Modelling the World through Play:

An Exploration in Repurposing, Representation and History Writing[1]

Pavel Drábek

Autobiographical Preamble

At the age of six or seven I found a passion: toy models. It started with simple plastic

maquettes of airplanes then spread to paper models of a great variety: castles, cars, airplanes

(very difficult) and even spacecraft. Later, I loved toy railways, then wooden and

mixed-material functional models of ships, and hoped to progress to aircraft. This passion

lasted until teenage years and then gradually petered out, surviving only calendrically at

Christmastime, cutting out figures for our much-loved Nativity scene with Mikuláš Aleš's *fin*

de siècle prints pasted on plywood. In retrospect, as an anecdotal historian of my own life, I

ought to declare a great fondness for models of all kinds. That would be a history that is

self-explanatory and satisfactory as a story. However – as is consubstantial with models – it

has to be revised. As this essay argues, the purpose of models is never fixed: an essential

feature of a model is the instability of its purpose. I learned much later that my parents

cleverly put me onto models because I had problems with handwriting. After starting primary

school, I was diagnosed with shaking fingers. Model building was a therapeutic way of

---

[1] Dedicated to the memory of Ivo Osolsobě (1928–2012), from a fellow native of Brno, who

– half a lifetime ago, deep in the study of theatre theory in the Radcliffe Camera – realised

that instead of a pilgrimage to Oxford, he might have gone half a dozen stops on the number

32 bus to visit – as he just discovered – the most relevant theatre theorist then alive.

training my fine motor skills. In other words, my passion for models was no more than a pleasurable and enriching by-product of an entirely different purpose.

Let me use (repurpose) this autobiographical anecdote as a model for this essay on the historiography of models in theatre and performance, from a detailed theatre- and performance-specific definition of what a model is and how it relates to representation, through its multiple and even ubiquitous uses in practice, to a discussion of models in historiography. As Marina Warner succinctly put it, "Imaginative forms of the past become moulds that in turn press out the shape of things to come." In her formulation, moulds are synonymous with models, and "in turn" may be read as an expression of the repurposing that is an inherent quality of any model, as I argue in this essay (2017, 39).

What is a Model? A *Theoriography* of Models

The word model is commonly and loosely used as an abstract form that is intended to represent a certain pattern, or to serve as a master for future replication. Even narrowed down to theatre and performance, models are of endless variety. Provisionally, on the basis of their materiality, I divide them into three interconnected categories: (1) material models as objects of theatre and performance historiography, (2) medial models, which sit on a precarious border between materiality and metaphysics, and (3) immaterial or conceptual models that historiography relies upon to practise its purpose.

Models are often seen as tools: speculative, epistemic things – "heuristic devices" (Hesse 1963, 25) – that probe (speculate) into propositions and possibilities of a theory, and give ostensible and self-contained figuration to thought. They have been defined as "any system, whether buildable, picturable, imaginable, or none of these, which has the characteristic in

making a theory *predictive*" (19). However, models are more than that: "A model looks like a tool, but it's not," observed Peter Marx in one of the conferences with this volume's contributors. Juri Lotman defines it as "an analogue of an object of perception that substitutes it in the process of perception," linking models with particular perspectives and ways of seeing: in other words, theory (1967, 250).[2] The relationship between a model and a theory is important, especially for historiographic models. It is also significant to consider the notion of theoriography: a reflection of the perspectives, views and agendas that lie behind the formation of theory. In this sense, Hesse's theory of models is theoriographically utiliarian and instrumental. Her teleology of models is heuristic: "models, like metaphors, are intended to communicate" (1963, 165). However, not all theories of models need to adopt this perspective.

The word theory derives from ancient Greek, *θεωρία* ("action of viewing, contemplation, sight, spectacle," in Hellenistic Greek also "speculation, theory;" its stem "*θεᾶσθαι* to behold, view, contemplate" connects to theatre and its suffix "to see"). Etymologically, model comes from the "Italian *modello* […] denoting a figure made of wood or other materials used to make a mould in metal casting" (*OED*). The relationship between the two is therefore analogous (and similarly problematic) to the distinction between subject and object, the former being ontological, the former having its autonomy outside the subject.

What are models? In the most abstract sense, model is a figure (abstract or physical) of another thing. Herbert Stachowiak, in his *Allgemeine Modelltheorie*, sums up the model as

---

[2] I am grateful to Freddie Rokem and Martin Procházka for their comments on an earlier version of this paper, particularly for drawing my attention to Lotman's *Sign System Studies* (1967).

"the supposedly objective cognitive formation as well as the thought construct that emphasises its subjectivity and perspective" (1973, 56; my translation). Theoriographically, this definition is somewhat circular and stands uneasily on the border of ontology and epistemology. At the same time, Stachowiak stresses the model's subjective construction and its perspectivity (presumably the awareness that a model is created with a particular view or theory in mind). Additionally, models are mimetic in being instrumental in representation in some fashion; they are iconic (Black 1962, 221). They are abstracts, simplifications, the gist of a particular reality; they are "conceived to be *simpler* and *more abstract* than the original" (223). And they are functional entities, created to be used in one way or another. In this context Stachowiak cites Wittgenstein's observation on the sign (which in itself is a kind of abstract model): "A sign on its own is dead. What gives it life? It lives in its use" (1973, 130). In other words, models are things to do things with. This kind of instrumentality endows them with a double status: they are simultaneously propositional (to be worked with) and reified (things in their own right). They are used for a purpose but also stand on their own. This duality has significant theoretical implications: the distinction between "a model *of*" and "a model *for*" is difficult to reconcile, and yet this duality of models (of/for) is a defining feature of a model. The *propositional* character of models is significant: propositional in the Leibnizian sense as a statement to reflect on, irrespective of its truth value. At the same time, models operate in their own autonomy and modality – alongside imitation – that of *what if* or *as if*. They are not an end in themselves yet surpass any restrictive perspective that a theory might impose. In this sense, models are intermediary entities, bound to an ulterior *telos* through the use to which they are put. Shifting constantly between models-of and models-for, models are ever repurposed: they are heterotelic. Very importantly, the recognition of a thing as a model is a theoretical activity: the recognition that a thing can be a model-of or a model-for always stands outside the model's autonomy. It is theoriographically dependent on

the propositionality of its use, on its heterotelic quality. Additionally, models, as things in their own right, have supposed objectivity, and yet are repurposed outside the epistemic system that created them. Or, as Lotman observes in relation to models in the arts, "the structural nature of a work of art is not an external 'form' that […] could be disentangled from it. It is a realization of the information contained in the model" (1967, 251). Some of the more elaborate models even have the potential for cosmopoiesis, world-making (Brejzek and Wallen 2018, 3, 24ff.), proposing a world of their own.

The heterotelic nature of models provokes a playful and creative engagement. Lotman links models to play as a cognitive activity: "Play is a model of reality of a special kind. It reproduces some of the features of reality by translating them to the language of its rules" (251). In other words, working with a model is an autonomous reality with its own rules. As such, it is distinct from the realities the model is meant to imitate: working with a model is a performative activity. This is an inherently theatrical and performative mode: behaviours, bodies, words and meanings, stories, and images are offered for view, and participants as well as onlookers are invited to play with them as models.

The Prague School theorist Jindřich Honzl analyses the essential shift (mobility) that occurs in onstage representation. He speaks of the theatrical sign but this can equally be extended to performative models and the playful engagement with them: "the actor *represents* a character ([actor] Vojan represents Hamlet), the set *represents* the place where the story takes place (a Gothic arch represents a castle), white light *represents* daytime, blue light nighttime, music *represents* some action (the noise of battle): (Honzl 1940, 129). Humans offer themselves onstage as models for the audience's mental construction of the fictional characters and their actions. The set is a model for a possible visualisation of the setting; the light, the sounds and

other stage business are offered as models for the corroboration of mental images that we construct as spectators. Honzl takes this theory further, pointing out that even fragmentary signs (read: models) have the power to create full-fledged, cosmopoietic fictions: an offstage voice or a voice on the radio (that is, an acoustic perception) becomes an actor who represents a fictional entity (he gives the example of the offstage voice of God in stage productions of Goethe's *Faust* (130)). This heterotelic quality of modelling is the substance of performance.

This theory of models has implications for historiography. Models are forms created (performed) in time; they carry the signature of their initial purpose, and their heterotelic usage is always indelibly connected with the model's history. In this sense, a theory of models is always historiographic in that it documents the particular objectives of a model's existence (why a model was formed) as well as its subsequent heterotelic interactions (the uses it was put to and autonomous existence it engendered). Additionally, theatre and performance historiography needs to account for models' inherent mobility (or repurposing), primarily by eschewing definitions of models based on their purpose, and by acknowledging the fluid shifts that occur between models-of and models-for.

Models in Theatre and Performance Historiography

Any of the three interconnected categories of models may serve historiographic practice, each in its own way and with its specific methodological problems. While puppets, masks, curtains, backdrops, model boxes, and even architectonic structures are material models, genres, dramaturgical patterns, or stage figures are immaterial (or conceptual). A special category here is medial models, i.e. those that exist in various media (text, image, video) such

as photography, sketches, documents, and scripts that have material vehicles but immaterial content.

It is important to reiterate that historiographic models have different materialities and the proposed categorisation is far from discrete. For example, an historian may study actress Sarah Bernhardt (1844-1923) and take that historic figure as an object of their study; that is apparently a material model (a physical human being). However, the underlying historiographic model is an actor – that is a metaphysical, socially constructed concept – and the historian will study the heterotelic ways in which Bernhardt embodied the immaterial concept of actor in her specific and unique ways.

Models as directly operative in theatre and performance are distinct from historiographic models. This is often clear enough: an historic practice is different from historiographic attempts at (re)constructing an understanding of it. So, a baroque backdrop showing a seastorm or a wilderness – as known from surviving court theatres and marionette theatres – is a model for a particular stock scene in a play (Dido's desperate abandon, reflected by the tempestuous sea; the rescue of Don Juan and his servant after a shipwreck; or Armida and Rinaldo's scene in the enchanted wilderness). These stock sets can be repurposed to any *dramma per musica*, and it was with these model scene changes (*mutazioni di scene*) in mind that eighteenth-century librettists conceived dramatic action. Historiography uses them differently: Jana Spáčilová breaks new ground in her novel historiographic model: a confrontation of opera libretti with surviving decorations and visual documentation allows her to uncover historic practices, among them the uses of stock sets. The historiographic model here is the correspondence between structural patterns in libretti (*mutazioni*) and standard types of baroque backdrops. Identifying this hypothetical correspondence gives

autonomy that enables the historian to find new uses, researching other historic practices and models, such as the baroque opera's *pasticcio*-dramaturgy (Spáčilová 2020, 78–80), the history of scenography (Hilmera 1965), or the practices of puppet and toy theatres (Blecha 2011).

This conceptual model is of particular importance for historiography and is distinct from the historic reality. Let us propose a hypothetical model: Alex dresses up for a party with friends, puts on extraordinary clothes, extravagant accessories, and dons provocative makeup. The party – including any guests who happen to enjoy the sight and presence of Alex in costume – may or may not like, appreciate, or critically comment on this event. Calling the event a performance and referring to it as a model (in that Alex found inspiration somewhere, or in that it may serve as a model for someone else later) – frames it within a different realm: one of cultural memory or personal history. Moreover, the party and Alex's figure are likely not only remembered by eyewitnesses but also captured on camera, and the clothes and accessories may survive and serve as mementos of the moment. These remnants of memories and their corroborating evidence are separate from the party as an event. In other words, the act of calling something a model is not only a theoriographic but also a historiographic process: it frames and communicates a reality by means of a recognisable concept.

Material Models in Theatre and Performance Historiography

A helpful and comprehensive semiotic theory of theatre and performance models has been elaborated by Ivo Osolsobě, successfully overcoming the theoretical and practical limitations of semiotics and its obsession with sign-communication (1974; 1986; 1992; and 2003). Osolsobě traces four distinct traditions of model theory, from St. Augustine through Jonathan Swift and Charles Peirce to Otakar Zich. St. Augustine's essay "De magistro" stages a

learning situation between a teacher (Magister) and a student (Adeodatus) and theorises the communication not only by means of signs of things but also by things themselves through showing (ostension). Emotions and behaviours – for instance, tenderness, anger, or singing – do not have to be communicated by means of signs but can be shown, deictically, by being performed: by modelling, practising or pointing to those behaviours. The second source of Osolsobě's model theory is Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), specifically the passage in Part III set on the island of Balnibarbi, a satire on the mock-scientific methods of the Royal Society of Sciences and its empiricist project of eliminating metaphors and figures of speech (see also Cohen 1978, 3–5). One of the projects of the Balnibarbian academy of Lagado is "a scheme for entirely abolishing all Words whatsoever" and to communicate by showing to one another the originals of things they seek to communicate, in order to eliminate any misunderstanding: "since Words are only Names for *Things*, it would be more convenient for all Men to carry about them, such *Things* as were necessary to express the particular Business they are to discourse on" (Swift 1726, 184). The third stem of theatre model theory elaborates Peircean semiotics (iconicity) and cybernetics as a general science of mechanical and human communication. Last and most significantly, Osolsobě's theory builds on Otakar Zich's *The Aesthetics of Dramatic Art* (1931), a seminal work and the cornerstone of theatre semiotics that offers a comprehensive analysis and theorisation of theatre practice (Elam 1980, 5–6). Zich was not only an aesthetist and philosopher but grounded his theory on psychology and anticipated phenomenological approaches to theatre. As an opera composer and critic, his theory is inclusive of the multiple perspectives of participants in theatre, and emancipates theatre and performance as autonomous art forms with their specific medium, practices, and aesthetics. Synthesising a great breadth of influences, Osolsobě theorised theatre as showing human interaction rooted in ostension as communication by means of non-signs: the showing of autonomous models that are more than mere signs. Among the

models that Osolsobě theorises are not only theatrical instances proper, including metatheatrical models, but also ostensive (performative) models in other settings ranging across fashion shows; decoys in shooting ranges; museums, zoos and botanical gardens; show trials; Potemkin villages (*потёмкинские деревни*); and citations, empathy, and spontaneous mimicking in everyday settings (1974, 36–72). All these can be considered theatre and performance models of a material kind.[3]

The most common model – as well as the most available one, as Osolsobě quips – is the actor's body. Using their own bodies, actors create figures on the basis of their roles. As Zich has theorised, actors do not create a fictional, dramatic persona, for instance when playing Desdemona; they use their physical and mental abilities, skills, and talents to portray a figure through specific ostensive behaviours (movements, gestures, mimicry, and utterances). This actor figure (*herecká osoba*) is the physical model offered to the spectators' view. Spectators are aware that they watch an actor performing a particular role (e.g. Peggy Ashcroft playing Desdemona), and on the basis of the ostensive model they perceive; piece together concepts (mental images: Zich's *obrazové představy*); complement them with their own experience, interpretation and imagination; and create the dramatic persona as the imaginary product of

---

[3] By way of honouring the dedicatee of this essay: Osolsobě was a victim of his own generosity. Roman Jakobson offered to have all his works published by the University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, but Osolsobě disagreed: why should his works be published if Zich's foundational book is still unavailable in English? Before Osolsobě and Samuel Kostomlatský were able to complete the translation, Jakobson was dead and with him both publication projects. Zich's book is forthcoming in Karolinum Press in 2020, edited by David Drozd, translated by Pavel Drábek and Tomáš Kačer, with a view to Osolsobě and Kostomlatský's manuscript translation.

their mind (the fictional Desdemona) (Zich 1931, 89–131 *passim*). In some theatre styles, actors' performance is aimed at being as realistic as possible to the point of a stage illusion, and spectators are maximally aided by the stage action in the creation of their imaginary actions. Film takes this facilitation even further. Nonetheless, there is never perfect unity (authenticity) between the ostensive models in performance and the imagined action; some theatre styles are intentionally stylised, ostending the artifice and keeping an explicit distance between the model and the imagination. This happens most famously in Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt* (alienation effect) but also, much more commonly, in the many non-realistic styles within and outside of Western culture.

While actors' bodies (in character) are material models, they are transitory and often exist only for short periods of time. In realistic performance styles these periods may be measured in minutes or even hours, or in non-realistic styles the models may last only seconds. Recent performances may be recorded, which of course translates the performance into another medium, from an actual event with physical models to an audio-visual account with medial models. By removing it from its context (the environment and time in which the performance took place), the recording disrupts the framing of the event and its entire significance. So, a recording of a political cabaret from a few years ago will not only have outdated references but even the behavioural modelling and mimicking, relating to an individual (caricatures of a public persona) or to stereotypical behaviours (typical postures of class, party or institutional members) may be indecipherable. Tunji Kasim's delivery of Octavius Caesar in Simon Godwin's production of *Antony and Cleopatra* (National Theatre, London, 2018–2019) portrayed Caesar through bodily rhythms, gestures, and speech patterns that were remarkably

imitative of Barack Obama.[4] Yet such subtle and fine actorly work would probably be lost or diminished in a later viewing of the recorded production, once Obama's physical mannerisms have faded from public memory. In this way, the material model of a figure operates within a specific social, cultural, as well as aesthetic environment. Differences in the cultural structure of time – in culture-specific models such as poetic rhythms, storytelling, jokes, as well as in gestures and other emotive expressions – is a well-known problem of drama translation.

Using what is familiar for the purposes of making art famously served Viktor Shklovsky to define art as follows:

> The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar,' to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. […] Art removes objects from the automatism of perception [… and] *makes the familiar seem strange*. (1917, 12–13 emphasis added)

This performative act of making strange (*остранение, ostranenie*) is tantamount to creating a model – from a gesture or a familiar object or concept – of the most available material of all, the human body.

Shklovsky's theory may serve as a useful and suggestive perspective on a specific type of "strange" material model known from history: physical anomalies, prodigies, and other sensational sights. The amazement at the reason-defying, extraordinary, or simply strange lies at the heart of a rich history of theatre and performance, from fairground displays of wonders

---

[4] I am grateful to Margaret Pinder for pointing out this behavioural model. For a similar example from 1772, see Kreuder (2020).

of nature, the circus, and virtuoso performances in the more artificial genres (such as musical child prodigies). So, while displays of cultural, natural or physical anomalies (conjoined twins, dwarves, giants, or atavisms such as excessive facial or bodily hair), common in the long early-modern period, were interpreted as miracles of nature, divine visitations (omens both good and ill), or via other rationalisations, their cultural function was that of a model: they did not signify per se, but were themselves realities offered on view for reflection and wonder (see Katritzky 2007 and 2012).

Another prominent category of material models in theatre are performance objects such as props, prosthetics, costumes, accessories, and pieces of set. Andrew Sofer illustrates the duality of performance objects: while they have a material vehicle, their theatrical essence lies in the performance of memory and in making present the invisible, ineffable and the absent (2003; 2013). This is true of performance in general. Spontaneously, we use hands to conjure gestic spaces and objects to perform a story. A classical illustration is told in Ovid's *Heroides*, in the first fictional letter of Penelope to Ulysses, where she tells of someone describing the fall of Troy on a table top:

> And one seated at table describes the fierce battle
>
> and draws all of Troy in a little wine:
>
> 'Here was Simois, here Sigean ground,
>
> here stood aged Priam's towering palace:
>
> here Achilles camped, here Ulysses,
>
> here mangled Hector scared the galloping horses.' (Ovid 2001, I: 31–6)

On a micro level, a material (spatial) model of the story is created, with the help of gestures and everyday objects (a little wine, a table), ostensively offered to the audience to direct their imagination. Ovid's account may be taken literally or metaphorically; the narrator may be

drawing the battle with a finger or by using plates on the table to model Simois and Sigean ground, and a flask of wine for aged Priam's towering palace. In either case, this instance documents the elementary spontaneous fabrication of models in performance and an instance of what Shklovsky refers to as making the familiar strange. Concepts, stories, and images become actualised by means of these ostensive actions, as performative realities with their own autonomy.

A specific type of performance model is puppets. The variety and complexity of puppetry is beyond the scope of a single essay, even in a theoretical abstraction, and a definition of what puppets are is commensurately elusive. Even the passage from Ovid could be framed as an instance of puppetry. The historiography of puppet-performance is unsurpassably complex. Excavations in Moravia yielded a 27,000–32,000 year-old anthropomorphic figure that bears signs of functionality (indentations suggesting the possible use of strings): it was probably created to be manipulated (illus. 1). Does it comprise the thaumaturgical rituals of performance and storytelling? Might this object be historiographically treated as a puppet? If so, by the same token puppet performance history would become at least 25,000 years longer than theatre history.

[illus. 1 here]

Many puppetry cultures operate in an animistic mode. Western historiography often imposes inappropriate principles of consistency, thinking animism through and subjecting it to a rationalist scrutiny. These beliefs are non-critical and non-scientific, intuitively practised in everyday life. Just as every culture has a different attitude to bodily remains, so too is there cultural specificity in the animistic and often anthropopathic uses of objects. The belief that

puppets (and models-of generally) have autonomous souls as living beings is common, and continues to our day (Day 2011; Davie 2014). Puppets are magical objects insofar as they command emotions, create worlds, and actualise the extraordinary. While a common, disenchanted, modern view is that puppets are toys that have no productive purpose (unlike robots, maquettes, and simulators), an alternate view sees puppets as objects capable of containing the transcendental. Henryk Jurkowski, the leading historian of European puppet theatre, notes the religious employment of marionettes, starting with the Synod of Tiers of 1310, which overruled Christian iconophobia and encouraged pastors "to use pictorial presentation for evangelising and the propagation of religious knowledge" (1996, I: 63). As a consequence, movable objects, effigies, and quasi-puppets were used to perform biblical stories at festivals (Drábek 2014, 179). Some of these objects have been historiographically appropriated by art historians as artefacts of sculpture. However, their intended use was performative and statues such as Christ with articulated arms and legs were deployed as performance objects in ritual stagings of liturgical mysteries (Uličný 2011; Bartlová 2012; Speaight 1990: 32–5). The puppet has been approached as a repository of the uncanny and discussed psychologically by Sigmund Freud and Ernst Jentsch (Bell 2014). A more pragmatic and critical theory was formulated by Otakar Zich, combining the psychology of perception of the puppet in relation to its size, stylisation, and figurativeness (1923). Zich's theory offers a continuum of human performance, with extreme corporal stylisation and figurativeness at one end of a scale, masked, or symbolic figures midway, and puppets and object performances at the far end.

Just like models, puppets become what they are through use. Given this pragmatic definition, the animistic aspect of puppets – which is an indelible part of their intended use – cannot be ignored. From a historiographical perspective, this is of utmost importance. For example,

traditional Czech marionette touring troupes originated from a transnational mixture of Neapolitan marionettes, commedia dell'arte characters, and influences from early-modern English and German comedy, and operated until the mid-twentieth century. These troupes would always have two special puppets, Death and the Devil, unduplicated at any given time. If, through wear and tear, a marionette had to be repaired in part or entirely, it would still retain its original soul, transubstantiated into the new one. Writing a history of such aural objects operates on the quicksand between materiality and metaphysics. The historiographic problem is the modern concept of materiality, and of unambiguous knowledge, which is in itself an oddly dated standpoint to assume in an age of quantum mechanics and poststructuralism.

Early-modern puppet performance was commonly practised by carvers. By trade it was associated with the other genres of performance automata, trick puppets (Jirásková and Jirásek 2015), as demiurgical miracles in displays of visions of the world, and Christmas cribs, whether static or mechanised (Drábek 2015; Dubská 2012; Hyman 2011; Kafka 2009). Other types of cosmopoietic models are doll houses (analysed by Natasha Korda elsewhere in this volume).

Modelling worlds as a special kind of Western performance – both within and outside theatre – has a long history dating from the classical *translatio imperii,* the Roman colonialists' imposition of their urbanistic and societal structures on their conquered provinces. It persisted through church and theatre architecture following the same patterns in imitation of normative models, then within municipal theatres. The Roman *translatio imperii* served as model for the Christian church and its missionary and iconographic work: cathedrals were designed in strikingly faithful imitation of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and one of the Crusaders'

goals was to take the exact measurements (Morris 2005). In turn, Jesuit missions provided a global diaspora of Christian models of the world by fashioning their outposts according to canonical patterns; Nicole T. Hughes has documented early-modern performances in New Spain and Brazil and the creation of life-size models of the Holy Sepulchre (2017). Starting in the 1600s, opulent and expensive models of the Holy Sepulchre were sold as souvenirs, made "by local craftsmen in Bethlehem and Jerusalem." These "architecturally accurate representations of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem [were each] accompanied by a parchment scroll describing the numbered different parts of the building that worked like an instruction manual for decoding the church" (Weetch 2016).

The demiurgic desire to create and experience worlds is perennial. However apparent the purposes may be, it is important to acknowledge the heterotelic quality of these models. They are not only made to be wondered at and to assume a god's eye view. The uses and purposes may be various, as Lawrence Sterne comically documents in *Tristram Shandy*, wherein the narrator's Uncle Toby immerses himself in the hobby of modelling the battlefield where he had received "a blow from a stone [...] at the siege of Namur, which struck full upon my uncle Toby's groin" (1760, 50). The purpose behind this effort is specific: it is "a means of giving him ease. [...] All this succeeded to his wishes, and not only freed him from a world of sad explanations, but, in the end, it prov'd the happy means [...] of procuring my uncle Toby his HOBBY-HORSE" (58). This cosmopoietic model was a half-nostalgic and a half-therapeutic means of reliving the trauma. Importantly, other characters of Sterne's novel engaged with the model for different purposes. Similarly open and unprescribed is the engagement with other demiurgical models, such as theme parks and tourist attractions, from Madame Toussaud's salons to the "Making of Harry Potter" world (branded by Warner Bros Studios simply as "The Experience"), Miniatur Wunderland in Hamburg, and World

Exhibitions that not only stage an optimistic and colonially possessive vision of the world but also transform city planning, be it the Eiffel Tower from the 1889 *Exposition universelle* in Paris or the Midway Plaisance from the 1893 Chicago World's Fair. Exhibitions as propositional models of possible worlds were famously first theorised by Gottfried Leibniz in his essay "Drôle de Pensée, touchant une nouvelle sorte de représentations" (1675). Exhibiting as a special kind of model performance developed into autonomous disciplines such as show windows and display design pioneered by scenographer Antonín Heythum in the 1930s (Koubská 2018: 42–3), information design conceived by Ladislav Sutnar (Janáková 2003), and fashion shows starting in Parisian *couture salons* in the 1800s and, from 1903, in the stores of the Ehrich Brothers in New York City (Fortini 2006).

Specific cosmopoietic models are produced by scenography. The historiography of the model box as performance has been explored in detail by Thea Brejzek and Lawrence Wallen and its digital counterpart, the 3-D computer visualisation, by Cat Fergusson (Fergusson 2018). These theories argue that "this type of model is simultaneously referential and self-referential and is neither process-driven nor representational but rather conceptualised and built to be autonomous" (Brejzek and Wallen 2018, 2). The model's representational function cannot be taken for granted, a point first succinctly articulated by architect and scenographer Vincenzo Scamozzi in 1588:

> We are accustomed to say, and rightly so, that Inventions, and drawings traced on paper, and for the most part also the Models in relief, no matter how they are made, the ones, and the others are only Inanimate, soulless bodies, therefore they need the voice of the Architect or of other person of science and value to express in words and to demonstrate in reasoning what they really are, to give them soul and speech. (Cited in Brejzek and Wallen 2018, 27)

In their discussion of models as performance, Brejzek and Wallen consider other types of models that have developed from the theatre architect's need to give voice and body to the projected constructions, including full-size models as tools of propaganda, theatres of the world, or fully functioning models of prospective buildings, only made of cheap materials for a temporary performance.

A closely related model-making is realised scenography, which may also be representational (but only potentially). Scenography may mimetically imitate a real place (the Capitol in *Julius Caesar*) or an imaginary rendering of a site (Caesar's home or the battlefield at Philippi). However, it creates an autonomous dramaturgical space to play in and with, a space in its own right: a *model of nothing*. Whether or not the created performance space resonates with known cultural stereotypes (a kitchen, office, hermitage, dungeon, ocean in storm, or hell) is the scenographer's choice. Despite its mimetic qualities, it can be an abstract, non-representational space, as František Tröster's, Ralph Koltai's or Jaroslav Malina's metaphorical scenographies or Sally Jacobs' famously white set for Peter Brook's 1970 production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* attest (Koubská and Hilmera 2007; Backemeyer 2003; Brandesky 2019). Additionally, scenography creates material models that extend far beyond their own materiality, functioning as playground for other artists participating in the performance. As director-scenographer Pamela Howard succinctly states, scenography is "the seamless synthesis of space, text, research, art, actors, directors and spectators" (2019, 339).

Material models are objects of the theatre and performance historiography as long as they survive. Naturally, most are lost and known only through documentation. Strictly speaking, that irreversible loss turns material models into medial ones (the documents that inform about

them) and to material, conceptual ones (for instance, the concept of Sally Jacobs' set that is now knowable only through secondary media).

Medial Models in/of Theatre and Performance Historiography

Some models are unambiguously material, such as a shop window mannequin or a 1:25 scale model box of a scenography. Others are clearly immaterial: economic models, genres, or recognisable patterns of behaviour. There is also a category that does not perfectly sit with either, such as words, texts, or images, which may have a material aspect to them but are essentially based on arbitrary sign systems that are products of specific cultures. A text may be written down and seem materially fixed but its comprehension is dependent on immaterial knowledge. Arguably, an element of cultural conditionality is present with all models, including material ones; as some surviving enigmatic models testify, be it the paleolithic figurines such as the Venus of Willendorf, the Venus of Věstonice, the 25,000-year-old proto-puppet (illus. 1), or the ancient *Antikythera* (calendar/calculator) mechanism. What purpose they served and how they were used was culturally specific. However, that heterotelic quality is inherent to all models. Models that imitate by means of a conventional sign system present a categorically different quality, and will be referred to here as medial models. These are examples of medial models that are materially available but inaccessible due to the lack of knowledge of the culture that produced them.

Words

> One of the more famous interpreters was Antiphon the Athenian, whom Suidas called observer and interpreter of miracles and seasoner of words and speech, because of the pleasant turns he gave them: *Antiphon, the fortune teller and word cook.* (Ménestrier 1694, 316 emphasis added)

Words are models in their own right: available for endless repurposing and essentially

propositional, despite attempts to reify them in dictionary or legal definitions. As Walter Ong

theorises in detail, there are two principal ways of approaching a word: as an object

(something written down, existing on page) and as an event (an acoustic event, a

communicative act). These two simultaneous perspectives relate to the media culture that

produces them: the chirographic (or script) culture and the oral culture (2012, 31; see also

Ong 1967).[5] While the primary use of the word is oral as a communicative event, once it is

uttered it also acquires its autonomy, a reified quality that may give a word novel meaning. In

performance, it is often engaged but playfully explores its heterotelic nature. Thus, Mark

Antony in *Julius Caesar* is allowed to speak over the assassinated body of his friend only on

condition that he will speak well of Brutus and the other conspirators (III.2 ll. 70–226). The

rhetorical performance he delivers uses the collocation "Brutus is an honourable man;" the

uses and contexts to which he puts the word "honourable" annuls its original meaning and

reverts to its suggestive opposite. In another example, in Leonard Bernstein and Stephen

Sondheim's *West Side Story*, Tony's song "Maria" repeats his love's name in different

melodic settings with the interpretive opportunity of conveying different emotional and gestic

expressions. Additionally, words and phrases may be reified on a yet more complex level, as

---

[5] Ong (2012) offers an important insight into the instability and malleability of words in

relation to oral, residually oral, chirographic, and secondary oral cultures. He also spells out

consequences that this has for storytelling, for forming characters, and for the density of

language. Special attention is given to notion of the verbatim and to formulaic language

(terms, collocations, proverbs). While not poststructuralist himself (as a Jesuit, his

background was in biblical exegesis and theology), his theory is an inspiring contemporary of

Derridean critical theory.

in the following exchange between a Messenger and Cleopatra, who wants to hear that
Antony is well:

> Messenger.   But yet, madam –
>
> Cleopatra. I do not like 'But yet': it does allay
>
> > The good precedence. Fie upon 'But yet'!
> >
> > 'But yet' is as a jailer to bring forth
> >
> > Some monstrous malefactor. (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 2.5.60–64)

Here Cleopatra takes the phrase "But yet" in its gestic quality: it is a turning point, a
symptom of adverse news, and while the phrase is objectified it still is a verbal model of the
event and what that event anticipates.

Words are also performative models: they are the acts of imitating our thoughts – or rather,
propositional attempts "to transfer our mental discourse into verbal; or the train of our
thoughts, into a train of words," as Thomas Hobbes asserted (1651, 74). This interpretative
and self-interpretive quality of words is ubiquitous. Western epistemologies have tried to
eschew the frustrating instability of words by treating them as reified objects with at least
some semantic stability. However, it is important to iterate their volatility and propositionality
as attempts at formulation rather than conclusive accounts (imitations) of other realities. The
fact that uttered words are products of a human brain, some more unambiguously
standardised, others more tentative and provisional, should stand as a corrective to the
imposing tendencies to reify words. Especially in theatre and performance, operating in the
propositional *what-if* modality, the heterotelic quality of words needs to be recognised and
considered.

Scripts

Repurposing is an inherent aspect of theatrical scripts, though most theatre theory and historiography operates on the assumption that the texts of plays are written and published as instructions for or records of staging. Lotman identifies playscripts as examples of play models: "The meaning of the verbal text is unchanged, but it ceases to be the only one. The theatrical performance is a *played* version of the text of a play" (1967, 256). That, however, is a very special and even rare variant of scripts. Another tacit assumption – theorised and problematised by poststructuralists, such as Jerome McGann in *The Textual Condition*– is that meaning is concealed in the text and it only takes a critical interpretation to access it, shadowing the methods of biblical exegesis and salvation through Scripture's revealed Truth (Luther's *sola scriptura*) (1991). As medial models, texts are crucially dependent on the contexts that create them; dislocated from their original environment, temporally, geographically, or culturally they often fail to signify. An awareness of their heterotelic nature as a special kind of theatrical model is an all-important corrective, all the more so because scripts are among the most important documents in theatre and performance historiography as well as practice.

Zich systematically analyses "the fragmentary and imperfect nature of the objective fixation that the dramatic text allows" as an incomplete record of an imaginary action (1931, 94). The text effectively captures only the words spoken by individual personas, occasionally giving basic technical instructions. This fails to capture the essence of dramatic art: the impersonations (or mental transfigurations, as he terms it), intonation, emphases, rhythms, spatial relations, and social interactions. In order to bring those words to life, substantial creativity is required from the performer. Antony Sher, in rehearsing *Richard III*, reflects on the void of the playscript when trying to memorise lines: "They're just words, there's nothing to hang them on yet" (1985, 171). That "something" on which to hang the words are

extratextual realities, intonations, rhythms, emotional moments, or behaviours which the actor needs to contribute to give the script a purpose. That void present in the text is not the sum of all possible interpretations, as might be tempting to assume, but indeterminacies that far exceed mere textual exegesis.[6] The material of theatre and performance is embodied social reality, not words; texts only mediate it, imperfectly.

Theatre and performance scripts are of various types and cannot necessarily be read as texts written with the purpose of being performed. Such a reading imposes the authorial perspective, replicating the theological model of biblical exegesis: an author created a text for later recipients to put into practice, first as readers, then as actors. Many performance scripts were created with other purposes in view: not only dramatic texts but also opera and dance libretti, musical scores, scenarios, playbill summaries (*perichae*), synopses, plots, and playbills. Lukas Erne further distinguishes between the surviving texts of Shakespeare's plays and the printed books in which they appear; these "however, were not made by him" (2013, 90; see also Erne 2003). Erne argues that the purposes for which Shakespeare's plays were published should not be taken as records of theatrical practices or as texts to be staged, as they were arguably published and adjusted to suit the tastes of readers purchasing the book. This is especially important with regard to the changing imperatives (purposes) of play publishing in early-modern England: first as "'do-it-yourself' staging aids," then as "records of performance," literature, and even "culturally prestigious works" (Voss 2002, 98, 102). This is as true of scripts from other performance cultures, with unique levels of complexity,

---

[6] The concept of indeterminacy was theorised by the phenomenologist Roman Ingarden in relation to the literary work. Arguably, play scripts cannot be subsumed in one category with literary works in this aspect; that would deny the autonomy of the performer's creative work (Drábek 2019).

such as the earliest surviving scenarios of the commedia dell'arte in Flaminio Scala's *Teatro delle favole rappresentative* (1611) and the early-seventeenth-century Corsini manuscript (Hulfeld 2014). Some have been referred to as "post-scripts [since] the Corsini scenarios are probably transcriptions of performances that took place in the late sixteenth century" (Mengarelli 2008, 212). In contrast, the reasons for Scala's publication were much more complex and probably intentionally bifurcated, as Richard Andrews has argued. The printed scenarios (*canovacci*) catered both to a potential performer and to a reader (2006: 42). Among other reasons, Scala's publication aimed to establish his company (or perhaps the commedia as a style) as a recognised artistic entity. Scala also took great care to present his company in an idealised form: some of the performers mentioned in individual scenarios "would not in reality have been found acting all together for more than one or two performances during their lives. […] Very possibly, in historical terms, the full troupe never existed even once" (48–9). The volatility of the playscript applies not only to older scripts, but almost universally. Chance survival of anecdotal histories support the present argument that playscripts cannot be read as authorial projections, even if they claim to be so, as Tiffany Stern has demonstrated for early-modern English plays (2019). One such anecdote relates to Peter Shaffer's *Equus* whose published script allegedly bears significant influences from John Dexter's production (Rosenthal 2018, 163).[7] The script of *Equus* is not only a text available for staging but also a "post-script:" a certain record of its first, formative production of 1973.

Scripts can also be published as aids for spectators to follow complex or non-vernacular productions, as is the case of opera libretti or school drama synopses (*periochae*). The word libretto (a little book) originated from the practice of publishing the dialogues and lyrics of early-modern operas, sometimes in multiple language mutations, to help spectators follow the

---

[7] I am grateful to Jan Šotkovský for drawing my attention to this incident.

plot then take them home as souvenirs of a grand occasion. Given these purposes, libretti were often printed in idealised, incomplete, or excessive forms (Spáčilová 2020). A similar practice was common with Jesuit or Piarist productions of school plays; performed in Latin, the printed synopses mediated the action in the vernacular (Okoń 1970; Szarota 1979–1987; Valentin 2001). Heterotelic as performance records, reading aids, souvenirs, as well as advertisements, these scripts often least do what historians assume they do: serve as pretexts for performance.

Acknowledging the essential and decisive creative input of the performers is another aspect that should be taken into account in acknowledging the qualities of scripts as heterotelic models. A well-known example of an "impossible" script is Antonin Artaud's *Le jet de sang* (1925), which was believed to be unperformable despite its numerous productions. Of a different kind are Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine* (1977) or Martin Crimp's *Attempts on Her Life* (1997), which are closer to blueprints or creative provocations that help give shape to a production, contributing often no more than metaphorically to its eventual outcomes. Another interesting example is Hubert Krejčí's *Odchod hmyzu* (Exit Insect, 2001), probably the shortest play in existence (35 words including the author's name and title) with the largest cast (of 10 million) and cataclysmic dimensions; it is a *kōan* type of play whose absurdity in form agrees with the existential absurdity of the plot.

Immaterial (Conceptual) Models of Theatre and Performance Historiography

    "Do you want to play with me?" (Any child)

Historiography always operates with conceptual models: immaterial forms fleshed out with reference to available historic data. To put it in this way may seem an unnecessarily complicated way of talking about research themes and topics. From a theoretical point of

view, it is the concept in the form of a formulated and integral model in all its indeterminacy, abbreviation, and openness that allows the historian to pursue the agenda and bring together diverse historic realities under the aegis of one unifying principle.

An historiographic study of an acting company – say, McMillin and MacLean's *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* – uses the received model of a theatre troupe and, on the basis of available archival and textual evidence, offers ground-breaking insights into theatre and performance history that in turn redefine the model and uproot many of the theoretical assumptions associated with an Elizabethan acting company, such as conventional roles or the perceived stability of the company as an institution (1998). Similarly, Robert Henke revisits the genre of the early-modern pastoral using the conceptual model of a genre (and that of a dramatic pastoral), tracing its variants and invariants as it travels from Renaissance Italy to Jacobean England (1997). The conceptual model allows Henke to emphasise continuity on the basis of the tragicomic genre of the pastoral: continuity that is predicated on the generic model, its repurposed transformations, and substantial interpretive expertise on Henke's part. The model reveals how literary works would otherwise be far too diverse and disparate to warrant more literal, let alone material, links.

Conceiving research themes and topics as models opens a useful critical tool of assessment (or self-assessment, for example to facilitate refinement of one's research agenda). For instance, a (hypothetical) history of Czech scenography would operate with the following basic conceptual models: (1) Czech theatre as a concept cohering vis-à-vis Czech cultural identity, (2) historical continuity of Czech scenography as an autonomous art form, and (3) scenography as practice, with its developing function and role in theatre performance. Each

of the three conceptual models posits a number of problems and it is worth reflecting on how each skews the historian's perspective. For example:

(1) To what extent is Czech theatre's scenography a concept and practice when considered in conjunction with culture and region**?** How much is it predicated on a received model of nationality and nationalism? To what extent does it include, exclude or prioritise certain historic theatre and performance events on the basis of how "Czech" they are?

(2) What can be said about the construct of historical (dis)continuity? Is the narrative model one of development, duration, and change or onchiliastic vision? What is the merit of this preoccupation in an historical account, and how does it bear on perceptions of with the present day?

(3) Can we speak of scenography transhistorically or translocationally? Can we use one singular model to comprise all the complexities of the historic practices and how they are derived, exchanged, and changed? Does this conceptual model include, exclude, or prioritise certain perspectives, creative roles, and value judgements? What is conducive to granting autonomy as an art form and how is this justifiable?

This may enable an historian to refine their conceptual models towards a more inclusive, or more particular, intent.

Conceptual models also facilitate histories of immaterial realities of theatre and performance such as intangible cultural heritage, for example folklore (songs, plays, and calendrical performance) or other popular entertainments. Interestingly, some of these phenomena have their material component, like puppets or masks, but to study their materiality may require crossing disciplinary borders of art history or anthropology. Yet to study them as performance objects involves their immaterial basis as models and analysis of their purposes and effects in

performance. Whereas art historians are more interested in their in materials techniques and formalism, and anthropologists also focus on their cultural symbolism, theatre scholars may analyse their performative qualities, effect, or aesthetics.

For example, in Mexican professional wrestling, a performance mask is separable from its physical manifestation (as an object worn by the wrestler) and from the performer who is known for it.[8] In one case , a *luchador* (professional wrestler) known as Místico abandoned his Mexican mask (i.e. the stage name and persona he used in the Mexican wrestling league) to work for a US-based wrestling company in 2011; consequently, this *luchador* assumed a new mask (named Sin Cara). In 2014, he returned to Mexico, and the Sin Cara mask passed to someone else. Meanwhile, the Místico mask had been assumed by another *luchador*, formerly known as Dragon Lee, and the Dragon Lee mask was taken over by yet another *luchador*. The original *luchador* known as Místico, finding himself deprived of the two performance identities he had originated, created a new mask known as Carístico. In this guise, he has wrestled with the *luchador* who uses his former mask, Místico. In Mexican *lucha*, the real name and age of a wrestler are kept secret and revealed only as an act of humiliation after a defeat in a particular type of match. It is only thanks to this (relatively rare) succession of transfers that the name of the Místico/Sin Cara/Carístico wrestler (Luis Ignacio Urive Alvirde) became known. Writing a history of such a complex present-day phenomenon requires the use of conceptual models that treat the mask both as a recognisable trademark and as an immaterial (yet commodified and performative) thing that may be embodied in individual performances by different performers. Similar complexity is at work in the study of historic stage names, such as the clown figures of the Harlequin, the

---

[8] I am grateful to Russell Gilbert for this example, the information and the necessary initiation into the secrets of modern wrestling.

Pickelhering, or Zan Braguetta, which to a great extent exist as cultural phenomena and myths, independently of their originators (Henke 2002; Katritzky 2005; Katritzky 2020).

Positivist historians found sufficient cognitive satisfaction in mapping: if a century otherwise blank or unchartered could be inscribed with a sign of knowing (however fragmentary or even specious), satisfaction was felt in illuminating the darkness. This historiographic model that harmonised with a colonialist worldview of universal control under the guise of spreading enlightenment (congruent with Edward Gibbon's history of the Roman empire, Hippolyte Taine's chiliastic history culminating in the French Revolution, or Leopold von Ranke's nationalist history of Germany). Such models are now untenable, replaced during the twentieth century by progressive models such as class struggle, emancipation, oppression and its opposition, and hegemony and the human individual in combination with economic analyses, processes of production, and craft and trade routines. Older historiographic models also recur: the personality profile, an idealist teleology, or the so-called "birth" of a consummate work of art. And recent historiographic models offer other cosmopoietic perspectives: formations of communities, the relational portrait (including studies of multicultural or transnational entities), performance reception, and accounts of collective projects in their relative settings.

Historiography depends on conceptual models, and these are often original and ingenious creations that afford novel discoveries. Among the original historiographic models offered in this volume, for instance, Odai Johnson creates a conceptual model of the historiographic gap – the awareness of missing information – which allows him to open new perspectives that bring into light new findings by means of a metaphorical photographic negative. In her essay, Noémie Ndiaye's concept of the *moresche* is a propositional model that allows her to

encompass more than simply a musical genre but also comprise acoustic realities, dialects, accents, and their mocking imitations. Natasha Korda's chapter operates with a complex concept that brings together material, medial and conceptual types of models: doll houses as cosmopoietic imitations of worlds of women's labour but also as historic artefacts, as toys, and as documents encapsulating ideologies and value systems. And while setasidedness is "merely" a word, in Tracy C. Davis's chapter it models an approach to historiographic thought. These models are original in their creative and even playful deployment of methodologies that are firmly rooted in cultural, political, social, or economic histories and/or sociologies, immediately recognisable within these well-established practices. At the same time, these approaches take factography as their bedrock, rather than their own conceptual integrity or borrowed methodologies. In other words, they eschew a mechanical adoption of a readymade model, but create a bespoke one that allows the historians to explore novel insights into their subjects.

Historians use conceptual models to model the worlds they are studying. While models may seem to be tools, what they facilitate are not facts and realities but theories – that is to say, views, perspectives and perceptions. These theories result from the historian's creative engagement with the model as a heuristic device, freed from narrowly utilitarian notions of purpose. As such, they are particularly appropriate for the study of theatre and performance, which in turn is dependent on propositional realities, unproductive play, and social interaction. Since theatre and performance are inherently volatile and transitory, it is not definitive conclusions that their histories aim at; their historiographic models enable perspectives and imaginary representations that may eventually transcend toward an understanding. Historiographic models are not machines for answers but instruments of speculation and playful curiosity.

Works Cited

Andrews, Richard. 2006. "How – and Why – Does One Print Scenarios? Flaminio Scala,

    1611." *Italian Studies* 61 no. 1: 36–49.

Aristotle. 1902. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Edited and translated by S. H. Butcher. London:

    Macmillan.

Backemeyer, Sylvia, ed. 2003. *Ralph Koltai: Designer for the Stage*. London: Nick Hern

    Books.

Bartlová, Milena. 2012. *Skutečná přítomnost: Středověký obraz mezi ikonou a virtuální*

    realitou (Real Presence: The Medieval Image between an Icon and Virtual Reality).

    Prague: Academia.

Bell, John. 2014. "Playing with the Eternal Uncanny: The Persistent Life of Lifeless

    Objects." In *The Routledge Companion to Puppetry and Material Performance*.

    Edited by Dassia N. Posner, Claudia Orenstein, and John Bell, 43-52. Abingdon and

    New York: Routledge.

Black, Max. 1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca:

    Cornell University Press.

Blecha, Jaroslav. 2011. "The History of Scenographic Influence of Czech Family Marionette

    Theatre." In *Czech Stage Art and Stage Design*, Special Issue of *Theatralia/Yorick*.

    Edited by Christian M. Billing and Pavel Drábek, 14 no. 1: 114–46.

Brandesky, Joseph, ed. 2019. *Jaroslav Malina in Scenography and Painting*. Prague:

    Karolinum.

Brejzek, Thea and Lawrence Wallen. 2018. *The Model as Performance: Staging Space in Theatre and Architecture*. London and New York: Methuen.

Cohen, Ted. 1978. "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy." *Critical Inquiry* 5 no. 1: 3–12.

Davie, Grace. 2014. *Religion in Britain: A Persistent Paradox*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Day, Abby. 2011. *Believing in Belonging: Belief and Social Identity in the Modern World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drábek, Pavel. 2014. "English Comedy and Central European Marionette Theatre." In *Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theater*. Edited by Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson, 177-96.Farnham: Ashgate.

_____. 2015. "'No Italian Motion but Made in London:' Theatre Vogues and Folklore." In *Czech Puppet Theatre in Global Contexts*. Special Issue of *Theatralia/Yorick*. Edited by Christian M. Billing and Pavel Drábek, 18 no. 2: 10–18.

_____. 2018. "Shakespeare's Myriad-Minded Stage as a Transnational Forum: Openness and Plurality in Drama Translation." In *Forum: Shakespeare and Cultural Translation*, *Shakespeare Studies*. Edited by Rui Carvalho Homem, 46: 35–47.

_____. 2019. "Shakespeare's Myriad-Minded Stage: Propositional Spaces of Cultural Hybridity." *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 98 no. 1: 45–55.

Duggan, Patrick. 2013. *Trauma-Tragedy: Symptoms of Contemporary Performance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dubská, Alice. 2012. *The Travels of the Puppeteers Brát and Pratte through Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. Prague: NAMU.

Elam, Keir. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Routledge.

Erne, Lukas. 2003. 2013. *Shakespeare and the Book Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. *Shakespeare as Literary Artist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fergusson, Cat. 2018. "Visualising Process: Hofman's 1926 *Hamlet* Reconstructive Practice." In *Czech and Slovak scenography for Shakespeare*, *Theatralia* Edited by Šárka Havlíčková Kysová and Christian M. Billing 21 no. 2: 15–28.

Fortini, Amanda. 8 February 2006. "How the Runway Took Off: A Brief history of the Fashion Show." *Slate*.

http://slate.com/culture/2006/02/a-brief-history-of-the-fashion-show.html

Henke, Robert. 1997. *Pastoral Transformations: Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

_____. 2002. *Performance and Literature in the Commedia dell' Arte*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hesse, Mary B. 1963. *Models and Analogies in Science*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Hilmera, Jiří. 1965. *Perspektivní scéna 17. a 18. století v Čechách* (The Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Perspective Stage in Bohemia). Prague: Scénografický ústav.

Hobbes, Thomas. 1651 (1969). *Leviathan, or the Matter, Form and Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil.* Edited by John Plamenatz. London: Collins.

Honzl, Jindřich. 1940 (2016). "The Mobility of the Theatrical Sign." In *Theatre Theory Reader: Prague School Writings*. Edited by David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling, 129-46. Prague: Karolinum Press.

Howard, Pamela, with Pavel Drábek. 2019. *What is Scenography?* 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Hughes, Nicole T. 2017. *Stages of History: New World Spectacles and the Theater of the World in the Sixteenth Century*. PhD thesis, Columbia University.

Hulfeld, Stefan, ed. 2014. *Scenari più scelti d'istrioni: italienisch-deutsche Edition der einhundert Commedia all'improvviso-Szenarien aus der Sammlung Corsiniana*. 2 volumes. In collaboration with Demis Quadri, Sebastian Hauck and Stefano Mengarelli. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Hyman, Wendy Beth, ed. 2011. *The Automaton in English Renaissance Literature*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Janáková, Iva. 2003. *Ladislav Sutnar – Praha – New York – Design in Action*. Prague: Uměleckoprůmyslové muzeum.

Jirásková, Marie and Pavel Jirásek. 2015. "Puppet Cabaret: Visual Idioms, Performance Technologies and the Poetics of Czech Special Puppets in a European Context 1850–1950." In *Czech Puppet Theatre in Global Contexts*. *Theatralia/Yorick* Edited by Christian M. Billing and Pavel Drábek, 18 no. 2: 70–134.

Jurkowski, Henryk. 1996. A History of European Puppetry: From Its Origin to the End of the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. Edited by Penny Francis. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Kafka, Luboš. 2009. *Betlemáři: kapitoly z historie a současnosti tvorby betlémů* (Crib Makers: Chapters from the History and the Present of the Making of Christmas Cribs). Prague: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.

Katritzky, M. A. 2005. 2012. *Healing, Performance and Ceremony in the Writings of Three Early Modern Physicians: Hippolytus Guarinonius and the Brothers Felix and Thomas Platter*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

_____. "Pickelhering and Hamlet in Dutch Art: The English Comedians of Robert Browne, John Green, and Robert Reynolds." In *Shakespeare and the Low Countries*. Edited by Ton Hoenselaars and Holger Klein, 113-40. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

_____. 2007. *Women, Medicine and Theatre, 1500–1750: Literary Mountebanks and Performing Quacks*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

_____. 2020. "London and The Hague, 1638: Performing Quacks at Court." In *Transnational Connections in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by M. A. Katritzky and Pavel Drábek, 114-38. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Koubská, Vlasta and Jiří Hilmera. 2007. *František Tröster: básník světla a prostoru* (František Hilmera: an Artist of Light and Space). Prague: Obecní dům.

Koubská, Vlasta. 2018. "Scenographer Antonín Heythum and His Work in the US: The Case of *King Lear*." In *Czech and Slovak scenography for Shakespeare*, *Theatralia* Edited by Šárka Havlíčková Kysová and Christian M. Billing 21 no. 2: 38–63.

Kreuder, Friedemann. 2020. "The Re-Inspired and Revived Bernardon: Metamorphoses of Early Modern Comedy in Eighteenth-Century Bourgeois Theatre." In *Transnational Connections in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by M. A. Katritzky and Pavel Drábek, 162-78. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 162–78.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. 1675. "Drôle de Pensée, touchant une nouvelle sorte de représentations" (An Odd Thought Concerning a New Sort of Exhibition). https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Dr%C3%B4le_de_Pens%C3%A9e,_touchant_une_nouvelle_sorte_de_repr%C3%A9sentations . English translation in *Artforum* 2010. *International* 48 no. 10: n.p.

Lotman, Juri. 1967 (2011). "The Place of Art among other Modelling Systems." Translated by Tanel Pern. *Sign Systems Studies* 39 no. 2/4: 249–70.

McGann, Jerome J. 1991. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McMillin, Scott and Sally-Beth MacLean. 1998. *The Queen's Men and Their Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ménestrier, Claude-François. 1694 (2018). "La philosophie des images énigmatiques" (The Philosophy of Enigmatic Images). In *Images d'action: Claude-François Ménestrier's Theoretical Writings on Festivals and Performing Arts: Translation and Commentary*.

Translated by Kareen Seidler. Edited by Annette Kappeler, Jan Lazardzig and Nicola Gess, 257-331. Leiden: Wilhelm Fink (Brill).

Mengarelli, Stefano. 2008. "The Commedia dell'Improvviso Illustrations of the Corsini Manuscript: A New Reading." *Early Theatre* 11 no. 2: 212–26.

Morris, Colin. 2005. *The Sepulchre of Christ and the Medieval West: From the Beginning to 1600*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Okoń, Jan. 1970. *Dramat i teatr szkolny* (School Drama and Theatre). Wrocław: Universytet Jagielloński.

Ong, Walter J. 2012. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. 30th Anniversary Edition, with additional chapters by John Hartley. London and New York: Routledge.

_____. 1967. *The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Osolsobě, Ivo. 1974. *Divadlo, které mluví, zpívá a tančí: teorie jedné komunikační formy* (A Theatre That Speaks, Sings, and Dances: a Theory of a Communicative Art Form: Semiotics of the Musical Theatre). Prague: Editio Supraphon.

Osolsobě, Ivo. 1986. "Ostension." In *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Semiotics*. Vol. 2. Edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, 656–660. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____. 1992. *Mnoho povyku pro sémiotiku: ne zcela úspěšný pokus o encyklopedické heslo Sémiotika divadla* (Much Ado About Semiotics: a Not Entirely Successful Attempt at an Encyclopedic Dictionary Entry "Theatre, semiotics of the"). Brno: Nakladatelství "G" hudba a divadlo.

_____. 2003. *Ostenze, hra, jazyk* (Ostension, Play, Language). Brno: Host.

Ovid. 2001. *The Heroides*. Translated by A.S. Kline. *Poetry in Translation* website. https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/Heroideshome.php

Rosenthal, David. 2018. *Dramatic Exchanges: The Lives and Letters of the National Theatre*.

    London: Profile Books.

Shakespeare, William. 2007. *Complete Works*. Edited by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen.

    Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Sher, Antony. 1985. *Year of the King: An Actor's Diary and Sketchbook*. London: Chatto &

    Windus.

Shklovsky, Viktor. 1917. "Art as Technique." In *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*.

    Translated by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, 5–24. Lincoln and London:

    University of Nebraska Press.

Sofer, Andrew. 2013. *Dark Matter: Invisibility in Drama, Theater, and Performance*. Ann

    Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

_____. 2003. *The Stage Life of Props*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Spáčilová, Jana. 2020 forthcoming. *Catalogue of the Italian Opera Libretti in Central Europe

    in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century I, Moravia*. Translated by Mark Newkirk.

    Prague: KLP.

_____. 2011. "Libretto as a Source of Baroque Scenography in the Czech Lands." In

    Czech Stage Art and Stage Design. *Theatralia/Yorick* Edited by Christian M. Billing

    and Pavel Drábek, 14 no. 1: 82–97.

Speaight, George. 1990. *The History of the English Puppet Theatre*. 2nd ed. London: Robert

    Hale.

Stachowiak, Herbert. 1973. *Allgemeine Modelltheorie*. Wien and New York: Springer Verlag.

Stern, Tiffany, ed. 2019. *Rethinking Theatrical Documents in Shakespeares England*.

    London: The Arden Shakespeare.

Sterne, Lawrence. 1760 (1983). *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman.* Edited by Ian Campbell Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swift, Jonathan. 1726 (1971). *Gulliver's Travels*. Edited by Paul Turner. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szarota, Elida Maria. 1979–1987. *Das Jesuitendrama im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Eine Periochen-Edition*. 7 volumes. München: Fink.

Uličný, Petr. 2011. "Christ in Motion: Portable Objects and Scenographic Environments in the Liturgy of Medieval Bohemia." In *Czech Stage Art and Stage Design. Theatralia/Yorick* Edited by Christian M. Billing and Pavel Drábek 14 no. 1: 24–64.

Valentin, Jean-Marie. 2001. *Les Jésuites et le théâtre (1554–1680): contribution à l'histoire culturelle du monde catholique dans le Saint-Empire romain germanique*. Paris: Desjonquères.

Voss, Paul. 2002. "Printing Conventions and the Early Modern Play." *MRDE* 15: 98–115.

Warner, Marina. 16 November 2017. "Diary." *London Review of Books* 39 no. 22: 37-9.

Weetch, Rosie. 2016. "Models of the Holy Sepulchre." *Bearers of the Cross: Material Religion in the Crusading World, 1095–c.1300.* http://www.bearersofthecross.org.uk/interpreting-the-collections/models-of-the-holy-sepulchre/

Zich, Otakar. 1931. *Estetika dramatického umění: Teoretická dramaturgie* (The Aesthetics of Dramatic Art: Theoretical Dramaturgy). Prague: Melantrich.

_____. 1923 (2015). "Puppet Theatre." In *Czech Puppet Theatre in Global Contexts. Theatralia/Yorick* Translatd by Pavel Drábek, Edited by Christian M. Billing and Pavel Drábek. 18 no. 2: 505–13.