territory's Arnhem Land – produces site-specific performance that draws on traditions well beyond western European models, despite the use of new media in *Crying Baby* (2001). Similarly, Legs on the Wall's outdoor aerial performance, *Homeland* – featured as part of the Sydney Olympics Arts Festival – and the series of performances created by The Party Line, established in 1991, are indebted to circus and are potentially more aptly described under the rubric of physical theatre and, in terms of The Party Line, of discussions that address the influence of feminist practice and theory.

This is not to preclude the contribution that Lehmann's analysis makes to the study of this type of practice, particularly in light of his discussion of the function of the body as signifying material in *Postdramatic Theatre*. Nor does it dilute the possibilities that Lehmann's theory offers – for the

articulation of the aesthetic logic of a significant body of work to have emerged in Australia; for the relation of forms of 'performance' to the theatre paradigm; and for the difficulty of thinking 'performance' without thinking 'theatre' and, subsequently, overlaying expectations synonymous with drama. Companies such as The Sydney Front (1986–93), Open City (1987–) and Entr'Acte (1979–99), and productions such as Nigel Kellaway's marathon 240-hour *This Most Wicked Body* (1994), as well as material by playwright Jenny Kemp and photographer William Yang, and specific productions by the Sidetrack Performance Group, are indicative of the contemporary and historical presence of new theatre 'texts'. From this perspective, the discourse of postdramatic theatre can be used to reconsider and re-articulate what McAuley identifies as the precarious position of performance – that is, its marginalisation in relation to theatre²⁴ in the local cultural economy. In Europe, or more specifically on the Continent, what McAuley terms 'performance theatre' to discuss artists such as Robert Wilson, and what is understood in this paper as 'postdramatic theatre', is as likely to attract funding as conventional form.²⁵ While I suspect that venues like the Hebbel Theater, Berlin – re-structured in 2003 from the amalgamation of three theatres – might question funding priorities, particularly with regard to production budgets, there is clearly a different agenda in operation concerning aesthetics and subsidy in Australia.

Unlike the 'new wave' of playwriting that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s and its subsequent canonisation as Australian drama, the range of 'new theatre' forms that have developed over the last few decades – and this term in no way implies a relation to the New Theatre movement – has remained a largely negligible sector of the industry, much to the detriment of the Australian theatre landscape. A range of factors have contributed critically to this situation, including the commitment to specific forms of dramatic theatre by government-subsidised State theatres in Australia. The result, as Veronica Kelly observes, is an increasing dichotomy between mainstage (literary) theatre and innovative hybrids developed and presented at the margins of mainstream production.²⁶ It is a bifurcation that has been principally accounted for in terms of the social discourses underpinning this development: the experience of middle-class Anglo-Celtic Australia, as opposed to queer, feminist, Indigenous, migrant Australia. Together, both ends of the spectrum constitute a highly diverse group of practitioners, performance styles and subject matter. Comprehensive studies of contemporary Australian theatre are rare, however, and in comparison to monograph-length research analysing Australian playwrights, articles largely account for research into new forms of theatre or 'contemporary performance', to use the more common description of the field in Australia.²⁷ In addition, a number of the studies that emerged in the 1990s apply a specifically postcolonial critique to an examination of alternative theatre 'voices'²⁸ or – in the case of essay collections and surveys of physical theatre

and performance – focus on the significance of the 'real-time-space' of the performing body.²⁹ As a consequence, departures from the idea of traditional dramatic theatre have been variously explicated in terms of a re-inscription of identity and a preoccupation with the 'live' nature of the medium, its phenomenology.

If performing forms of new theatre relates to the 'unspecifiable', to return to the idea embedded in *Performing the unNameable* referred to above, this ostensibly implies a particular, if not peculiar, complexity. More specifically, it raises the question of the relations underpinning this conception of the practice within the performing arts in Australia – that is, the relationship of new forms of theatre to 'dramatic theatre' and other contemporary cultural phenomena. Practitioners and scholars have consistently lamented the inadequate language used to describe forms characterised by fragmented narration, heterogeneity in style and a non-hierarchical approach to scenic composition that intentionally compromises the dominance of text in the theatrical medium. 'Anti-character', 'anti-plot', 'anti-dialogue' are typical of the oft-cited labels applied to examples of 'new theatre' and this raises a critical dilemma in terms of its reception. Australian artist Virginia Baxter elaborates on this issue in the following way:

... there are many companies who in an effort to create new forms, have chosen quite legitimately to ignore verbal language in favour of other languages ... But where does that leave us? To theatre critics! Labelled un-theatrical, misread as un-dramatic ...³⁰

Australian theatre director Barrie Kosky, one of the most vocal critics in public debate about directions in the performing arts, similarly referred to the propensity for text-based theatre on Australian stages in the 1990s and for him it constituted 'market-driven, masterpiece-sofa sort of mediocrity'.³¹

This is not to suggest that mainstream theatre is 'moribund if not dead', to cite Gerhard Fischer's opinion of the industry in the early 1990s.³² Instead, theatre critic John McCallum has pointed out that physical theatre, contemporary performance and non-realistic theatre have 'at last begun to creep into the mainstream'.³³ In doing so, he referred to Kosky's *The Lost Echo* – an eight-hour production for the Sydney Theatre Company indebted to contemporary European performance 'conventions' – as the highlight of 2006. McCallum describes the encroachment of non-text based and non-realistic forms of performance as 'postdramatic theatre' in his article for *The Australian*. Lehmann's term is particularly useful here to articulate the relationship between the theatre institution – traditionally the domain of drama – and new approaches to the medium. However, it is perhaps ironic that, over twenty years after John Baylis, then of The Sydney Front, objected to the notion of the avant-garde in the short-lived journal *Spectator Burns*,³⁴

the 'shock' of Kosky's treatment of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* should resonate on an entirely different stage the effect of The Sydney Front's earlier approach to text in productions such as *The Pornography of Performance*, which had its première at The Performance Space in Sydney in 1988. For Baylis, the 'avant-garde' implied artists acting as 'scouts' or forerunners for the 'main army' of the mainstream. As a consequence, what constitutes a sigh of relief for McCallum reflects an industry that has failed to recognise and engage more broadly with the history of postdramatic theatre practice in Australia.

It is perhaps not surprising in this context that Australian productions are rarely selected for the programmes of European festivals and venues renowned for presenting 'new theatre', like the Hebbel Theater, Berlin, Festival Kunsten Festival des Arts and the Kaaithater in Brussels, Rotterdamse Schouwburg and Künstlerhaus Mousonturm in Frankfurt-am-Main.³⁵ This is despite the fact that these venues operate as contemporary forums facilitating artists to 'explore the boundaries between dance, performance, theatre, music and the fine arts in new and unexpected ways',³⁶ and find reflection in the mission statement of The Performance Space, for example, and the Perth Institute of Contemporary Art (PICA). Unlike the Netherlands and Belgium, Australia has not produced a theatre landscape that enables a range of companies not only to perform in large-scale theatres but to be recognised as equivalent to established theatre tradition. Instead, what has emerged is an 'antagonism' between those working in 'legit' theatre, as opposed to 'presumably illegitimate' theatre, in the words of the former director of The Performance Space and PICA, Sarah Miller.³⁷ As a 'playwright', Jenny Kemp is arguably an exception to this observation, as Rachel Fensham and Denise Varney demonstrate in *The Dolls' Revolution: Australian Theatre and the Cultural Imaginary* (2005). Against this backdrop, Lehmann's project – designed not only to conceptualise and articulate contemporary theatre but to promote the visibility and discussion of new forms of theatre – has the potential to contextualise examples of Australian practice within a broader discourse concerning developments in 'new theatre' internationally. Furthermore, by explicating an aesthetic logic of the material produced by a number of the most influential directors of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries – Robert Wilson, Romeo Castellucci, Elizabeth LeCompte – and linking this body of work to practice emerging from venues like the Institute for Contemporary Arts and Riverside Studios in London, The Performance Space, PICA (Portland), and the Mickery Theatre (Amsterdam), Lehmann offers a paradigm of theatrical development. In this respect, his approach circumvents the oppositional – and by implication marginal, in the Australian context – relation of new forms of theatre to the dramatic model.

In the lead-up to the 2007 Australian federal election, and through the publication of the proceedings of the symposium *Australian Arts Where the*

Bloody Hell Are You? Australian Arts in an International Context, international advocacy for local arts was once again on the agenda. However, while Ian Maxwell acknowledged in his introductory essay that 'enthusiasm for an export model' has the potential to result in a focus on the 'outwards' at the expense of the 'inwards', he did not specifically address the highly complex question of local aesthetics in relation to the international market.³⁸ Based in Berlin for four years as a consultant in international arts market development for the Australia Council for the Arts, I consistently negotiated the question of 'European' and 'Australian' aesthetics in order to avoid what Daryl Buckley, the artistic director of the Elision Ensemble, refers to the 'Gallipoli syndrome'³⁹ – that is, landing a company or artist on the 'wrong bloody beach at the wrong bloody time' and celebrating a misguided victory based on the idea that simply 'being there' is an achievement. More significantly and pragmatically, my ability to build and sustain relationships with European artistic directors was dependent upon my understanding of the artistic objectives of the festival or venue's programme. As part of this position, I liaised with producers and programmers predominantly from the European Continent participating in the Cultural Awards Scheme run by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade or attending the Australian Performing Arts Market. A recurring critique from European programmers concerned what they perceived as a conservative dramaturgy. This is not to imply that these presenters found all Australian theatre 'conservative' and clearly a number of companies have developed an international reputation on tour in Europe. In addition, I am not suggesting that Australian material should be created for particular markets, but it raises a range of questions concerning the capacity for experimentation in light of domestic funding priorities and the development of aesthetics in relation to international directions in the industry. In contrast to the 'export' of Australian theatre, a number of high-profile international artists attesting to the emergence of new forms of theatre have steadily flowed into Australia. Over the last twenty years the Australian festival circuit has presented key examples of this paradigm including Robert Wilson, Jan Fabre, Wooster Group, Pina Bausch, La Fura dels Baus, Michael Laub and Remote Control Productions, Societas Raffaello Sanzio, Forced Entertainment, Heiner Goebbels and Uwe Mengel.

Critical reaction, however, has tended to sensationalise significant deviations from conventions of dramatic theatre and, in doing so, reflects the polarisation of the popular press and specialised media. In Hilary Crampton's opinion, for example, Jan Fabre's *I Am Blood* failed as 'Art' on the basis of its lack of structure,⁴⁰ and was described less elegantly as 'a bloody shambles' by another *Age* reviewer.⁴¹ Similarly, Helen Thomson concluded in her review of the 2002 Melbourne Festival's presentation of Michael Laub's *Total Masala Slammer* that the work failed on the basis that the production did not understand the formal conventions it set out to

critique. Without entering into a detailed discussion of the merits and shortcomings of the production, Thomson's evaluation exemplified an acute inability to clarify Laub's aesthetic strategy. What Thomson described as a 'grab bag' of styles, genres and cultures – patronisingly applauding performers 'obviously trained' in the classical Indian style Kathakali – in fact accentuated the historic manipulation of dance and sound and, more significantly in light of Thomson's conclusion, the act of interpretation.⁴² What the Laub 2002 and Fabre 2003 Melbourne Festival coverage reveals is an acute inability to critically respond to new forms of theatre – and this is not to suggest that all examples of postdramatic theatre constitute 'first-rate' theatre but simply that an appropriate set of criteria be used to discuss the material. With this in mind, Lehmann's explication of the stylistic traits of new theatre, the aesthetics of time and space, images of the body and treatment of text, provides a new vocabulary to discuss theatre-aesthetics that depart from the dramatic model.

In addition to ineffectual accounts in the daily press, a number of factors have contributed to insufficient discussion of the theatre aesthetics integral to these 'new' forms of expression. Kelly, for example, draws attention to the 'diffusion of scholarly energies into more focussed or richly theorised studies' coinciding with the dissolution of grand narratives apparent in the 1990s.⁴³ Lehmann, similarly, points out that 'under the banner of an interdisciplinary approach scholars often evade the very cause and *raison d'être* for the theorizing – namely the aesthetic experience itself'.⁴⁴ McAuley, furthermore, refers to the 'fact that theatre exists, as it were, under erasure in much theoretical discourse drawing on performance rais[ing] the vexed question of the treatment of theatre within Performance Studies'.⁴⁵ The blurring of distinct disciplines of practice and subsequent debate about the expansive field of performance has tended to impede analysis of new forms of theatre and limit critical debate exploring dramaturgical developments in Australia. This is not to undermine the contribution *RealTime* has made to discussion of 'new' dramaturgy, and in particular The Dramaturgies Project.⁴⁶ In *Body and Self: Performance Art in Australia 1969–92*, Anne Marsh argues that Australian artists in the 1980s and 1990s no longer felt 'impelled' to assert the difference between theatre and performance art.⁴⁷ Marsh based her argument on the premise that the distinction between theatrical illusion and 'real' life 'dissolves' in light of theory.⁴⁸ It is a claim that clearly reflects the deepening alliance of a number of key practitioners involved in the creation of new forms of theatre with the visual arts sector, on the basis that it provides a significantly more open platform for dialogue and experimentation in Australia. As a consequence, what emerges as the changed use of theatre signs raises the question of the relationship of new forms of theatre to practices such as performance art.

Collaboration, convergence and divergence: postdramatic theatre/performance-art

For Lehmann, the Concept Art of the 1970s is key to the shift from dramatic to postdramatic theatre form and he specifically elaborates on the correlation between new forms of theatre and performance art in *Postdramatic Theatre*.⁴⁹ The critical understanding of art practice as the experience of the 'real' – that is, real time, space and body – evident in new forms of theatre can be traced to conceptualism, and a significant body of international literature attests to the emphasis on self-reflexivity and the body of the artist by contemporary theatre practitioners in the field. With reference to theorist RoseLee Goldberg and artists like Jan Fabre, Robert Wilson and Elizabeth LeCompte, Lehmann notes a reversed trend in the flow of influence in the movement towards theatricalisation in the performance art of the 1980s and a new integration of performance, theatre and opera. Furthermore, he discusses the incorporation of elaborate visual and audio structures, as well as the broadening of media technology and the engagement with extended time-frames as a move towards the theatre medium. To describe the aesthetic logic of these forms of 'new theatre', Lehmann developed the concept of postdramatic theatre into a comprehensive theory.⁵⁰ Lehmann's study can be read in relation to Peter Szondi's *Theory of Modern Drama*. For Szondi, the drama of modernity entailed the eradication of prologue, chorus and epilogue and, in doing so, established a series of distinctions to antique tragedy, medieval cleric plays, baroque theatre and Shakespearean form to produce a tension between and intrinsic to Aristotelian and Epic form. As a result, the 'absolute dominance of dialogue' characterised modern drama as a form dedicated to the reproduction of interpersonal communication.⁵¹ From this perspective, postdramatic theatre is indicative of a further process of eradication and/or transformation, and in this respect Lehmann provides 'a concrete historical understanding of the complex and conflicted relations of text and language to performance and space in the theatre' or what Johannes Birringer lamented as lacking in applications of broader theoretical discourses to the study of the theatre medium.⁵² With this in mind, translator Karen Jürs-Munby points to Lehmann's approach as the 'missing link' insofar as *Postdramatic Theatre* sketches a 'trajectory from within theatre aesthetics',⁵³ and it is an approach that frames existing theory to develop a set of critical analytical tools that advance the explication of departures from the dramatic model.

The term 'postdramatic theatre' has entered a contested lexicon dedicated to encapsulating the 'new theatre' phenomenon. In the decades following the 1970s, practitioners and scholars applied a range of labels to describe new forms of theatre. 'Performance', largely in an Anglo-American context, gained currency as a means of elaborating upon 'live' experience as a unique self-reflexive situation that contests the fictive cosmos of the theatre and institutes a shift in terms of the performer-spectator relationship. Its current

usage, as Marvin Carlson (2004) demonstrates in *performance: a critical introduction*, is not limited to the arts but extends to the social sciences, anthropology, psychoanalysis and linguistics, as well as technology. In his analysis of performance and its implications for theatre scholarship, Lehmann points to ritual, interactive performance and the production of presence as key illuminating features of postdramatic theatre.⁵⁴ In doing so, he qualifies postdramatic theatre as a theatre of the present by pointing to the 'slippage of presence' specific to the medium.⁵⁵ This latter point is of key consideration in relation to Peta Tait's emphasis on the 'porous meanings of live performing bodies' that cannot be fixed in photographs or film for evaluation.⁵⁶ Philip Auslander (1999)⁵⁷ challenges precisely the notion of the 'liveness' Tait accentuates by contesting the prevalent conjecture championed by Peggy Phelan (1996)⁵⁸ that the 'live' distinguishes an event as 'real' and constitutes it as resistant to mediated reproduction. Other academics have applied the periodising term 'postmodernism' as a theoretical discourse to explicate the features of new forms of theatre in relation to contemporary cultural phenomena. Its application, however, is limited, as Lehmann clarifies, particularly in relation to the breadth of forms – empty spaces to overwhelming stimuli – implied by 'new theatre'.⁵⁹ Examples of nihilism and the grotesque are equally valid in earlier theatre periods and are similarly difficult to categorise within the frame of postmodernism. In Australia, artists and funding agencies increasingly employed the description 'hybrid' during the 1980s, which was later incorporated into new media arts practice as an explanatory tenet of the field.

For Jürs-Munby, however, the relationship between 'no longer dramatic' forms of practice and the dramatic model has been inadequately explored, if not neglected, although Elinor Fuchs's *The Death of Character* (1996) constitutes an exception to this conclusion.⁶⁰ In this context, Lehmann's exposition addresses the question of the aesthetic logic of new forms of theatre in relation to dramatic theory and history. In addition to the range of cross-disciplinary influences alluded to above, Lehmann details the development of a postdramatic discourse within the theatre medium as a succession of stages from the end of the nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first. Through self-reflexion, decomposition and the practice of breaking down the elements specific to dramatic theatre, the historical avant-garde and the neo-avant-garde of the 1950s and 1960s acted as a prelude to postdramatic theatre form.⁶¹ In this schemata Lehmann links, for example, Gertrude Stein's *Landscape Play* to Robert Wilson's theatre aesthetic and points to the manifestation of aspects of the Theatre of the Absurd in the postdramatic theatre forms of the 1980s and 1990s. The elements Martin Esslin accounts for as 'metaphysical anguish at the absurdity of the human condition'⁶² – discontinuity, collage, montage, collapse of narration, speechlessness and so forth – Lehmann identifies as a 'cultural given' in postdramatic theatre.⁶³ In this respect, it is

not the presentation of the collapse of the certainty of *Weltanschauung* that is intrinsic to postdramatic theatre, but its assumed validity. The Theatre of the Absurd, however, like Brechtian dramaturgy, is underpinned by dramatic literary tradition even though, as Lehmann notes, a number of texts explode the boundaries of narrative and dramatic logic.⁶⁴ It is a tradition that attests to the fortitude of the fundamental interconnection between drama and logic – or drama and dialectic in the work of Brecht – specific to European theatre forms and modern drama in Australia, as well as implying the radical nature of the postdramatic theatre project.

As a consequence, the poetic order organising the theatre medium, its practice and reception, is deeply connected to the ascendancy of the text despite a variety of developments, including the heightened use of non-verbal physical gestures, music, dance and the intention of Brecht's 'theatre for a scientific age', which was designed to supersede dramatic theatre by instituting the 'Epic' form.⁶⁵ Brecht objected to the 'inaccurate representations of our social life' in 'so-called Naturalism', but did not denounce the central position of the literary text.⁶⁶ Instead, he censured the construction of a dramatic vision of the 'real world' that concurrently asserts its (political) legitimacy by virtue of its form: the illusory basis of mimesis, unity and the claim to representation. The manifold devices Brecht designed to expose the fictive cosmos of the theatrical universe in order to foreground the dialectical capacity of representation – theatre-in-theatre, prologue, epilogue and so forth – did not, as Lehmann notes, destroy the specific experience of dramatic theatre.⁶⁷ Examples of 'new theatre', however, characterised by scenic poems and fragmentation, operate beyond a logocentric understanding of dramatic discourses. In doing so, they 'desemanticize' language to refer to Lehmann's argument in his article 'From Logos to Landscape: Text in Contemporary Dramaturgy'.⁶⁸ To explicate this realm of practice, Lehmann demonstrates that this aesthetic experience can be theorised within the bounds of Aristotelian logic by referring to Aristotle's concept of *opsis* as opposed to *pragmata*; *opsis* is the realm of the visual. In Aristotle's terms it is 'inartistic' and insignificant to poetic art.⁶⁹ By implication it is devoid of structure and rationality and implies the possibility of perplexity and sensuality and consequently undermines the *telos* of tragedy and its structural mainstay: the text.

What Lehmann proposes is an aesthetic logic of theatrical praxis dating from the 1960s; praxis 'no longer dramatic' – but not 'beyond' drama – that offers new constellations of and subsequently conceptions for subjectivity. His term 'postdramatic theatre' acknowledges the dramatic literary heritage intrinsic to new forms of theatre and the consistent contiguity between theatre and text despite its non-hierarchical position in postdramatic praxis. In doing so, Lehmann applies affirmative language in his comprehensive account of a new vision for the theatre medium. He categorises and explicates postdramatic theatrical signs in terms of a number of stylistic traits, including

the retreat of synthesis, dream images, manneristic traditions, simultaneity, minimalistic tendencies and density, defiguration, scenography, the physicality of the body as subject matter, musicalisation and polyglossia, concrete as opposed to abstract theatre, the 'real' as opposed to representation. Text, space, time, the body and media attain an aesthetic language in the theatre realm. Utterances that do not conform to the pattern of dialogue can be described as the 'monologisation of dialogue'; for example, in the event that the performers' voices correspond to an additive language and create the 'impression of a chorus'.⁷⁰ In his account of new theatre forms, Lehmann stipulates a '*shift of axis from dialogue within theatre to dialogue between theatre and audience*',⁷¹ which reinforces the concept of participation intrinsic to the *performer-spectator* relationship discussed as key to the distinction between performance and theatre in Australia.⁷² It is a point that raises the question of dramaturgy specifically in relation to the performance text or theatre situation. The shift in communication associated with postdramatic theatre implies the creation of a space in which the spectator is responsible for fusing its elements: the musicality of language; the presence of the body; and multi-dimensional auditive and visual moments unfettered by traditional concepts of unity. If the spectator is conceived of as an interactive component of the performance text, and this implies a different understanding of the spectator's role in the linguistic and/or production text, what are the implications for dramaturgy and specifically its political function as a structure instituting aesthetic 'responsibility'? It is precisely this re-configuration of the role of the spectator from passive witness to active partner, as Lehmann observes, that has led to an unavoidable association with the criteria of mass communication.⁷³ 'Media reality' and changed conditions of social communication as a result of new technologies have clearly impacted on the development and reception of forms of theatre and their subsequent classification as a medium.

'Inter-Arts': the logic of funding aesthetic development

In Australia, this has manifested in the discussion of 'hybrid' forms of performance as part of new media arts practice, although its formal origins, as Keith Gallasch observes, are found in radical departures from conventional models of theatre, dance and opera.⁷⁴ New media arts and the multiplicity of media and disciplines implied by 'hybridity' constitute an expansive field of inquiry. Furthermore, it potentially subsumes examples of postdramatic theatre and suggests a technological platform. The New Media Arts Board (NMAB) of the Australia Council for the Arts, for example, clarified its broad area of practice in its policy statement by stipulating that interdisciplinary art

describes a process where artists collaborate and combine conventional artforms to create new forms of artistic expression ... It does not refer to the theme of the work. There is no necessity for a technological component in ... interdisciplinary art.⁷⁵

On 8 December 2004 the Australia Council announced as part of its most recent re-structure the dissolution of the NMAB, the re-direction of its responsibility to the Visual Arts/Craft Board and the Music Board, and the establishment of an Inter-Arts Office to distribute applications to the relevant traditional artform section of the Australia Council. It is a decision that demonstrates the significance of artform definition in the allocation of financial resources and raises serious issues for the future development of new forms of theatre, particularly in light of the stronghold of the dramatic model as a standard aesthetic dominating the theatre industry, as well as other forms of practice distinct from a conventional artform model. In his report on a meeting held on 24 January 2005 to discuss the dissolution of the NMAB, Gallasch stated:

Above all there were feelings of imminent loss: of identity (new media and hybrid arts were being un-named, un-represented by an artform board and at Council level), of expertise (the accumulated knowledge of NMAB), of coherence and continuity (the forms scattered to other artform boards). Finally, the restructure was felt to parallel the growing conservatism of Australian society, here with the return to the fundamentals of traditional artform categories. I described the key issue as not being about money ... But the very standing of the forms was at stake if their names were to be erased or relegated to the small print.⁷⁶

Approximately ten years after the formation of the Hybrid Arts Committee in the mid-1990s as part of the Performing Arts Board, the Australia Council had disbanded the NMAB on the basis that 'It's not ... a board which validates an artform', in the words of former Chief Executive, Jennifer Bott.⁷⁷ For Gallasch, this consigned a range of practices to the 'unnameable' and it reflects a return to the language used to describe the first collection of performance texts published in Australia. At a time when the critical project of adequately identifying developments difficult to categorise according to established paradigms attains increasing urgency, Lehmann's concept of 'postdramatic theatre' has the potential to promote the visibility of new forms of theatre in relation to the traditional artform category of 'theatre' by specifically alluding to the medium of practice and the literary genre of drama.

In conclusion, Lehmann's concept of 'postdramatic theatre' offers a theoretical framework that provides clarity to an area rich in aesthetic

exploration and arguably vulnerable in many respects in Australia – vulnerable as a result of prevailing standards of media critique, the allocation of subsidy and the wide-ranging semantic implications of the term ‘performance’ and, more recently and specific to an Australian context, the expression ‘new media’. For a majority of spectators, a comprehensible story is intrinsic to the concept of theatre and, in contrast to the expressions ‘performance’ or ‘contemporary theatre’, the term ‘postdramatic theatre’ arguably has the capacity to resonate more precisely for the broader community a practice that challenges the model of dramatic theatre and, in doing so, expands conceptions of the theatre medium. Many Australian artists have been historically marginalised for producing theatre that departs from the dramatic model, and Lehmann’s project attempts to bridge this disjunction. Unlike the increasing recognition and multi-lateral co-production opportunities that supported the emergence of artists like the US playwright Richard Maxwell or the Polish director Krzysztof Warlikowski, Australian theatre artists producing new forms of theatre struggle for international partnerships as a result of a lack of local performance platforms, critical dialogue and government funding for the arts. At a one-day symposium held in conjunction with The Performance Space’s twenty-first birthday, former director of the Sydney Festival Anthony Steel phrased the issue in the following way, and it is a fitting conclusion to an article addressing the question of contextualising a ‘new’ theatre landscape in Australia within a broader discourse concerning international developments in the theatre medium:

Very seldom do governments and funding bodies talk about the arts in philosophical terms, and it is that debate that is so urgently needed.⁷⁸

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Geoffrey Milne for his insightful comments and support in relation to this article, and my thanks for the anonymous reader’s input. In addition, I would like to thank Karen Jürs-Munby for her generous and invaluable email exchange with regard to Hans-Thies Lehmann’s book.

NOTES

- 1 Marvin Carlson, review of *Postdramatic Theatre*, by Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Theatre Research International* 31.3 (2006): 315. In his review, Carlson points to the central position that Lehmann’s theory occupies in recent German and Continental theatre theory.

- 2 Richard James Allen and Karen Pearlman, eds, *Performing the unNameable: An Anthology of Australian Performance Texts* (Redfern: Currency Press in association with *RealTime*, 1999) xi.
- 3 Gay McAuley, ‘Performance Studies: Definitions, Methodologies, Future Directions’, *Australasian Drama Studies* 39 (2001): 12.
- 4 See Elinor Fuchs, *The Death of Character: Perspectives on Theatre after Modernism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996) 79–80.
- 5 Denise Varney, review of *Postdramatic Theatre*, by Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Performance Paradigm* 3 (2007) <<http://www.performanceparadigm.net>>.
- 6 *Ibid.*
- 7 McAuley 17.
- 8 Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. Karen Jürs-Munby (London and New York: Routledge, 2006) 33 (original emphasis).
- 9 See Stephen J. Bottoms, ‘The Efficacy/Effeminacy Braid: Unpicking the Performance Studies/ Theatre Studies Dichotomy’. *Theatre Topics* 13.2 (2003): 173–87.
- 10 McAuley 15.
- 11 Romeo Castellucci, ‘The *Oresteia* through the Looking-glass’, *Theaterschrift* 11 (1997): 193.
- 12 Bottoms 173.
- 13 Lehmann (2006) 85.
- 14 David Savran, ‘Choices Made and Unmade’, *Theater* 31.2 (2001): 91.
- 15 Lehmann (2006) 144.
- 16 Michael Fried qtd in Bottoms 180.
- 17 Peggy Phelan, ‘The Ontology of Performance: Representation without Reproduction’, in *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) 148.
- 18 Varney.
- 19 Lehmann (2006) 17.
- 20 Erika Fischer-Lichte qtd in Janelle Reinelt, ‘The Politics of Discourse: Performativity Meets Theatricality’, *SubStance* # 98/99 31.2–3 (2002): 207. See also Erika Fischer-Lichte, ‘Introduction: Theatricality: A Key Concept in Theatre and Cultural Studies’, *Theatre Research International* 20.2 (1995): 85–9.
- 21 Reinelt 207.
- 22 Keith Gallasch, ‘Australian Contemporary Performance: An Introduction’, in *In Repertoire: A Guide to Australian Contemporary Performance* (Sydney South: *RealTime* for the Australia Council for the Arts, 2001) 38.
- 23 Heka Gilbert, *Sightlines: Race, Gender, and Nation in Contemporary Australian Theatre* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) 3.
- 24 McAuley 7.

- 25 *Ibid* 8.
- 26 Veronica Kelly, ed., 'Old Patterns, New Energies', in *Our Australian Theatre in the 1990s* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998) 6.
- 27 This is not to overlook the more recent volumes on contemporary Australian performance and the theatre landscape published by Rodopi as part of its Australian Playwrights series, including Geoffrey Milne's *Theatre Australia (Un)limited: Australian Theatre since the 1950s* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2004) and Peta Tait's *Body Shows: Australian Viewings of Live Performance* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 2000), or Helena Grehan's *Mapping Cultural Identity in Australian Performance* (Brussels: PIE-Peter Lang, 2001) and Peta Tait's *Converging Realities: Feminism in Australian Theatre* (Sydney: Currency Press, 1994). For a survey of critical and historical studies, see also Kelly 9–10.
- 28 In addition to Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins' specific application of postcolonial theory in *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) and Helen Gilbert's *Sightlines: Race, Gender, and Nation in Contemporary Australian Theatre* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), see also Jane Goodall's 'Seduction and The Sydney Front', *Canadian Theatre Review* 74 (1993): 32–4, for a discussion of the question of identity politics and postcolonialism in relation to The Sydney Front's production *Don Juan* or Laura Ginters' chapter in Rachel Fensham and Denise Varney's *The Dolls' Revolution: Australian Theatre and Cultural Imagination* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2005) for a discussion of postcolonialism in relation to Beatrix Christian's work.
- 29 See Peta Tait, 'Introduction: A/live Performance', in Tait (2000) 1–11, or Sarah Miller, 'A Question of Silence – Approaching the Condition of Performance', in Nick Waterlow, ed., *25 Years of Performance Art in Australia* (Sydney: Ivan Dougherty Gallery, 1994) 7–12.
- 30 Virginia Baxter qtd in Kerrie Schaefer (1999), *The Politics of Poaching in Postmodern Performance: A Case Study of the Sydney Front's 'Don Juan' in Rehearsal and Performance* (Dissertation: University of Sydney, 1999) 96.
- 31 Barrie Kosky qtd in Kelly 6.
- 32 Gerhard Fischer, ed., *The Mudrooroo/Müller Project: A Theatrical Casebook* (Kensington: University of New South Wales, 1993) 15.
- 33 John McCallum, 'The Post-dramatic Stage', *The Australian*, 2 January 2007: 12.
- 34 John Baylis, ed., 'Deconstruction in the Theatre/Deconstruction of the Theatre', *Spectator Burns: Performance/Theory* 1 ([c. 1987]): 34.
- 35 This is not to ignore the touring history of Stalker Theatre Company, Strange Fruit and Performing Lines – particularly in light of its 2001 and 2002 tour of *The Theft of Sita* – or the significant body of Australian work presented by the Zürcher Theater Spektakel under the artistic direction of Maria Magdalena Schwaegermann. Hebbel Theater (Berlin), Künstlerhaus Mousonturm (Frankfurt-am-Main) and Festival Kunsten Festival des Arts (Brussels) have all presented William Yang, and the Hebbel Theater presented the Elision

- Ensemble's Sonorous Bodies* in 2002 and *Yuè Ling Jié (Moon Spirit Feasting)* in 2003; Yang and Elision were presented at the Hebbel Theater by Schwaegermann. For a description of these performances in the context of an analysis of transnational theory see Margaret Hamilton, 'Re-visioning Australia: Directions in Contemporary Performance', in Renate Brosch and Rüdiger Kunow, eds, *Transgressions: Cultural Interventions in the Global Manifold (Trac: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2005)* 59–72. It is worth noting that Fensham and Varney describe the contribution of Australian women playwrights and directors as being of export quality (2005: 329) but, in the last fifteen years, limited Australian material has been presented in Europe – as discrete from Britain – although the production of Daniel Keene's work in France is an exception and Schwaegermann's ongoing interest in Australian artists since the late 1990s has significantly increased presentation opportunities for artists from Australia. For an analysis of the approach of European presenters and producers and the strategies of Australian policy-makers abroad, see Margaret Hamilton, 'International Fault-lines: Directions in Contemporary Australian Performance and the New Millennium', in Elizabeth Schafer and Susan Bradley Smith, eds, *Playing Australia: Australian Theatre and the International Stage* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003) 180–94.
- 36 Kirsten Herkenrath, ed., *Hebbel: tanz.musik.theater* (Berlin: Hebbel-Theater, 2000) 7.
- 37 Sarah Miller qtd in Virginia Baxter, ed., *Playworks: Telling Time*, Proceedings of the Playing with Time Festival, 13–15 October 1995 (Sydney South: Playworks, 1996) 3.
- 38 Ian Maxwell, 'Introductory Essay: Advocating Australian Arts', in John Clark, Peter McCallum and Ian Maxwell, eds, *Australian Arts Where the Bloody Hell Are You? Australian Arts in an International Context*, Proceedings of a Symposium at the University of Sydney, 8 December 2006 (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 2007) 19 (original emphasis).
- 39 Daryl Buckley in Clark, McCallum and Maxwell 35.
- 40 Hilary Crampton qtd in Richard Murphet, 'Fabre and the Anxiety of Formlessness', *RealTime* 58 (2003–04): 5.
- 41 Neil Jillett, 'It's a Shambles. A Bloody Shambles', review of *I Am Blood* by Jan Fabre, *Sunday Age*, 19 October 2003: 8.
- 42 Helen Thomson, 'A Grab Bag that Fails to Grip', review of *Total Masala Summer* by Michael Laub and Remote Control Productions, *The Age*, 2 November 2002: 27.
- 43 Kelly 10.
- 44 Lehmann (2006) 20.
- 45 McAnley 7.
- 46 See 'Dramaturgies Now' (<www.realtimearts.net>) and 'The Dramaturgies Project', *RealTime* 70 (2006): 1–8.

- 47 Anne Marsh, *Body and Self: Performance Art in Australia 1969–92* (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1993) 203.
- 48 *Ibid.*
- 49 See Lehmann (2006) 134–5.
- 50 Richard Schechner used the term ‘postdramatic theatre’ to describe happenings in his discussion of the incompatibility between established methods of analysis and non-Aristotelian forms of playwriting and performance in *Performance Theory*, rev. edn (New York and London: Routledge, 1988) 21.
- 51 Peter Szondi, *Theory of Modern Drama*, ed. and trans. Michael Hays (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987) 8.
- 52 Johannes Birringer qtd in Karen Jürs-Munby’s ‘Introduction’ to Lehmann 14.
- 53 Jürs-Munby in Lehmann 14.
- 54 Lehmann (2006) 141.
- 55 *Ibid* 144 (original emphasis).
- 56 Tait (2000) 2.
- 57 Philip Auslander, *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999).
- 58 See Phelan 146–66.
- 59 Lehmann (2006) 25.
- 60 Jürs-Munby in Lehmann (2006) 1.
- 61 See Lehmann (2006) 48–57.
- 62 Martin Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, 3rd edn (London: Methuen, 2001) 23–4.
- 63 Lehmann (2006) 54.
- 64 *Ibid* 55.
- 65 Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, ed. and trans. John Willett, 2nd edn (London: Methuen, 1964) 179.
- 66 *Ibid* 179.
- 67 Lehmann (2006) 22.
- 68 Hans-Thies Lehmann, ‘From Logos to Landscape: Text in Contemporary Dramaturgy’, *Performance Research* 2.1 (1997): 57.
- 69 Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996) 13.
- 70 Lehmann (2006) 129.
- 71 Lehmann (1997) 58 (original emphasis).
- 72 Miller (1994) 10.
- 73 Lehmann (2006) 136.
- 74 Keith Gallasch, ‘Hybrid Art: Hybrid Nation’, in *In Repertoire: A Guide to Australian New Media Art* (Sydney South: *RealTime* for the Australia Council for the Arts, 2003) 8.

- 75 **Australia Council for the Arts, *Support for the Arts Handbook* (Strawberry Hills: Australia Council for the Arts, 2003) 82.**
- 76 **Keith Gallasch, ‘Australia Council Unplugged’, *RealTime* 65 (2005) 4.**
- 77 **Jennifer Bott qtd in Gallasch (2005) 4.**
- 78 **Anthony Steel in ‘Performance Space Turns 21: More Than a Building’, *RealTime* 64 (2004): 11.**