شرکت کننده یا تماشاگر: بیننده تئاتر در گذر زمان

(علمی ـ پژوهشی)[*]

ناهید فخر شفائی

مربی گروه زبانهای خارجی دانشگاه شهید

باهنر کرمان

چکیده

تماشاگر تئاتر امروز در مقایسه با تماشاگر تئاتر دوره های گذشته بسیار منفعل است.این تماشاگردر طول اجرای نمایش در تاریکی، بدون هیچ گونه تماسی با بازیگر، در صندلیی که حرکت فیزیکی او را محدود می کند می نشیند وهیچ نقشی در نمایش ندارد. از نظر تاریخی این انفعا ل جدید است زیرا تماشاچی در تئاتر یونان باستان ،قرون وسطی و رنسانس نقشی بسیار مهم تر از تماشاگر امروز داشت. در یونان باستان بین تماشاگر و بازیگر مرز مشخصی وجود نداشت و تماشاگر در واقع شرکت کننده بود زیرا در فرهنگ آتن در قرن پنجم پیش از میلاد تمام جنبه های زندگی حالت نمایشی داشت. در این جامعه تئاتر برای تماشاگر چیزی اجتناب ناپذیر و جزئی از زندگی روزمره بود. در تئاتر قرون وسطی نیز ،پس از بیرون رفتن نمایش از حیطه

قدرت کلیسا و اجرای نمایش در سطح شهر رابطه تنگاتنگی بین بازیگر ـکه از مردم عادی بود ـو تماشاگر شکل گرفت . تماشاگر تئاتر رنسانس نیز که از نظر فیزیکی بسیار به بازیگر نزدیک بود به شدید ترین شکل ممکن احساسات خود را نشان می داد. اما با گذشت زمان شرکت تماشاگر در نمایش به تشویق بازیگر و کف زدن محدود شد . بازیگر و تماشاگر به علت زیاد شدن فاصله طبقا تی از هم فاصله گرفتند و این جدایی با مشخص شدن جایگاه تماشاگران و تثبیت آنها روی صندلی های ثابت، نمود فیزیکی پیدا کرد.تئاتر رئالیستی که سعی داشت روی صحنه یک دنیای واقعی خلق کندو تئاتر حماسی که سعی در فاصله گذاری بین تماشاگر و نمایش داشت ، هیچ کدام نتوانست شکاف بین تماشاگر و بازیگر را بین ببرد. با ظهور تئاتر پوچی امکان نزدیک شدن رابطه بین تماشاگر و بازیگر به حداقل ممکن رسید زیرا در این تئاتر شخصیتها غیر واقعی،غیر ملموس و بدون هویت هستند و در جهانی بی معنا زندگی می کنند که در آن کلام مفهومی ندارد واز این روامکان همذات پنداری تماشاگر با شخصیت وجود ندارد.گرایشات ضد تئاتری در تئاترمعاصر مانع از ایجاد ارتباط بین تماشاگر و بازیگر می شود ، تئاتر جنبه آیینی خود را از دست می دهد و هر گونه تکنیک اجرایی برای درگیر کردن تماشاگر در نمایش عملاً با شکست مواجه می شود.

واژگان کلیدی:تئاتر امروز،تماشاگر، شرکت کننده ،قرون وسطی،رنسانس.

Participants or Spectators: Theater Audience Through Ages

Modern theaters are theaters of indoors were the audience sit in comfortable chairs in darkness and watch the action in a passive state. In this theater the actor and the audience are thoroughly separated. The audience never climbs up the stage and the actor rarely ever goes to the auditorium. There is little, if any, possibility of contact between the audience and the actor. Throughout the performance, the audience is generally expected not to make any reactions. When the play ends the audience would normally react only by clapping .A highly enthusiastic and exaggerated reaction could be a standing ovation. The hushed audience who peoples modern theaters nowadays has probably no conception of the riotous audience in the past who was not a mere spectator, but rather a participant in the action. Focusing for the most part on theater in England, the present study reviews three significant periods in the growth and development of Western drama – ancient Greek theater, Medieval drama and Elizabethan theater in which the audience was most active, and moves to

the twentieth century drama in which the audience has become thoroughly disempowered.

Ancient Greek society where drama first originated is the best example of a theater where audiences were active participants. The theater of that time is an example of democratic theater because it gave the audience the opportunity to participate in the action freely. Participation was not simply limited to showing extremities of emotion like laughing, clapping, hissing, kicking the benches or eating food and throwing it, as this was done freely by the audience. Participation went beyond this definition as performances at that time turned into opportunities for the whole town to gather and see itself represented in the dramatic competitions.(Rehm, p.30) And the vastness of what has remained of the seating area is a physical proof that ancient drama was community theater.(Sowerby, p.79) Ancient Greek theater was a community theater because it was not separable from the life of the period and it grew in a culture in which each and every aspect of life had something forensic about it.

Rehm observes that Ancient Greek society had a "performance culture" in which drama was only one kind of performance among other performances. *Symposia*-gatherings

for food and wine-which turned into occasions for performance, political gatherings in which the relation between the speaker and the audience was similar to the relation between the actors and the audience and in which the seating bank around the speaker's platform was modeled on the cavea surrounding the orchestra in Athenian theater, the law courts which turned the plaintiff and the defendant into actors each trying to win the jury audience, public festivals held in honor of Dionysus in which ritual cries were raised after the sacrifice and which included athletic or musical contests arranged as performances, all and all had something theatrical about them.

In addition to these, there were pan-Hellenic gatherings which were actually athletic or poetry and musical competitions, Homeric recitations in which the rhapsode became an actor when reciting from memory, and-to enter a more private realm- rituals of wedding and funerals which contained the basic elements of drama: singing and dancing. (pp.3-11)

Simon Goldhill also points out that the culture of ancient Greece was a "performance culture" because of social institutions such as the gymnasium, the symposium, the law court, and the assemblies which were all theatrical in nature.

The theater which emerged in such a culture was a political theater because nearly all members of the society or their representatives were present in performances: the auditorium placed 14000 to 17000 audiences. There are even evidences of how the seatings were divided between the members of the audience: special seatings were devoted to the executive council of 500 men, war orphans, members of different tribes, the priests, foreigners, metics-non citizen resident aliens-and even women and slaves.[1](PP.56-68) A theatrical performance in ancient Athens was not seen by the elite or any specific social group or class. It was seen by the whole community and it belonged to the community. This is why all critics have stressed the communal nature of theatrical performances of that time. Levi ,for example, who like Rehm and Goldhill stresses the affinity between theater in the ancient world and religious, political and private ceremonies.(p.157)

Obviously the Greeks felt that theater is life and life is theater. For the Greeks, these were not two separate entities. To understand why theater in ancient Greece had the high status accorded to it and why the audience enjoyed this feeling of participation in the plays and oneness with the actors, many factors should be taken into consideration. In addition to the cultural life of the period which made theater

an indispensable aspect of Athenian life, Goldhill argues that the shape of the theater is an important element in getting the audience involved.(p.69) The theater was an open-air auditorium which used sloping hillsides for its terraced seating. The theatron, rising in tiers in a vast semi-circle up the side of the city enabled the audience who were spread along the hillside to see each other as well as the actors. And this, according to Rehm made the members of the audience aware of their importance.(pp.38-39) It was possible only due to lack of artificial lighting, as performances took place during the day. From where they were sitting, members of the audience dominated the orchestra on which the chorus sang and danced and the actors performed. One has to also consider the fact that interior scenes, which are so common in our indoor theaters, were non- existent in Greek tragedies. In Greek plays, the action took place in front of palaces or temples or other outdoor settings. To the Greek audience, this was quite natural probably because public affairs at that time, of whatever nature, were held outdoors. Mackintosh also argues that the importance of theatre architecture in activating audience participation has been neglected, but observes that our starting point for discovering this interrelation could be the theatre of Shakespeare.(p.7)

Another important factor in the involvement and participation of the audience is the presence of the chorus. In its singing and dancing and in the ritualistic effect that it creates, the chorus becomes the representative of the audience on the stage as it allows the audience to merge in the spell of the action by identifying with the suffering tragic hero. Nietzsche calls this identification of the audience with the satyr –like chorus "dramatic proto-phenomenon". This actually means the transformation of the audience into the satyr-like chorus. Giving up their individuality, the audience enter the character of the chorus and as the chorus they enter the character of the god-head, thus transcending their own suffering. (Nietzsche, pp.58-64) The members of the audience are then supposed to have regarded the chorus as their own representative or more specifically, representatives of the different tribes to which they belonged. (Greene, p.9)

In the Middle Ages, like the ancient Greece, drama had a communal nature. The whole town accepted the responsibility of the production of religious drama on an annual holy day and divided into different guilds, each guild taking upon itself the production of one scene from the bible: from the Creation and the Fall to the Incarnation, life, death , and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Like Greek plays, Medieval plays had a

ritualistic effect: the whole town was involved in the production and performance of the plays. As Spiers notes, these productions were much more important to the townspeople than we might imagine today.(p.46) The plays were religious celebrations or "tourist attractions" inspired by elevated pious feelings and national pride and are impossible for us to reproduce today..(Twycross, p.37) At that time, the members of the audience

were regarded as active participants rather than spectators: they were so integral to the play that

actors depended on their presence and addressed them frequently, asking them at times to "make room".

Hans –Jurgen Diller suggests that addressing the audience creates a link between the dramatic world and the ordinary world. Word, according to him, is the means of getting from one world to another. In Medieval drama, he distinguishes three different forms of address: straddling, framing, and homiletic. In straddling, the speaker wavers between the dramatic and the ordinary world, and the audience is at times seen as belonging to the dramatic world. In framing, the presenter or prolocutor addresses the audience from the ordinary world and thus frames the action. In homiletic addressing, the preacher who is outside the action draws an

analogy between the ordinary world and the dramatic world. (pp.156-165) Although Diller only hints at the modern theatrical convention of "the fourth wall", the reader realizes that the reason for the involvement of the audience of the Medieval drama is that in this theater, unlike modern drama, the ordinary world was not annihilated in favor of the dramatic world and the audience was invited to inhabit both or to shift between the two.

In the theater of the Middle Ages the dividing lines between audience and actor were not very clear. Spiers takes the view that people attending a Medieval performance should be called worshippers or at least participants and the actors only the more active participants because they were really "impersonators in a ritual", there being no distinct line between the actors and the audience.(p.45) This merging of the audience and the actors draws attention to the staging of plays at that time. Something specific in the plays must have urged the audience to get involved in the production of the plays. Probably the most important factor is the place of production. The plays were performed in church-yards, market squares, tavern-gardens, inn-yards, open spaces or pageant-wagons. These were places where crowds normally thronged. There were no invitations and no advance booking

for these performances. There was also no switch-off lighting, no curtains, and no numbered seats. These plays were suddenly performed in front of ordinary people who had no preparation for the performance and were not supposed to be well-behaved. It is suggested that performing the plays in places that were known to the audience made them "an extension of every day life" to the audience, something which belonged to their world and was not a commentary upon it or an evasion of it.(Tydeman, p.170)

The most common stage in the Middle Ages, if the plays were not performed in a hall, was the Booth stage. This was a raised playing area consisting of a portable platform divided in two by a curtained frame and barrels on which the platform was placed. This stage was erected in the open air in a place like a market –square and had sets of steps leading to the market-place or the inn-yard, allowing the actors to move freely among the audience. Mapping the staging of *Mankynde* with its three sets of steps leading to the inn-yard, Tydeman explains in detail how this relatively complicated system of entrances and exits creates a feeling of intimacy between the audience and the actors because it allows the actors to appear at will among the audience. "The ease of passage between the stage and the auditorium induces a stronger faith in the

characters' existence than if they had appeared as make-belief figures of no substance posturing behind an invisible pane of glass illuminated by mysterious means." (p.52)

In Elizabethan theater, like the Medieval theater, the stage was mainly a platform stage and the audience surrounded the stage on three sides, and sometimes even on the fourth. The stage which run far out into the auditorium was erected in an open air octagonal amphitheater that could seat up to 3000 spectators. A typical theater like the Globe Theater was three stories high with a diameter of approximately 100 feet. It is commonly accepted that the design of Elizabethan theaters was based on the configuration of the inn yards which provided good performance spaces in the Middle Ages.[2] The audience saw the play as a scene enacted in their midst and this made them feel intimate with the actors. Some of the members of the audience who had to stand in order to watch the play-namely "the groundlings"-were physically so near the stage that they could have jumped on the stage if the mood took them. They would stand in the yard and eat, drink, fight, cheer, hiss, and throw things like eggs or apples at an offending actor. In short, they would show extremities of emotion.

Bristol relates the English Renaissance drama to the traditions of carnival[3] and maintains that in Renaissance England theater was not just a literary production but a representation of the festive life of the period, "a celebration and reaffirmation of collective traditions lived out by ordinary people in their ordinary existence.(pp.3-4)This function of drama is similar to its function in the ancient Greece and Middle Ages: a drama which is inseparable from the life ordinary people live. Indeed in Elizabethan drama popular taste played an important role in the formation of the theater of the period. It is suggested that Drama is the point where humanism and popular taste meet .This means that the taste of the ordinary people determined the nature of plays which were entertaining. Although some plays were written for the elite to be performed at court or in universities, the majority of the plays were written for the groundlings who populated commercial theaters. Instead of the critics, these groundlings judged the value of the plays. The plays, then, didn't appeal to the tastes of the intellectuals but were rather entertaining.(Salinger, pp.54-55) Although groundlings were illiterate and preferred clown-acts and bear baiting to tragedies, they were an integral part of the drama, their existence essential to the performance.(Foakes,p.9)

Another reason why Renaissance theater was interwoven into the social life of the period was the social status of the actors: actors belonged to the same social class as the audiences and their living conditions were very unsteady and insecure for various reasons. In the sixteenth century, actors usually formed strolling groups and went about the country wherever they would find welcome. This made their life and carrier subject to changes of all kind. Foakes maintains that life for acting companies could become dangerous and risky if their relations with the current owner of the theater became strained or if they were censored for an offence –which happened frequently. Other important factors were the plague and fire which would break acting companies and send them to the country, never to return.(pp 41-42) Abercrombie and Longhurst also point out that in early theater there was no social distinction between actors and audiences and it was since the seventeenth century that actors started to be accepted into higher social circles.[4](p.48)

The use of language in sixteenth century drama also intensified audience participation. Unlike modern audience of realistic plays who watch the play from the removed "fourth wall", Sixteenth century audiences were not involved in any such illusions. They were addressed frequently by the actors

through the conventions of aside and soliloquy. These forms of address which depended on the presence of the audience, like the forms of address in Medieval drama, encouraged the audience to participate in the action freely.

After the Elizabethan age drama declined as Puritanism advanced. The actors were declared rogues and vagabonds and stage galleries were demolished. The stigma of dishonor came to rest not only on the actor, but also on the playwright and the theater, on the whole profession. Although with the Restoration theaters began to revive and actors started to thrive again, drama never regained its former splendor. With the Restoration the taste for drama also changed: the intellectuals showed a dislike for the popular theater which had entertained their forefathers. There was a gulf for the first time between the audience and the actors. No longer did the taste of the groundlings determine the form and the content of the plays. The sentimental comedy of the next age with its avoidance of "vulgar" subjects and its preference for "lofty" themes only widened the gulf. In the nineteenth century drama went into complete decline with the dominance of the Romantic spirit. There was something inherently anti-theatrical in the Romantic attitude to drama, for although Romantics wrote plays, these were closet plays, written only

to be read, not performed. When performed, these plays which were unreal and lacked in vitality, could not communicate with the audience. Drama was then declared to be on its deathbed when the emergence of Ibsen on the European scene gave it new life. Indeed the period between the closing of theaters with the advent of Puritanism and the recreation of drama in the late nineteenth century has been seen by some critics as the "dark ages " of drama.5

Although Ibsen revolutionized drama in both subject matter and language, the innovations could not restore to drama the status it had enjoyed in the sixteenth century. There was already a gap between the audience and the actors that was unbridgeable. The change from verse to prose and the focus on the "problematic" only alienated the audience the more. Ironically, as plays became more and more realistic and nearer to the audience in both subject matter and language, the gap between the audience and actors widened. The audience had already changed into decorous, complaint, captive souls who booked in advance and who sat comfortably on sprung seats. The realistic tendencies of the age were limited to a photographic reproduction of reality. The stage appeared not as a stage but as a room, the stage property was to be seen as an authentic part of a particular

everyday environment. And the stage was separated from the auditorium by a proscenium arch. The apron stage of the sixteenth century which enabled the audience to be physically near the audience was replaced by the "picture-frame" stage which had the effect of framing the action on the stage in a three-sided box set and virtually separated the actor from the audience. The proscenium's "fourth wall" through which the audience peered and was invisible by convention, alienated the audience, in spite of the illusion of reality it created. In addition to the staging of the plays, the passivity of the audience could be due to the inherent weakness of the realistic drama. As Raymond Williams argues, realistic drama is concerned with appearances only. All it tries to do is to recreate, on the stage, a world that looks exactly like the real one: real-looking rooms, real-looking people, real-sounding dialogue, etc. This is done at the expense of excluding the inner and the inarticulate which are also part of reality. Thus the world on the stage, looking so real might in fact be devoid of reality.(p.533)

Epic theater which was another major movement in the split drama of the modern age was also unable to bridge the gap between the audience and the spectator. Although it differed in many significant ways from the traditional theater,

it could not change the passive attitude of the audience. Intending to create a different effect on the audience, Brecht developed a series of anti-illusive techniques to jar the audience out of the story. Such techniques included flooding the stage with harsh white light and leaving the stage lamps in full view of the audience, reducing the stage property to the minimum, making use of symbolic scenery, using episodic montage where self-contained scenes were juxtaposed, interrupting the action at key moments to drive home an important message and employing placards and songs. Moreover, he instructed the actors to merely demonstrate the actions of the characters they portray and not to identify with their roles. The costumes were worn by actors, rather than characters, thus embodying the fine line between illusion and reality. This is a dramatic tradition that makes use of narrative elements, in particular narrative diegesis, a tradition which is basically anti-theatrical. Although Brecht did not directly seek audience participation, he wanted them to be more active than the audience of the dramatic theater. This is why he distinguishes between the dramatic theater' s spectator and the epic theater's spectator:

   "The dramatic theatre's spectator says: Yes, I have felt like that too_ Just like me_

It's only natural_ It'll never change_ The sufferings of this man appall me, because

They are inescapable_ That's great art; it all seems the most obvious thing in the

World_ I weep when they weep, I laugh when they laugh.

The epic theater's spectator says: I'd never have thought it_ That's not the way_

That's extraordinary, hardly believable_ It's got to stop _ The sufferings of this man

appall me, because they are unnecessary_ That's great art: nothing obvious in it _I

laugh when they weep, I weep when they laugh…." (Drain,p.113)

The effect Brecht created in his epic theater was somehow different from the effect created

by the dramatic theater, but the two movements were not essentially different .Innes holds to the view that although Brecht defines epic theater against realistic drama, the traditions of epic theatre and realistic drama are not opposing traditions.(p.5)

The theater of the Absurd, anti-theatrical as it is by nature, brought about the final blow to the relation between the audience and the actors. Although it seemed to shake the

audiences out of their comfortable, conventional life of everyday concerns, in reality it made them thoroughly passive. For one thing, Theater of the Absurd distrusted language as a means of communication.

It distorted, parodied, and broke down conventional speech and rejected the possibility of communication between the characters. The dialogue was meaningless and repetitive in this theater .At times, in order to show the impossibility of communication the playwright replaced silence for language, a thoroughly anti-realistic tendency in drama. As Bradbury and McFarlane observe, although in earlier plays characters had fallen silent, been horrified or shocked, it was in the modernist theater that these moments found theatrical expression and emphasis.(p.507) Moreover the world created on the stage bore little resemblance to reality. It subverted logic and relished the unexpected and logically impossible. It was an allegorical and mythological world, closely related to the world of dreams and nightmares. The stage sets also revealed a meaningless universe in which human values were irrelevant. But above all, it was the grotesque characterization which distanced the audience from the action. The characters which had no recognizable traits and were only mechanical puppets had no definite identity with which the audience

could identify. In a theater in which the character has become only a fabrication, it is impossible to think of iconographic figures who talk past each other and inhabit a shapeless world to be able to invite the audience into participation. The theater of the absurd deliberately rejects everything that is theatrical about theater and deprives theater of its ability to contact masses. Ionesco announces that he wants to "strip dramatic action of all that is particular to it: the plot, the accidental characteristics of characters , their names, their social setting and historical background, the apparent reasons of the dramatic conflict, and all the justifications, explanations and logic of the conflict." He distances the theater from the public because he believes that "to try and popularize the theater is in the long run to vulgarize it, to simplify it and to turn it into something rudimentary." (Drain, pp 53-54)

The anti-theatricality of the theater of the absurd is not the prerogative of modernist theater. Tracing "the bias against play" in Western culture to Plato's time and arguing that other cultures have not been so ambivalent towards play, Richard Schechner observes that Plato almost succeeded in banishing the poets, playwrights and actors from his ideal Republic: even today playing is considered frivolous and unimportant and a mere pastime in comparison to important

things like work.(p.101) Puchner also relates this anti-theatrical spirit to Plato's objection to mimesis and the belief about the immorality of the theater and the negative effect it is supposed to have on the audience. But he insists that in reality this objection to theatricality is based on a fear of the living actor and active audience and a close relation between them. This fear of masses and popular taste shows why the modernists prefer film to the theater. In the film the actor is dehumanized and in a sense dead, there being no possibility of contact between the actor and the audience.(pp.1-20)[6] As dramatic forms are now represented in movie form, television form and radio form, the audience do not encounter live actors and the possibilities of communication and identification are reduced to minimum; the privatization of performance with the advent of mass media has made reception of a great number of dramatic production largely domestic. In circumstances like this interaction becomes meaningless. The avant-garde effort to encourage audience participation and to produce a theater which is basically theatrical could not become a decisive factor in the history of theater.

Among directors who experimented with various strategies to relate the actor and the audience to each other,

Grotowski is probably the most significant. These strategies, as Grotowski mentions them, include having the actors play among the spectators, building structures among the spectators and including them in the action, neglecting the audience while performing, physically separating the spectators from the actors giving them a downward view to the action using the entire hall as a concrete place thus eliminating the stage auditorium dichotomy, and calling upon the audience as witnesses of an action. These methods were employed to get the audience involved not only psychologically, but also physically. The important thing, according to Grotowski, is to find the proper actor-audience relationship for each specific play. (Schechner, p.220) But the audience's innate passivity in modernist drama, according to Mitter, force Grotowski to contradiction. For, on the one hand, he emphasizes the importance of the audience but on the other hand he regards the actor as the essence of theater. After trying in vain to make the audience participate in the action, he comes to the conclusion that the attempts at making the audience participate have actually been a pressure on the audience and concludes that "exploitation is incompatible with communication.": "Years ago we tried to secure a direct participation of spectators…We reached a point when we

rejected these kind[s] of proceedings, since it was clear that we were exerting pressure, tyranny of sorts…And so we told ourselves: no the spectators should simply be as they are, that is to say witnesses, witnesses of a human act."(p.100) Other attempts, like Meyerhold's "mass theater" and his attempts to take on Wagner's conception of theater as a combination of dialogue, action, music, singing and all that plastic arts have to offer have turned out to be futile efforts in activating the audience. One could also mention Rhodessa Jones's attempts at creating a theatre of the oppressed, an improvisational theatre in which "individual monologues, songs, and group dancing are juxtaposed ; old-time wisdom, myths and spiritual histories are brought into relation with contemporary women, who sometimes stand alone to their individual stories and sometimes sing and dance together en masse." (Fraden, p.9) But interrupting the comfortable passivity of the audience and including them in the action has become an impossibility given the present circumstances of theatre.

Unlike early theater which was bound up with religious observance, modernist theater is deprived of all that is sacred and ritualistic. The theater is a solemn place, the audiences are secular and the actors with their special costumes and language are isolated, inhabiting a restricted world which is

artificially illuminated. No boisterous and riotous audiences. Quoting Webb, Bennett calls this audience a "reactive audience" who accepts his role as receiver and whose passivity is intensified by the conventional theatre architecture, his sitting in darkness and his lack of motion. Through a social contract the spectator accepts his passive role and awaits the unfolding of the action. (p.204) Baz Kershaw also draws attention to the passivity of the audience in the restricted theater of today and observes that audience participation is limited to an applause. He sees applause as a sign of sickness of the theater and holds that as audiences changed from patron to client to costumer and became the mere consumers of the commodity of theater, applause became more and more important and other types of audience engagement ceased to exist. Speaking about the "global democratic deficit", Kershaw holds to the view that there is no democracy in Western theaters, although Western societies are supposed to be democratic societies. The type of audience participation is an affirmation of power and a reestablishment of the status quo. By reacting in predetermined ways audiences subject themselves to culturally dominant systems. The great care that is taken to control audience response and

reaction is indicative of a fascistic attitude in Western theater. (pp.133-144)

Dissatisfaction with the status quo and objection to controlled reactions can change the whole world to a performance to participate in. Actually there are more roles in daily life for everybody to perform than can be realized. If performance is not limited to those forms traditionally known as artistic, then any action that is displayed , focused on or framed could be a performance. Thus all routines, rituals, habits and public entertainments could have something forensic about them and speaking of audience passivity could only have a political connotation.

Notes

1. It is usually believed that in ancient Greek society women lived a life of repression and confinement and were, like the slaves, excluded from the social life of the period. Goldhill admits that he has entered a "hotly contested subject" but tries to prove the presence of women in theatrical performances by drawing analogies between theater and other social festivals in which women were present.

2. Some critics argue that the design of theaters may have come from bear baiting rings that could be found in many parts of London. They draw attention to the similar circular structure of the theaters and bear baiting rings. In these rings, a bear was tied to a post and forced to face packs of dogs. The spectators gambled on how many dogs the bear could kill.

3. About the culture of folk humor and carnival in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Bakhtin in *Rabelais and His World* writes: "In fact, carnival does not know footlights, in the sense that it does not acknowledge any distinction between actors and spectators. Footlights would destroy a carnival, as the absence of footlights would destroy a theatrical performance. Carnival is not a spectacle seen by the people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all people. While carnival lasts, there is no other life outside it. During carnival time life is subject only to its own laws, that is, the laws of its own freedom."(p.7)

4. This of course doesn't mean that the profession of acting is regarded by the whole society to be a respectable profession.

5. William Archer (1856-1924) for example, who was the most influential critic of the New Movement and a translator of Ibsen. In his *The Old Drama and the New* he uses images of light and darkness and images of desert and wasteland throughout the book to contrast new drama with the old or to comment on the new drama. He compares drama in the "dark ages" to a dreary desert broken only by a single oasis: the comedies of Goldsmith and Sheriden.

6. In the last chapter of *The Social History of Art: Naturalism, Impressionism, The Film Age* (pp.236-240) Arnold Hauser, argues that film is as an attempt to produce art for the masses and regards the invention of cinema as the first step in the democratization of art. The film is considered to be even more democratic than drama in the Ancient world because the public is able to "influence the ways of the art directly", because as a medium it is more accessible to the masses and because in the film the middle class can see the fulfillment of its life long dream of transcending its social stratum.

Bibliography

1-Abercrombie, Nicholas and Brian Longhurst.(1998). *Audiences.* London: Sage Publishers.

2-Archer, William. (1923). *The Old Drama and the New: An Essay in Re-Valuation*. Boston: Maynard & Company.

3-Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1984). *Rabelais and His World.* Tras. Helene Iswolsky. Indiana: Indiana   University Press.

4-Bennett, Susan. (1997). *Theatre Audience: A Theory of Production and Reception.* 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

5-Bradbury, Malcom and James McFarlane, Eds. (1987). *Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930.* 7th ed. London: Hazell Watson & Viney.

6-Bristol, Michael D. (1985). *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England.* London: Methuen.

7-Diller, Hans-Jurgen.(۱۹۸۹). "Theatrical Pragmatics: The Actor-Audience Relationship from the Mystery Cycle to the Early Tudor Comedies" In *Comparative Drama.*23 (Summer 1989) No.2, 156-165.

8-Drain, Richard, Ed. (1995). T*wentieth Century Theatre: A Sourcebook.* London, Routledge.

9-Easterling, P.E. (1997). "Form and Performance" In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy.* Ed.P.E. Easterling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10-Foakes, R.A. (1994). "Playhouses and Players" In *The Cambridge Companion to English RenaissanceDrama.* Eds. A.R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway.2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

11-Fraden, Rena. (2001). *Imagining Medea: Theatre for Incarcerated Women.* North Carolina:

University of North Carolina Press.

12-Goldhill, Simon. (1997). "The Audience of Athenian Tragedy" In *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy.*Ed. P.E. Easterling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

13-Green, J.R. (1994). *Theater in Ancient Greek Society.* London: Routledge.

14-Hauser, Arnold. (1999). *The Social History of Art: Naturalism, Impressionism, The Film Age. Trans.* Stanley Godman. 4 vols.3rd Ed. London: Routledge.

15-Innes, Christopher. (1992). *Modern British Drama:1890-1990.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

16-Kershaw, Baz. (2001). "Oh, for Unruly Audiences! Or Patterns of Participation in Twentieth Century Theater". *Modern Drama.*42 (2) 133-154.

17-Levi,Peter. (1986). "Greek Drama" In *The Oxford History of the Classical World.* Eds. John Boardman, Jasper

Griffin and Oswyn Murry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18-Mackintosh, Lain. (1993). *Architecture, Actor and Audience.* London: Routledge.

19-Mitter, Shomit. (1992). *Systems of Rehearsal: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Grotowski and Brook.* Florence: Routledge.

20-Nietzche, Friedrich. (1967). *The Birth of Tragedy and the Case of Wagner.* Trans. Walter Kaufman. New York: Vintage Books.

21-Puchner, Martin.(2002). *Stage Freight: Modernism, Anti-theatricality, and Drama.* Baltimore:The John Hopkins University Press.

22-Rehm, Rush. (1992). *Greek Tragic Theater.* London: Routledge.

23-Schechner, Richard. (2002). Performance Studies: An Introduction. Florence: Routledge.

24-Sowerby, Robin. (1996). *The Greeks: An Introduction to Their Culture.*2ⁿᵈ ed. London: Routledge.

25-Spiers, John. (1969). "A Survey of the Medieval Verse" In *The Pelican Guide to English Literature: The Age of Chaucer.* 9ᵗʰ ed. Ed. Boris Ford. 7vols. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

26-Twycross, Meg. (1994). "The Theatricality of Medieval English Plays" In *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theater.* Ed. Richard Beadle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

27-Tydeman, William. (1986) *English Medieval Theater:1400-1500.* London: Routledge.

28-Williams, Raymond. (1969). "Recent English Drama" In *The Pelican Guide to English Literature: The Modern Age.* vol.7. 9ᵗʰ ed. Ed Boris Ford. 7 vols. Middlesex: Penguin Books.1969.