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# Treading the Boards: Walking on Stage and “Sit-Specific” Theatre

This article examines the significance of walking on the theatre stage, responding to the growing research scholarship of pedestrian performance. It seeks to provide a point of expansion for a field that is still largely concerned with site-specific works where audiences walk during the performance. Beginning with a discussion as to the possible reasons for its omission, the author addresses the prominence of walking and the journey as a rehearsal tool employed by a wealth of practitioners. As further justification for the inclusion of the stage in pedestrian performance research, a series of historical case studies are presented, which span over a century of theatrical history. There is an examination of the audience’s pilgrimage to Richard Wagner’s *Parsifal* (1882) and the ‘epic flow’ of Erwin Piscator’s treadmill in *Good Soldier Schwejk* (1927). The significance of walking in Samuel Beckett’s life is also explored through the ‘inward walking’ of *Footfalls* (1976) and the proscenium staging of Matthew Earnest’s *Wanderlust* (2010)is made significant through its critique of supermodernity. The article concludes in arguing that an immobile audience can kinaesthetically empathise with the performers, embarking on their own internalised journey within the theatre. Kris Darby is a Post-Doctoral Teaching Fellow in Drama at Liverpool Hope whose research interests concern the relationship between walking and performance.
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## Pedestrian Performance

Pedestrian performance is one of the many terms[[1]](#endnote-1) attributed to works that place emphasis on the action of walking. As a research field it is still relatively young, reflecting an increase since the beginning of the twenty-first century in such performances. For Carl Lavery, one of the principle academics interested in the field, the objective of pedestrian performance is ‘to replace vicarious experience (reading someone else’s account of space) with actual experience (producing one’s own spatial map)’.[[2]](#endnote-2) It has grown from an increased interest in site-specific works that provide audiences with the “actual experience” of walking as a means to interact and explore spaces not originally conceived for performance. The urban drifting of arts collective Wrights & Sites and the binauralguided walks of Janet Cardiff, run parallel with the more theatrical promenade and environmental works from companies such as Punchdrunk and Grid Iron. Audiences are not consigned to taking their seats in a darkened auditorium, but are able to share the same space with the performers, touring, exploring and drifting through public and private spaces. Not surprisingly, most of the current research concerning pedestrian performance draws substantially from site-specific theory and the myriad of disciplines it intersects with. Although the application of site-specific theory is found within both the disciplines of theatre and performance studies, the significance of walking is more keenly researched in the latter. This essay seeks to elucidate as to why the theatre has had little consideration in this growing field of pedestrian performance, and what it can contribute to it.

## At The Theatre Doors

There are two principle reasons why the theatre is largely overlooked with regards to studies of pedestrian performance. The first is that in a conventional modern theatre, walking is an action largely reserved for the performers who move within the confines of the stage space. Social custom dictates that the audience must remain seated throughout, walking into the auditorium before the performance has begun and exiting once it has finished. Elinor Fuchs’s and Una Chaudhuri’s editing of *Land/Scape Theatre* (2002)was motivated by a similar difficulty, evidencing the need to study the ways in which the ‘open countryside and panoramic views’ of landscape are staged within the theatre.[[3]](#endnote-3) The theatre as a space that ‘summons the very image of interiority’,[[4]](#endnote-4) lacks the vast expanse of some of the landscapes traversed by walking artists such as Louise Ann Wilson and Amy Sharrocks and the “actual experience” Lavery attributes to pedestrian performance. However, Esther Pilkington and Martin Nachbar’s essay ‘We Always Arrive in the Theatre On Foot’ (2012), has reiterated the significance of walking in the audience’s experience of a theatre event; an answer to Richard Schechner’s earlier assertion that too ‘little study has been made of the liminal approaches and leavings of performance’.[[5]](#endnote-5) As will be demonstrated later, this journey to and from the theatre can become imbricated with the performance itself, meaning that an audience’s reading of “someone else’s account of space” can also merge with their “own spatial map”.

The second reason for an overlooking of the theatre in pedestrian performance research stems from a dislike for the traditional demarcation of audience and performer, as well as the institution as a whole, articulated by some exponents of site-specific performance. Walking has in part become symbolic of an exodus from the theatre; a ‘getting out of the church’.[[6]](#endnote-6) However, this does not necessarily suggest that theatricality has been wholly avoided within pedestrian performance. For instance, Phil Smith of Wrights & Sites asserts that despite his pedestrian performance work beginning as ‘an anti-theatrical act, … elements of theatricality have resurfaced in his practice’.[[7]](#endnote-7) This observation is evidenced by publications such as Nicolas Whybrow’s *Street Scenes: Brecht, Benjamin & Berlin* (2005)*,* Jen Harvie’s *Theatre & The City* (2009)*,* and *Performing Site-Specific Theatre* (2012)*,* edited by Anna Birch and Joanne Tompkins. The theatrical uses of walking in site-based performance have been discussed at length, yet the overall significance of walking in the training of performers and the devising, rehearsing and staging of theatre productions have been largely overlooked. This however, has been recognised recently by Martin Welton in his essay ‘Getting Things Off the Ground: Pedestrian Feelings’ (2012). Within it, Welton explores what knowledge the performer accrues between foot and floor, the significance of the ‘walk through’ in the rehearsing of a performance, as well as some historical accounts of the different uses of walking adopted by stage actors.[[8]](#endnote-8) It gives merit to the study of the walking of the performer, suggesting that pedestrian performances do not require an audience to remain on its feet. Despite this, within the field there is still a noticeable emphasis on the site-specific, the boundaries of the field ending at the theatre doors.

## A Walk-Through

Walking historian Rebecca Solnit’s observation that walking and travelling have ‘become central metaphors in thought and speech’[[9]](#endnote-9) is recognized in the theatre also with ‘everyday phrases used by theatre practitioners, such as “treading the boards”, “doing a walk-through”, and “finding the right posture”’.[[10]](#endnote-10) Although ‘perhaps the most popular motif of site-specific practice at the beginning of the twenty-first century’,[[11]](#endnote-11) the journey has also long established itself as ‘the master trope of modern drama’, having an active and longstanding presence within the theatre as well.[[12]](#endnote-12)Konstantin Stanislavsky referred to a need to give actors ‘various paths’ in rehearsals,[[13]](#endnote-13) which resonates with the writings of his former student Michael Chekhov in *The Path of the Actor* (1927). Additionally, Tadeusz Kantor, in an essay entitled ‘My Work – My Journey’ (1988) writes: ‘I rushed into this future, with my eyes wide open and with the feeling of “greatness” in my rucksack.’[[14]](#endnote-14) Walking and the motif of the journey are evocative metaphors for some directors and actors because it suggests a process, and one that has resonances with a multitude of processes within the devising of theatre. There are numerous instances of this phraseology shared amongst directors and actors, from a variety of different theatrical styles and cultural backgrounds.

The phrase “Walk around the space” is a common direction heard in actor training, necessitating an awareness of the biomechanical rhythm of the self as well as a haptic and spatial mapping of the environment. The studio and performance space is a network of trajectories in which many paths meet and part. Such paths may act as an aide memoire for the performer, a walking through of a ‘character map’[[15]](#endnote-15) or a logistical set of directions that signal entrances, costume changes and specific actions both on and offstage. What is particularly significant is that such a path is not a linear or even a continuous one, as the restrictive dimensions of the stage often necessitates a re-treading of the same space.

Some of the oldest forms of theatre that actively places emphasis on the action of walking are primarily found in traditional Eastern performance. Noh theatre for example, performed since the fourteenth century in Japan, employs a type of walking known as *Suriashi,* which ‘is the art of sliding the foot, ensuring that it never completely leaves the floor’.[[16]](#endnote-16) It is part of a triadic relationship with that of the basic body position (*Kamae*) and movement forms (*Kata*), which must be all given equal attention by the performer in order to avoid diluting the aesthetic effect of the performance.[[17]](#endnote-17) Japanese director Tadashi Suzuki has continued this attention to walking in his performance work, through what he terms the ‘grammar of the feet’.[[18]](#endnote-18) In his book *The Way of Acting* (1986)*,* he argues that modern theatre has ‘no feet’, due to a lack of attention paid to the ‘ambulatory possibilities’ of the actor.[[19]](#endnote-19) Although Suzuki is referring principally to naturalistic theatre, there is an argument that the curbing of such “ambulatory possibilities” in western theatre is possibly due to a need for it to distinguish itself from dance. Eugenio Barba, suggests that the ‘rigid distinction between dance and theatre, characteristic of our culture, reveals a profound wound, a void of tradition, which continually risks drawing the actor towards a denial of the body and the dancer towards virtuosity’.[[20]](#endnote-20) However, this is invariably countered by physical theatre, where ‘the somatic impulse is privileged over the cerebral’.[[21]](#endnote-21) This itself originated in part with French performer and director Jacques Copeau and his observing of the traditions of the aforementioned Noh theatre in the early twentieth century.[[22]](#endnote-22) Noh also later proved influential upon Polish director Jerzy Grotowski, whose Poor Theatre ‘minimized reliance on autonomous costume, make-up, scenery and lighting’ giving prominence to the movement of the actor.[[23]](#endnote-23) Grotowski is just one of a number of directors who have utilized walking in their performance work, leading to a scattering of walking-related exercises in western theatre, ranging from the anecdotal to the instructional.

## Ambulatory Possibilities

From his earlier work with Theatre Laboratory to his later para-theatrical treks, Jerzy Grotowski has become a key figure in the prominence of walking in twentieth-century performer training. In a list of physical exercises suggested in his *Towards a Poor Theatre* (1969), walking illustrates *organicity,* allowing the actor to function without distractions. Grotowski’s ‘plastic exercises’, draw from ‘ancient and medieval theatre in Europe as well as African and oriental theatre’[[24]](#endnote-24) and advocate the importance of studying different types of gait as a means to unmask ‘those characteristics that one wishes to hide from others’.[[25]](#endnote-25) This idea of ‘unmasking’ has resonances with French acting instructor Jacques Lecoq and the development of his clown walks, which sought to externalize the personal way of walking ‘buried deep within’ the performer.[[26]](#endnote-26)

This “person who walks correctly” is an idea that we carry within us, the idea of a perfect gait, one that is economical and neutral. In other words it does not exist in reality and each one of us walks with different “faults” which go to make us an individual, different from all others.[[27]](#endnote-27)

Lecoq, like Grotowski, highlights the infeasibility of perfecting a “neutral” walk, instead choosing to explore the different characteristics of walking and what they denote. Such characteristics, beginning with the feet, allow for an excavation of these “buried” ways of walking, which itself takes the form of a journey for the performer to internalize. Such an idea was extended by Grotowski through an exercise that asked his actors to imaginatively traverse different types of terrain, ‘walking on different types of ground, surface, matter’.[[28]](#endnote-28) This particular exercise was favoured later by improvisation theatre teacher Viola Spolin, who termed it *space substance,* acting as a means to develop imagination and concentration.[[29]](#endnote-29) It chimes with Martin Welton’s assertion that just ‘as walls “appear” against the fixed-point of a mime-artist’s hands, the embodiment of resistance in the feet enacts a path-like space upon or above even an empty stage’.[[30]](#endnote-30) It allows the individual ways of walking found within a company of actors, to share common ground, as they are all reacting to and simultaneously sculpting a shared “path”.

In addition to collectively imagining different terrains to walk across, some directors have chosen to experiment with the rhythmicity of walking through music. In the case of avant-garde director and performer Robert Wilson, these have resulted in a number of works that incorporate a significant amount of slow walking, what Maria Shevtsova refers to as the ‘basic Wilson walk’.[[31]](#endnote-31) Despite Wilson not having a ‘training system’, in *Robert Wilson* (2007) Shevtsova assembles a series of movement exercises that resonate with the former’s method of direction.[[32]](#endnote-32) The level of detail presented in these exercises suggests not only the significance of walking in Wilson’s work, but a need to document the significance of walking in western actor training.[[33]](#endnote-33)

Returning briefly to Grotowski, his observations concerning “organicity” with regards to walking[[34]](#endnote-34) highlight the difficulties in ascertaining its presence in performance as an *action* or a *movement.* Its familiar existence as an everyday practice in contrast to the ritualistic extra-daily practices in which performance resides, have in part contributed to such uncertainty[[35]](#endnote-35). In ‘On Acting and Not-Acting’ (2002), Michael Kirby suggests that anyone ‘merely walking across a stage containing a realistic setting might come to represent a person in that place – and, perhaps, time – without doing anything we could distinguish as acting’.[[36]](#endnote-36) Such an observation is ambiguous, because on the one hand it suggests that a performer’s walk is indistinguishable from that of an audience’s, but on the other, it implies that walking is naturally performative.[[37]](#endnote-37)

This latter suggestion brings us to Peter Brook whose widely quoted opening to *The Empty Space*, (1968) asserts that an ‘act of theatre’ begins with a walk observed by others.[[38]](#endnote-38) Whilst working in Africa in 1972**,** Brook ‘asked the actors literally to walk again,’ in what became known as *The Walking Show*.*[[39]](#endnote-39)* As John Heilpern observed: ‘It’s astonishing – but given the simple direction to do no more than walk, everyone was running … in the scramble to “perform”, show out.’[[40]](#endnote-40) Shomit Mitter concluded that in ‘order to simply walk, the actors must do no more than exist’ or ‘the actors must act without acting in order plainly to be’.[[41]](#endnote-41) This assertion echoes that of Grotowski and Suzuki, advocating a heightened sense of awareness through the body rather than a ‘direct transposition of bodily shapes, postures, and training sequences into performance’.[[42]](#endnote-42)

Moving from Africa to South America, Augusto Boal, writing in *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (1992), presents a host of different walks for the actor to experiment with. He explains that changing ‘our way of walking forces us to activate certain little-used muscle structures, and makes us more conscious of the possibilities of our bodies’.[[43]](#endnote-43) However, in addition to exploring such “possibilities”, Boal demonstrates an interest in ascertaining the varying factors which prompt a person to walk in a particular manner. Such an interest is extended further by movement teacher Anne Dennis in *The Articulate Body: The Physical Training of the Actor* (2002).

For the actor, the walk is simply an extension of everything a character is, i.e., what he does with his body, what his self-image is, and how his status and interactions with others manifest themselves. The whole history and physicality of his body can be seen in the walk.[[44]](#endnote-44)

In her book, Dennis presents one of the most substantial collections of walking-based exercises for actor training, drawing from some of the principles of Lecoq, Etienne Decroux, and Jean-Louis Barrault. Like many of the above practitioners, Dennis observes that an actor’s walk ‘immediately tells us a great deal about him’,[[45]](#endnote-45) reiterating Barrault’s assertion that ‘a man may be betrayed by his walk’.[[46]](#endnote-46) The actor’s ‘mimetic altering of gait and sensitivity’[[47]](#endnote-47) is as much a tool for their own characterisation as it is a means in which to give character to the space they walk.

In order to give weight to the inclusion of the theatre stage within pedestrian performance studies what follows is a small selection of historical case studies, featuring productions that have innovatively used walking in the theatre. These are principally works within the western tradition of performance from the late nineteenth to the early twenty-first century. This is largely because studies into the relationship between walking and eastern performance history are much more substantial, as evidenced by research in Noh and Kabuki theatre.[[48]](#endnote-48) Through examining the selected works through the lens of pedestrian performance, it can be argued that, although denied the “actual experience” of walking, an audience can encounter a different kind of walking, one which is metaphorical and internalized. It illustrates how the walking of the actor and the journey motif can facilitate a kinaesthetic empathy within a seated audience, in which it is possible for them to feel as if a part of the walking that occurs on stage.[[49]](#endnote-49)

## Being Carried Along: Parsifal

Richard Wagner’s opera *Parsifal* (1882) was a performance built on two walks: the pilgrimage of the title character to the secret location of the Holy Grail and the audience’s own journey to the Bayreuth Festpielhaus theatre in which it was performed. Throughout the nineteenth century European theatre ‘tended towards the representational; the audience witnessed a harmoniously conceived “other” world; they were invited to be transported; to become absorbed, anonymous spectators’.[[50]](#endnote-50) Such ‘transportation’ was facilitated in part, by the Symbolism movement, which, emerging towards the end of the century, ‘saw theatre as a potential crucible in which the arts of poetry, painting, music and dance might be harmoniously fused’.[[51]](#endnote-51) As a director, composer and essayist, Wagner was very much at the centre of this transition, and his coining of the term *gesamtkunstwerk* or ‘total art’ expressed a desire for a theatre audience ‘to forget other inhabitants of the darkened auditorium, and lose themselves in evocations of Germanic myth’.[[52]](#endnote-52)

*Parsifal* was a theatre-specific production, designed exclusively for the Bayreuth Festspielhaus, which, for Christopher Baugh, ‘was a revolutionary architectural solution that removed galleries and provided a unified auditorium offering an encumbered “spectator” to experience and to become absorbed in the “other” world created by the very latest technology on the stage’.[[53]](#endnote-53) In addition to the invisible orchestra pit, and the novel use of electricity in making the grail glow at the end of Act I, we also have one of the earliest attempts in trying to create the illusion of a journey.

Here the rhythmical theme of the Bells of Monsalvat enters and the scenery begins to move whilst Parsifal and Gurnemanz appear to walk …. As the scene proceeds the youth remarks in surprise: “I hardly step, and yet I seem already far”. “You see, my son”, explains Gurnemanz, “Time changes here to Space.”[[54]](#endnote-54)

This change from ‘time to space’ was effected by ‘means of four long moving dioramas, which were spooled into rollers and gradually unravelled to simulate movement’.[[55]](#endnote-55) Referred to as a ‘master-stroke in scenic illusion’, this moment dazzled some of its spectators.[[56]](#endnote-56) Composer Felix Weingartner stated that ‘one did not walk, one was carried along’.[[57]](#endnote-57) Wagner here was trying to further establish the totalising effect of his theatre, by attempting to give the audience the ability to transcend the ‘mystic gulf’ between them and the performers, by following the same ‘magic paths’ as Parsifal.[[58]](#endnote-58) Weingartner’s observation about being ‘carried along’, in addition to contributing to the canon of scholarly work concerning the production’s religious themes, illustrates first-hand the effects of this walking without moving. There is a sense that some of the audience did not need to physically walk in order to be given the feeling of embarking on a journey. In fact, such dislocation of the travelling imagination from that of the stationary body adhered to the spiritual transcendental qualities that helped to annihilate time and space through the actuality of the drama.[[59]](#endnote-59) Rather than resorting to a ‘shutter-like revelation’ between scenes, which invariably segments the narrative, the audience are “let behind the curtain” to a degree, to follow the characters on their journey.[[60]](#endnote-60) Parsifal and Gurnemanz do not leave the scene, but the scene leaves them, inverting the usual experience for an audience.

The theatre-specific nature of the production, coupled with the location of the theatre itself, has prompted many academics and critics to describe Bayreuth as a pilgrimage site.[[61]](#endnote-61) In *The Haunted Stage* (2001)*,* Marvin Carlson suggests the term “pilgrimage theatre” with reference to unique institutions such as Bayreuth, the Cartoucherie at Vincennes, and the Bouffes du Nord.[[62]](#endnote-62) For Carlson, each visit to one of these theatres for recurring audiences ‘is ghosted by memories not only of visiting this particular theatre in the past but indeed of the much more elaborate process of traveling across Europe or from some remote part of the world to come to Bayreuth’.[[63]](#endnote-63)Consequently, Matthew Wilson Smith suggests that the audience drew parallels between their journey to the theatre and Parsifal’s journey to the Castle of the Grail[[64]](#endnote-64). Matthew Jefferies also makes such a comparison, referring to Bayreuth as a ‘temple’, providing ‘holy communion’ for its audience.[[65]](#endnote-65)

Wagner’s decision to locate Bayreuth outside of the metropolitan district of theatres meant that audiences wishing to experience his productions had to depart from this also. Their journey to the theatre required a social commitment, its location heightening a sense of exclusivity, which prompted Leo Tolstoy to wonder ‘what an honest peasant would say watching the cream of the upper classes engaged in voluntary hypnosis’.[[66]](#endnote-66) This “hypnosis” was facilitated by Wagner’s creation of the aforementioned “mystic gulf”, which created a space without obstacles, no longer dividing the audience from the stage. It allowed some to imaginatively transgress more fluidly into the world of the play, overcoming a threshold of sorts akin to the liminality of pilgrims, who when temporarily removed from a social structure exist in ‘no-place and no-time’.[[67]](#endnote-67) Although the innovative design of the Bayreuth theatre enabled such an effect, this was also strengthened by the journey motif of *Parsifal,* and the marrying of the spiritual quest of its hero with the audience’s unique journey to the theatre.

## The Epic Flow: Good Soldier Schwejk

This illusion of distorting the dimensional qualities of the stage space through technological advances in scenography was further illustrated in Erwin Piscator’s production of *Good Soldier Schwejk* (1927) at the Piscator-Bühne Theatre in Berlin. Deemed the theatre’s ‘greatest popular success’[[68]](#endnote-68), the production was adapted by Piscator, Felix Gasbarra, and Bertolt Brecht from the unfinished satirical novel *The Fateful Adventures of the Good Soldier Švejk During the World War* (1911) by Czech writer Jaroslav Hašek. Whilst, as illustrated in *Parsifal,* scenographic innovations created an optical illusion of the dimensions of the stage expanding, in *Schwejk* they also underwent contraction, prompting an experience that was both seamless and at times dislocating for its audience.

*Good Soldier Schwejk* concerns the never-ending march of the good soldier ‘who accepts anything at all, and walks through the wicked world invulnerable’ by marching in a ‘straight line, looking neither right nor left’.[[69]](#endnote-69) He is a figure whose blind loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian cause, prompts him to march in total obliviousness of anything that he passes unless it hinders him from reaching the Austrian Front. Through the stage design, Piscator sought to retain the rambling step-by-step structure of the novel by building a large conveyor belt on stage for the performers to walk on.[[70]](#endnote-70) Schwejk would not need to leave the stage, and his long march into infinity would continue uninterrupted. The compression of the novel’s essentials working in conjunction with that of the seemingly expansive properties of the conveyor belt, allowed for the ‘seamless’ flow of events to physically occur “step-by-step”.[[71]](#endnote-71)

The conveyor belt was similar to the moving panorama in *Parsifal,* in which Schwejk did not need to enter or exit a scene, but the scene seemingly entered around *him*, thus creating a totalising effect by offering a more seamless experience for the audience. Nevertheless, one of the factors that undercut its illusive qualities was that Schwejk, when marching, never left his spot on the treadmill, and his overall demeanour did not alter noticeably. He moved without being moved himself, going ‘beyond the single-room space and cause-and-effect linear time of dramatic theatre’, whilst remaining within the same location on stage.[[72]](#endnote-72) The initial comedy in Schwejk’s inability to move whilst walking became something tragic, in accordance with the figure ‘who did not develop at all in the course of the novel’.[[73]](#endnote-73) For Sarah Bryant-Bertail, the ‘Piscator-Bühne had accidently discovered the potential for subversive humour inherent in the modern stage apparatus itself’,[[74]](#endnote-74) and this oscillation between tragedy and comedy relates to the seemingly paradoxical expansive and restrictive dimensions of the stage.

These contradictive components were further strengthened by Piscator’s other scenographic additions. Behind Schwejk’s treadmill, and parallel to it was another conveyor belt, which was employed in order to send actors, props and scenery onto the stage. In addition to allowing scene changes to occur almost seamlessly around the central character, it also, for Bryant-Bertail, suggested ‘a *counter-discourse:* Schwejk walked against the forces rushing towards or towering over him’.[[75]](#endnote-75) These ‘forces’ were illustrated on a screen behind the stage, in which projections of satirical drawings by Dada artist George Grosz would unravel before the audience as Schwejk walked. Bryant-Bertail further illustrates the earlier usage of photomontage by the Dada movement as being influential in highlighting the comic irony of *Schwejk*, in which the social relationships between characters ran at times in tandem with the larger political backdrop.[[76]](#endnote-76) At one instance, Schwejk conducts a large march from a village, only to then find himself back in the same village again, his route projected above.[[77]](#endnote-77) This moment highlights his comic ignorance of events but also suggests a tragedy that is inescapable, one that is emphasized by the cyclical treadmill. Unlike Schwejk, the projections changed their appearance constantly, presenting the war ‘as pieces of a montage that the spectators were entrusted to connect as a system in process’.[[78]](#endnote-78) This was a heavily politicized landscape in which each projection sketched ‘in the power structure to which Schwejk and his ilk are subject’.[[79]](#endnote-79) Schwejk’s journey became bound up with the political history of Europe, its changeability casting the unchangeable soldier as a contradictory symbol of ignorance and passivity who does not react to it.

In addition to the logistical feats of operating the treadmills themselves, comedian Max Pallenberg, who played Schwejk in the production, had the challenge of performing on them for a prolonged period of time. However, although Piscator highlights the challenges of acting whilst walking for a prolonged period,[[80]](#endnote-80) there may have been advantages for the actor also. The ‘uninterrupted flow’ of the play may have benefitted the performer, who could now remain “in role” throughout with very little dialogue. For Brecht, the ‘performer’s self-observation, an artful and artistic act of self-alienation, stopped the spectator from losing himself in the character completely, i.e. to the point of giving up his own identity, and lent a splendid remoteness to the events’.[[81]](#endnote-81) Such “self-observation”, one could argue, was aided by Pallenberg remaining on stage throughout, his constant movement becoming a process of suspension which enabled him to avoid depicting a fully grounded and perhaps more naturalistic representation of Schwejk. Apart from some minor distractions, integral to the plot, the character of Schwejk was allowed to remain unchanged, retaining the passivity of the character[[82]](#endnote-82) and became ‘one with the figure’ as one critic noted.[[83]](#endnote-83) The seamless flow of events created through the use of walking can therefore benefit the performer who never left the stage, engaged within an ‘epic flow’.[[84]](#endnote-84)

## Inward Walking: Footfalls

In the previous examples technological developments in scenography allowed for the performer to walk unobstructed, without having to turn around. However, in *Footfalls,* performed originally at the Royal Court in 1976,the action of turning around and retracing steps is critical to its dramatic effect. In a dimly lit stage a woman named May with ‘*dishevelled grey hair, worn grey wrap hiding feet, trailing*’ walks back and forth along a strip of light for exactly nine steps for each length, pausing at intervals.[[85]](#endnote-85) Throughout this short play, the strip of light reduces ‘growing shorter and narrower following each fade out’,[[86]](#endnote-86) pinpointed by the sound of a chime, until no trace of May remains.[[87]](#endnote-87) However, her feet remain unseen and dislocated from the clearly audible sound of footsteps. Here, placing emphasis on the staging of the walker and their path can provide further understanding of Beckett’s ‘enigmatic’ text.[[88]](#endnote-88)

Katherine Worth observes how in some of Beckett’s plays walking is a ‘painful necessity’[[89]](#endnote-89) as evidenced in the ‘short, stiff strides’ of Vladimir in *Waiting for Godot[[90]](#endnote-90)* and the ‘Stiff, staggering walk’ of Clov in *Endgame*.[[91]](#endnote-91) Beckett himself was a keen walker, a pastime he inherited from his father[[92]](#endnote-92) that eventually became a means for him to combat depression during his spells of illness when he found it difficult to write.[[93]](#endnote-93) However, it was the pacing of his mother May who was influential in his later writing of *Footfalls.*

She did have difficulty sleeping throughout the night, and there were often periods when she paced the floor of her room or wandered through the darkened house as silently as one of the ghosts which she swore haunted it.[[94]](#endnote-94)

Beckett’s mother embodied a mixture of stern Protestantism, superstition and a borderline obsessive compulsive disorder, which manifested itself physically through her pacing. Although there is evidence to suggest that she was not the sole influence for the figure of May in *Footfalls,* the sight of her ‘gaunt apparition’ by the Beckett children and the nightmares it prompted, undoubtedly had a lasting effect on the playwright.[[95]](#endnote-95)

One of the principal reasons why *Footfalls* has to be staged with a physically immobile audience is because the character of May must ‘hear the feet, however faint they fall’.[[96]](#endnote-96) Putting the audience on their feet would undoubtedly hinder their ability to ‘watch her move in silence’.[[97]](#endnote-97) Actress Billie Whitelaw, who portrayed May in the original stage production, described the play as a ‘musical Edvard Munch painting’ in which Beckett used her ‘to play the notes’.[[98]](#endnote-98) The ‘notes’ themselves are very specific, and Beckett himself later stated that there were ‘a lot of problems concerning precision’.[[99]](#endnote-99)

Pacing: starting with right foot (r), from right (R) to left (L), with left foot (l) from L to R.

Turn rightabout at L, leftabout at R.

Steps: clearly audible rhythmic tread.[[100]](#endnote-100)

With some of the lines made specific to a single footfall, the degree of focus required by an actor to do this may seem quite staggering. This is furthered by the fact that May’s walk never alters, and she is committed to doing her nine steps back and forth across the playing space without deviation. She walks back and forth in order to remember, her repetition of lines indicating moments when she encounters the ghost of her former self. Her questions to her Mother (‘What age am I now?’[[101]](#endnote-101) and ‘Will you never have done … revolving it all?’[[102]](#endnote-102)) illustrates that May is caught between remembering and forgetting. This brings us to what Worth in her account of the original production describes as ‘inward walking’, or a ‘going over some stretch of ground in order to see it more clearly, perhaps to lay a ghost’.[[103]](#endnote-103) However, such repetition is not to make us more aware of *who* exactly May is, but to make us “clearer” as to her predicament – that of a ghostly figure who does not know if she is “coming or going”. Walking here then illustrates an ability to stage a process of simultaneously remembering and forgetting, existing outside of a specific time or place whilst caught in a looping rhythm of footsteps and dialogue.

Walking is the action that makes the character of May “present”. As Beckett himself and many have noted, the character of May remains incomplete, ‘a presence, not a person – certainly not a person who has ever been properly born outside the imagination’.[[104]](#endnote-104) Whitelaw described how, as the play progressed, she ‘began to feel more and more like a “thing” of the spirit, something that was vaporising’.[[105]](#endnote-105) May’s presence and indeed her existence is bound up with her walking, and this notion of her ‘not being quite there’, suggests that she does not have a ‘place’ outside of this reducing strip of light.[[106]](#endnote-106) This is echoed by Enoch Brater in his detailed examination of the play, who compares May’s walking route to an elongated ‘variation of the figure 8 turned on its side’, resembling ‘the mathematician’s symbol for infinity’.[[107]](#endnote-107) The connotations of such movement – the repetitive pacing for prolonged periods of time – chime with a host of different types of walking and walking routes, and through careful cross-analysis the differences between the ‘inward walking’ and actual walking of *Footfalls* can be ascertained.

## The Super-Modern: Wanderlust

Originally staged at the Cleveland Public Theatre, Matthew Earnest’s *Wanderlust* (2010)is an important and overlooked case study in pedestrian performance research. It is one of very few recent pedestrian performances taking place in a conventional stage setting and furthermore, is very much a piece *about* the action of walking itself. It is adapted from the non-fiction book of the same name by Rebecca Solnit (2002), presenting a history of walking that has proven popular with academics and artists. With regards to the performance’s quite traditional staging arrangement, Earnest revealed that his reasoning for this was two-fold. Firstly, he felt that it was logistically easier to stage a touring production in a proscenium arch arrangement and secondly, such staging was more in accordance with his approach to the adaptation.[[108]](#endnote-108) It is this second aspect that will be focussed on here, as Earnest’s adaptation, like all the case studies in this essay, could only achieve its proper effect in the theatre by the audience remaining immobile. Such a move encouraged the audience to take a more objective stance, demonstrating a tension between the experience of walking and its representation. Whilst in many site-based pedestrian performances, walking functions as a means for audiences to explore sites, here, it is the action itself that is being explicitly interrogated.

The piece like its source material, concerns the history of walking and the role it has played in humanity’s history, chiming with Francesco Careri’s belief that ‘the history of the origins of man is a history of walking.’[[109]](#endnote-109) In one hundred minutes (without an interval), *Wanderlust* travels far both geographically and temporally, showing the audience glimpses of the beginning of walking and its possible demise in a post-walking world.

One of the principal argumentative threads running through *Wanderlust* is that of walking as an act of resistance to super-modernity. Defined by sociologist Marc Augé, super-modernity is a concept born from a belief in the ‘acceleration of history’[[110]](#endnote-110) and the shrinking of space, due to an increase in high-speed transportation.[[111]](#endnote-111) For Augé, we ‘are in an era characterized by changes in scale – of course in the context of space exploration, but also on earth: rapid means of transport have brought any capital within a few hours’ travel of any other’.[[112]](#endnote-112) In *Wanderlust* we witness this transition from modernity to super-modernity in a compressed period of time, beginning in England in 1830 with the unveiling of George Stevenson’s Rocket. Here the announcer champions the superiority of motorized transportation in which ‘foot power at last begins its long slide towards obsolescence’ that will signal the arrival of ‘The Mechanical Principle, the new philosophy of the 19th century!’.[[113]](#endnote-113) Earnest, in a similar vein to Piscator with *Schweik,* comically juxtaposes these aspects with the tragic events that befell the arrival of the railway. Mrs. Schivelbusch’s facial mutilation involves the dropping of her dislodged eyeball into a Ziploc bag and William Huskinsson, who was run over by the train is carried offstage by the rest of the cast who sing ‘You are my Sunshine’ ‘as a funeral dirge’.[[114]](#endnote-114) This, coupled with the ‘canned cheers’, suggests that for Earnest, motorized transportation has an inherent artificiality.[[115]](#endnote-115) The announcer may have dispelled some of the myths that prefixed the arrival of The Rocket, but within this tragi-comic framing Earnest suggests that there are still psychological and physiological effects to be incurred from motorized transport that cannot be ignored.

This scene is book-ended with the last scene of the play which relates to the last chapter in Solnit’s book. This moment, a popular one with reviewers, takes place entirely within a car and depicts a family who drive around Las Vegas observing all the sights entirely from within their vehicle. Famous landmarks are juxtaposed, there is an overdependence on GPS and a wariness of walkers, who are viewed almost as unnatural figures who are behind the times. Earnest uses a spotlight to isolate the family further,[[116]](#endnote-116) echoing Carl Lavery’s comments regarding the loneliness and isolation of travel by car.

The act of driving alone in a car, for instance, demonstrates the lonely isolation of the contemporary individual better than any theoretical text ever could: it provides empirical proof that supermodern individuality – the right to go where we want, when we want – entails separation from others and reinforces solitude.[[117]](#endnote-117)

This is the present that Earnest satirically depicts; a world in which walking is becoming substituted by high-speed motor travel, creating spaces that we barely interact with.[[118]](#endnote-118) As technology advances, the divide between walking and high-speed motorized transportation continues to expand. Earnest explains how in

Capitalist, mostly vacationless and broke America, the only hope of travel and discovery is Las Vegas, where one may see replicas of all the world's great sites – the pyramids, the Eiffel Tower, the Statue of Liberty, etc. – in one place. I put a middle class family in a car on summer vacation to Las Vegas, hoping that I could express Rebecca's point that we're not really in our bodies anymore, but that we experience the world rolling in these really bizarre boxes we call cars, looking out at the world through windows, not travelling on our own natural steam.[[119]](#endnote-119)

Such a “point” divided critics, some labelling it as ‘the show’s highlight’[[120]](#endnote-120) and others believed that such a ‘moralizing thread’ is ‘simplistic and dated’.[[121]](#endnote-121) The piece for Earnest is about proving that travelling ‘is what makes your life richer … if you allow it to happen to you’,[[122]](#endnote-122) but in Las Vegas the short distance between these ‘architectural greatest hits’ detracts from the “riches” of travel.[[123]](#endnote-123) This, combined with the comparatively less effort needed for motorized transportation, means that the pleasures found in walking, as illustrated by Earnest and his company in the preceding scenes, will diminish. Earnest’s argument, although perhaps a little “simplistic”, is by no means “dated”, and what makes its effect all the more powerful is that it is presented in the theatre, another “bizarre box” in which we look at the world on stage through another “window”.

*Wanderlust* perhaps loses a sense of specificity with this staging that could be achieved by taking the audience to an actual location. However, here the theatre further illustrates a sense of detachment, observed by an audience that does not have to physically move. Earnest’s attitude towards driving echoes that of the Austrian playwright Peter Handke, in which ‘there exists no departure, no change of scene, no sense of arrival’.[[124]](#endnote-124) Earnest attempts to make such a readily accepted and familiar action strange by setting it in an environment that is also susceptible to departure, changing scenery and arrival – that of the theatre. The close proximities between capital cities that Augé refers to are here emphasized, making the distance between whole countries and even time periods lasting but a few seconds. This is a reason why one member of the audience felt ‘exhausted’, because they were forced to align themselves with the pace of Earnest’s piece, which was faster than their own ‘natural stream’.[[125]](#endnote-125)

## Sit-Specific Performance

The variety of different dramatic effects generated by the staging of a walk, provide a firm case for the accommodation of the theatre stage within studies of pedestrian performance. Audiences can recognize that acting is a specialized skill, but walking across a space is something perceived as an ability possessed by most people. It is an action that helps foster a kinaesthetic empathy for the movement of the performers on stage but also creates uncertainty as to whether it is acting or ‘not-acting’.

In analyzing the theatrical event through the lens of pedestrian performance we can observe how the very walk of an actor can act as a point of entry into understanding their characterisation. For the performer in the studio, this provides a sense of return, of unmasking and re-learning bio-mechanical processes to develop themselves, the motif of the journey presenting a seductive means to articulate this. The staging of the path can yield a myriad of themes and ideas pertinent to a play, whether it is the quite seamless technological trickery of a magical pilgrimage or a tragic, never-ending mechanical march through a politicized landscape.

Pedestrian performance also acknowledges the significance of the audience’s journey to and from the theatre. The kinaesthetic experience they accrue when walking to a performance is suspended when they take their seats. The performance they witness may extend such a journey or remind them of their immobility through a manipulation of not just their emotional empathy but their ability to kinaesthetically empathize with the movements of the performers. For some audiences, their departure from the theatre facilitates a marrying of such empathy with their walking, which, as evidenced in *Wanderlust,* facilitated introspective reflection as to the historical significance of their feet.

In focussing on site-based performances that require its audience to walk throughout, the field of pedestrian performance overlooks the significance of the *immobility* of an audience. Fiona Wilkie’s suggestion that the ‘well-documented “walking” model’ of site-based performance has scope for expansion[[126]](#endnote-126) further suggests a need to rethink the defining characteristics of pedestrian performance itself. As interest in walking and performance continues to grow, the field itself also needs to grow, widening its gaze without stopping at the theatre doors.

1. These include: ambulatory performance, walking-based practice, walking performance. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Carl Lavery, ‘Mourning Walk and Pedestrian Performance: History, Aesthetics and Ethics’, in Roberta Mock, ed., *Walking, Writing and Performance* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009), p. 45. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. Elinor Fuchs and Una Chaudhuri, eds., *Land/Scape/Theater* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2002), p.1. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. Ibid*,* p. 1. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. Richard Schechner, *Essays on Performance Theory, 1970-1976* (New York: Drama Book Specialists), p. 122. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. Simon Persighetti, ‘Wrights & Sites & Other Regions’, in Wrights & Sites eds., *Site-Specific: The Quay Thing Documented* (Wiltshire: Antony Rowe, 2000), p. 11. [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. Phil Smith, ‘Crab Walking and Mythogeography’, in Roberta Mock, ed., *Walking, Writing and Performance* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009), p. 81. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. Martin Welton ‘Getting Things Off the Ground: Pedestrian Feelings’, *Performance Research,* Vol. XVII, No. 2, pp. 12-7. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. Rebecca Solnit, *Wanderlust: A History of Walking* (London: Verso, 2002), p. 73. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. Carl Lavery, ‘Preamble: A Panegyric for the Foot’, *Performance Research,* Vol. XVII, No. 2 (2012), p. 3. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. Fiona Wilkie, ‘The Production of “Site”: Site-Specific Theatre’, in Nadine Holdsworth and Mary Luckhurst, eds., *A Concise Companion to 20th Century British and Irish Drama* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 99. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. Una Chaudhuri, *Staging Place: The Geography of Modern Drama* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1997), p. 53. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. Konstantin Stanislavsky quoted in Sharon Marie Carnike, ‘Staniskavsky’s System: Pathways for the Actor’, in Alison Hodge, ed., *Twentieth Century Actor Training* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 17. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. Tadeusz Kantor, *A Journey Through Other Spaces: Essays and Manifestos, 1944-1990,* translated by Michael Kobialka, ed. (London: University of California Press, 1993), p. 17. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. A term used by site-specific promenade company Punchdrunk to reflect their mapping of the performer’s movements through the site. See Andrew Eglinton, ‘Reflections on a Decade of Punchdrunk Theatre’, *Theatre Forum,* No. 37, p. 52. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. David Griffiths, *The Training of Noh Actors and the Dove* (London: Routledge, 1998), p. 38. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. Ibid., p. 38. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. Tadashi Suzuki, *The Way of Acting: The Theatre Writings of Tadashi Suzuki,* translated by J. Thomas. Rimmer(New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1986), p. 3. For an account of some of the walking exercises employed by Suzuki, see James R. Brandon, ‘Training at the Little Theatre: The Suzuki Method’, *The Drama Review: TDR*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1978), p. 29-42. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. Ibid., p. 7. [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. Eugenio Barba, *Beyond the Floating Islands,* translated by Judy Barba(New York: PAJ Publications, 1986), p. 142. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. Dymphna Callery, Through the Body: A Practical Guide to Physical Theatre (London: Nick Hern, 2001), p. 4. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. Ibid., p. 8. [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. Lisa Wolford, ‘Grotowski’s Vision of the Actor’, in Alison Hodge, ed., *Twentieth Century Actor Training* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 196. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. Jerzy Grotowski, *Towards a Poor Theatre* (London: Methuen Drama, 1975), p. 110. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. Ibid., p. 112. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. Jacques Lecoq quoted in Mary Bryden, ‘Clowning with Beckett’, in Stanley E. Gontarski, ed., *A Companion to Samuel Beckett* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 362. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. Jacques Lecoq, *Theatre of Movement and Gesture,* David Bradby, ed. (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), p. 11. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Grotowski, Towards a Poor Theatre, p. 111. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. Renee Emunah, Acting for Real: Drama Therapy Process, Technique and Performance (London: Bruner-Routledge, 1994), p. 184. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. Welton, ‘Getting Things Off the Ground’, p. 16. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. Maria Shetsova, *Robert Wilson* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), p. 126. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
32. Ibid., pp. 119-29. [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
33. It is important to note that a number of these exercises are very similar to those outlined by Tadashi Suzuki in *The Way of Acting,* suggesting a western appropriation of these ideas. [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
34. See Wolford, ‘Grotowski’s Vision of the Actor’, p. 205. [↑](#endnote-ref-34)
35. [↑](#endnote-ref-35)
36. Michael Kirby, ‘On Acting and Not-Acting’, in Phillip Zarrilli, ed., *Acting (Re)Considered: A Theoretical and Practical Guide* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 42. [↑](#endnote-ref-36)
37. Kirby relates an anecdote regarding a ‘critic who headed backstage to congratulate a friend and could be seen by the audience as he passed outside the windows of the on-stage house; it was an opportune moment in the story, however, and he was accepted as part of the play’, p. 42. [↑](#endnote-ref-37)
38. Peter Brook, *The Empty Space* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1968), p. 9. [↑](#endnote-ref-38)
39. John Heilpern quoted in Shomit Mitter, *Systems of Rehearsal: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Grotowski and Brook* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 87. [↑](#endnote-ref-39)
40. Ibid., p. 87. [↑](#endnote-ref-40)
41. Shomit Mitter, Systems of Rehearsal: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Grotowski and Brook (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 108-9. [↑](#endnote-ref-41)
42. Paul Allain, ‘Suzuki Training’, *The Drama Review,* Vol. XLII, No. 1 (1998), p. 78. [↑](#endnote-ref-42)
43. Augusto Boal, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 70. [↑](#endnote-ref-43)
44. Anne Dennis, The Articulate Body: The Physical Training of the Actor (London: Nick Hern, 2002), pp. 45-6. [↑](#endnote-ref-44)
45. Ibid., p. 46. [↑](#endnote-ref-45)
46. Jean-Louis Barrault quoted in Dennis, *The Articulate Body,* p. 46. [↑](#endnote-ref-46)
47. Welton, ‘Getting Things Off the Ground’, p. 13. [↑](#endnote-ref-47)
48. See David Griffiths, *The Training of Noh Actors and the Dove* and Earle Ernst, *The Kabuki Theatre* (New York: Grove Press, 1956). [↑](#endnote-ref-48)
49. Susan Leigh Foster, ‘Movement’s Contagion: The Kinesthetic Impact of Performance’, in Tracy C. Davis, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 50. [↑](#endnote-ref-49)
50. Christopher Baugh, Theatre, Performance and Technology: The Development of Scenography in the Twentieth Century (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 13. [↑](#endnote-ref-50)
51. Richard Drain, ed., *Twentieth Century Performance Reader: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 3. [↑](#endnote-ref-51)
52. David Wiles, *A Short History of Western Performance Space* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 52. [↑](#endnote-ref-52)
53. Baugh, Theatre, Performance and Technology, p. 21. [↑](#endnote-ref-53)
54. Alice Leighton Cleather and Basil Crump, *Lohengrin and Parsifal* (London: Methuen, 1932), pp. 97-8. [↑](#endnote-ref-54)
55. Matthew Wilson Smith, *The Total Work of Art: From Bayreuth to Cyberspace* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 29. [↑](#endnote-ref-55)
56. Cleather and Crump, *Lohengrin and Parsifal,* p. 97. [↑](#endnote-ref-56)
57. Felix Weingartner quoted in Smith, *The Total Work of Art,* p. 29. [↑](#endnote-ref-57)
58. Richard Wagner, *The Diary of Richard Wagner 1865-1882* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1980 [1865]), p. 47. [↑](#endnote-ref-58)
59. Richard Wagner quoted in Cleather and Crump, *Lohengrin and Parsifal,* p. 98. [↑](#endnote-ref-59)
60. Baugh, Theatre, Performance and Technology, p. 86. [↑](#endnote-ref-60)
61. See Nicholas Kilburn, *Wagner’s “Parsifal”: A Pilgrimage to Bayreuth, August 1888* (Bishop Aukland: W.J. Cummins, 1888); Raymond Furness, *Wagner and Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press) and Matthew Wilson Smith, *The Total Work of Art: From Bayreuth to Cyberspace* (London: Routledge, 2007). [↑](#endnote-ref-61)
62. Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), pp. 157-8. [↑](#endnote-ref-62)
63. Ibid., p. 157. [↑](#endnote-ref-63)
64. Smith, The Total Work of Art, p. 29. [↑](#endnote-ref-64)
65. Matthew Jefferies, ‘Imperial Germany: Cultural and Intellectual Trends’, in Mary Fulbrook, ed., *German History Since 1800* (London: Arnold, 1997), p. 187. [↑](#endnote-ref-65)
66. Wiles, A Short History of Western Performance Space, p. 229. [↑](#endnote-ref-66)
67. Victor Turner and Edith Turner, *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives* (London: Basil Blackwell, 1978), p. 250. [↑](#endnote-ref-67)
68. Edward Braun, The Director and the Stage: From Naturalism to Grotowski (London: Methuen, 1982), p. 157. [↑](#endnote-ref-68)
69. Maria Ley-Piscator, *The Piscator Experiment: The Political Theatre* (London: Feffer & Simons, 1970), p. 88. [↑](#endnote-ref-69)
70. John Willett, The Theatre of Erwin Piscator: Half a Century of Politics in the Theatre (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 90. [↑](#endnote-ref-70)
71. Felix Gasbarra quoted in Erwin Piscator, *The Political Theatre,* translated by Hugh Rorrison(London: Eyre Methuen, 1980), p. 259. [↑](#endnote-ref-71)
72. Sarah Bryant-Bertail, *Space and Time in Epic Theater: The Brechtian Legacy* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), p. 38. [↑](#endnote-ref-72)
73. Felix Gasbarra quoted in Piscator, *The Political Theatre*, p. 258. [↑](#endnote-ref-73)
74. Bryant-Bertail, Space and Time in Epic Theater, p. 41. [↑](#endnote-ref-74)
75. Ibid., p. 50. [↑](#endnote-ref-75)
76. Ibid., p. 35. [↑](#endnote-ref-76)
77. Ibid., p. 48. [↑](#endnote-ref-77)
78. Ibid., p. 38. [↑](#endnote-ref-78)
79. Sheila McAlpine, *Visual Aids in the Productions of the First Piscator-Bühne, 1927-28* (Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1990),p. 210. [↑](#endnote-ref-79)
80. Piscator, The Political Theatre, p. 260. [↑](#endnote-ref-80)
81. Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic,* translated by John Willett, ed.(Bodmin: MPG Books, 1964), p. 93. [↑](#endnote-ref-81)
82. Felix Gasbarra quoted in Piscator, *The Political Theatre*, p. 258. [↑](#endnote-ref-82)
83. Alfred Polgar quoted in Piscator, *The Political Theatre*, p. 253. [↑](#endnote-ref-83)
84. McAlpine, Visual Aids in the Productions of the First Piscator-Bühne, 1927-28, p. 223. [↑](#endnote-ref-84)
85. Samuel Beckett, *Collected Shorter Plays* (London: Faber, 1984), p. 239. Beckett originally had May walking seven steps, but lengthened this to nine in later productions. See Stanley E. Gontarski, ed., *The Shorter Plays: With Revised Texts for Footfalls, Come and Go, and What Where* (New York: Grove Press, 1999) p. 281. [↑](#endnote-ref-85)
86. Enoch Brater, ‘A Footnote to Footfalls: Footsteps of Infinity on Beckett’s Narrow Space’, *Comparative Drama,* Vol. XII, No. 1, p. 35. [↑](#endnote-ref-86)
87. Samuel Beckett, *Collected Shorter Plays*, p. 243. [↑](#endnote-ref-87)
88. Brater, ‘A Footnote to Footfalls’, p. 35. [↑](#endnote-ref-88)
89. Katherine Worth, *Samuel Beckett’s Theatre: Life Journeys* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), p. 93. [↑](#endnote-ref-89)
90. Samuel Beckett, *Waiting For Godot: A Tragicomedy in Two Acts* (London: Faber, 1956), p. 9. [↑](#endnote-ref-90)
91. Samuel Beckett, *Endgame* (London: Faber, 1964), p. 11. [↑](#endnote-ref-91)
92. David Pattie, *Samuel Beckett* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 7. [↑](#endnote-ref-92)
93. Deirdre Bair, *Samuel Beckett: A Biography* (London: Cape, 1978), pp. 215-6. After the passing of his father, Beckett was quoted as saying: ‘I can’t write about him. I can only walk the fields and climb the ditches after him’. See Pattie, *Samuel Beckett,* p. 22. [↑](#endnote-ref-93)
94. Bair, Samuel Beckett, p. 10. [↑](#endnote-ref-94)
95. Ibid., p. 23. [↑](#endnote-ref-95)
96. Beckett, Collected Shorter Plays, p. 241. [↑](#endnote-ref-96)
97. Ibid., p. 241. [↑](#endnote-ref-97)
98. Billie Whitelaw quoted in Pattie, *Samuel Beckett,* pp. 44-5. [↑](#endnote-ref-98)
99. Brater, ‘A Footnote to Footfalls’, p. 35. [↑](#endnote-ref-99)
100. Beckett, Collected Shorter Plays, p. 239. [↑](#endnote-ref-100)
101. Ibid., p. 240. [↑](#endnote-ref-101)
102. Ibid., p. 243. [↑](#endnote-ref-102)
103. Worth, Samuel Beckett’s Theatre, p. 93. [↑](#endnote-ref-103)
104. Samuel Beckett quoted in Brater, ‘A Footnote to Footfalls’, p. 39. [↑](#endnote-ref-104)
105. Billie Whitelaw quoted in Mary Bryden, ed., *Samuel Beckett and Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 2-3. [↑](#endnote-ref-105)
106. Samuel Beckett quoted in Steven Connor, *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), p. 154. [↑](#endnote-ref-106)
107. Brater, ‘A Footnote to Footfalls’, p. 37. [↑](#endnote-ref-107)
108. Matthew Earnest, personal communication with author (2011). [↑](#endnote-ref-108)
109. Francisco Careri, *Walkscapes: Walking as an Aesthetic Practice,* translated from Spanish by Steve Piccolo and Paul Hammond (Barcelona : Editorial Gustava Gili, GG, 2009), p. 44. [↑](#endnote-ref-109)
110. Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity,* translated from the French by John Howe(London: Verso), p. 28. [↑](#endnote-ref-110)
111. Ibid., p. 31. [↑](#endnote-ref-111)
112. Ibid., p. 31. [↑](#endnote-ref-112)
113. Matthew Earnest, *Wanderlust: A History of Walking* (Unpublished, 2010), p. 9. [↑](#endnote-ref-113)
114. Ibid., p. 9. [↑](#endnote-ref-114)
115. Ibid., p. 9. [↑](#endnote-ref-115)
116. Ibid., p. 48. [↑](#endnote-ref-116)
117. Carl Lavery, ‘The Pepys of London E11: Graeme Miller and the Politics of Linked’, *New Theatre Quarterly,* Vol. XXI, No. 2, p. 152. [↑](#endnote-ref-117)
118. Raymond Lucas, ‘“Taking a Line for a Walk”: Walking as an Aesthetic Practice’, in Tim Ingold and Jo Lee Vergunst, eds., *Ways of Walking: Ethnography and Practice on Foot* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), p. 175. [↑](#endnote-ref-118)
119. Matthew Earnest, personal communication with author (2011). [↑](#endnote-ref-119)
120. Roy Berko, ‘Wanderlust: A History of Walking’, *Roy Berko* (online: <http://royberkinfo.blogspot.com/2010/05/wanderlust-history-of-walking.html>, 2010). [↑](#endnote-ref-120)
121. Claudia La Rocco, ‘A History of How We Got from Here to There’, *The New York Times,* (online: <http://theater.nytimes.com/2010/07/16/theater/reviews/16wander.html>, 2010). [↑](#endnote-ref-121)
122. Matthew Earnest quoted in Rebecca Kastleman, ‘These Feet Were Made For Walking’, *American Theatre,* May/June (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 2010), p. 21. [↑](#endnote-ref-122)
123. Solnit, *Wanderlust,* p. 286. [↑](#endnote-ref-123)
124. Peter Handke in conversation with Peter von Becker quoted in Mark Trezona, ‘The Hour We Knew Nothing of Each Other – Peter Handke’, *Performance Marks* (online: <http://performancemarks.blogspot.com/2008/04/hour-we-knew-nothing-of-each-other.html>, 2008). [↑](#endnote-ref-124)
125. Christine Howey, ‘Power Walking’, *Cleveland Scene* (online: <http://www.clevescene.com/cleveland/power-walking/Content?oid=1908899>, 2010). [↑](#endnote-ref-125)
126. Fiona Wilkie, ‘Site-Specific Performance and the Mobility Turn’, *Contemporary Theatre Review,* Vol. XXII, No. 2, p. 207. [↑](#endnote-ref-126)