**Mimesis of types:**

**Exploring urban types and their metamorphoses through theatre**

**Archetypes, Types, Patterns, and Everyday life**

Archetypes are *patterns* (Alexander, 1977, 1979(, physical configurations that foster life situations and are likely to be found in different cultures and places. The patterns, as arrangements of the physical environment receive their peculiar meaning in the historic-cultural constellations in which they are located. In other words, patterns are realized as types, in specific times and cities. The specificities of place and time interpret the pattern, grant it life and meaning. Interaction between patterns or archetypes creates the generic urban language, while the interaction between types creates the unique spatial language intelligible through the practices of everyday life. In other words, quotidian meaning is expressed in physical forms and order, activities, moods, and atmospheres of places in the city and constitutes the experience of urbanism at that time and place.

Thus the unique language interpreted the archetype "balcony" in various forms in the context of Naples, Vienna, Paris or Tel Aviv. In the urban image of all these cities the balcony occupies a significant feature, yet there are significant differences in the realization of this archetype in the quality of the quotidian and daily experience of urban life in each of the aforementioned cities. This experience is closely related to the human perception and to the human body.

This approach, promoted by Alexander, will be used in this article as a point of departure to shed light on a process in which the theater distills the interpretation of the pattern (archetype) as a type, and uses this essence in order to arouse specific urban experience and thus specific meanings, in the consciousness of the viewers.

**Mimsis and the direct link between theater and urban space and its meanings**

Like urban patterns, space in theater is interpreted through its use. However, in its theatrical performance urban space is enriched with additional meanings, due to the symbolic character of theatre stage.

On stage, every object, sight, idea, movement, speech, and relationship is perceived as representing a parallel phenomenon outside the theater fiction, in real life. Representation is a binary relationship in which A is placed instead of B by virtue of similar characteristics, which are accentuated in A (the imitation). According to Aristotle, this posing of A for expressing B is not merely a reduction of the characteristics of the thing that is being imitated (B), but the embedding of its distillation in materials and words, the revelation of its beautiful essence and its implementation. This process according to Aristotle is Mimesis. (Aristotle "Poetics").

Representation as system of signs (as in any meaning-carry system) is based on another factor that is external. This external factor mediate and connect between the representer and the represented, interprets the representer as a sign and grant it meaning. This is the addressee, and in the case of the theater: the audience.

The need for the physical presence of a public, and the gathering of people together for the theatrical event is one of the theater’s unique characteristics. Social and communal framework have been rooted in the essence of theatre from its birth in the Greek polis.

This virtual community of viewers also counted as the users of the city. Audience attending the theater are charged with attitudes, values, images, symbols and meanings that are familiar from their daily life. In light of these daily meanings, the theater audience interprets the stage representation, including the representation of the urban-scape. I.e. the theatrical event takes place as a dialogue between the present audience and its creators.

Further to the above, according to Erika Fischer-Lichte, the theater is also a genre of ‘cultural performance’) Fischer-Lichte, 1997; 2005) this term was first coined by American anthropologist Milton Singer in the late 1950s. According to Singer some public events are cultural structures in which a set of basic images is articulated. These images are a clear expression of the way in which a culture understands itself and presents itself, both to members of the culture and to strangers, both present in the event. Following Singer, Fisher-Lichte (Fisher-Lichte 1997, 2005) places the importance of theater as a cultural performance and as a community medium, through which key themes, attitudes and images can be examined in a specific time and place. She also proposes to approach the history of the theater as the history of culture.

Thus far, and as a starting point, I would like to indicate the choice of theater creators in highlighting certain aspects of urbanism. By virtue of the cultural event, this choice points to cultural and urban key issues inherent in these aspects.

Thereby, the embodiment of a specific urban type in theater as an interpretation of what Alexander refers to as Pattern (Archetype),constitutes an 'x-ray' of urbanism at a certain time and city. Moreover, the theater illuminates the urban experience as unique and emphasizes the sensory-poetic potential inherent in it as a network of spatial relations.

**Case study**

In the following paragraphs I will examine Tel Aviv, a young city, lately celebrated its 100th anniversary, which exists as a central meaning and as central experience in the lives of its residents and users. In fact from its inception (1909) Tel-Aviv served as a central idea in Israeli culture as a whole.

Tel Aviv's urbanism as typical everyday life arises in the collaboration work of Hanoch Levin - playwright and director, and Ruth Dar - scenographer and costume designer, last from the early 1970s until Levin's death in August 1999.

Both Levin and Dar grew up, was educated, lived and worked in Tel Aviv, The city whose images constitutes a foundations for their artistic creation.

From the corpus of their work I will focus on the theater show *Ya’akobi and Leidental* (1972, The Cameri Theater), and two productions of the play *Krum* (1974, Haifa Theater; 2000, The Cameri Theater). These works were chosen due to their unfolding scenario mainly outside the house. Overviewing the places and events in those performances characterizes the space appearing on stage and the fictional space, as a network of urban-patterns (Archetypes) that are interpreted as specific types. These types are characterized by the theatre works mentioned, and appear throughout Levin's writings (plays, stories, poems, etc.).

This paper will demonstrate the theatrical interpretation of a pattern (archetype) as type, focusing on the 'balcony' archetype in its unique Tel-Avivian variation. For this end I will analyze the quality of urban life emerging from the spatial relations appearing on Levin’s theatre stage, in light of the experience of the urban space and life environment characterized Tel Aviv in the 1970s and 1980s.

Examining the appearance of spatial archetypes on theatre stage relates directly to their representation (as particular types), by the entirety of theatrical means and especially by the scenography. Therefore, I shall focus on the means of representation no less than examining therepresented.

**Tel-Aviv - A City of balconies**

Notably, In the 1970s Tel Aviv was referred to as a "city of balconies". This image was based on the significant presence of the balcony in the urban - scape, which stemmed primarily from a municipal bylaw from its early years (mid-twenties), to include 6.6% balconies in each apartment (Aronis, 2016, p. 36). As a result 50 years later most of the apartments in the city included one or two balconies. (1) [[1]](#footnote-1)

The multiplicity of balconies[[2]](#footnote-2) led to the great weight of this element in the physical shaping of Tel-Aviv’s urban landscape. The balcony provided interesting reflections of lights and shadows in the building's mass, and cast shadows on the street. The railing of the balcony was designed in a variety of forms that gave attention and decoration to the modernist architecture that characterized Tel Aviv in the 1930s and 1940s.(picture) However, unlike the European balcony that is mainly a decorative element, the Tel Avivian balcony had a distinctive social function featuring a central position in everyday urban life. (Metzger-Smoke, 1994, p. 29).

In the housing buildings characterized Tel Aviv from the 1950s, the balcony was a spacious, semi-open area, which served as a spatial continuation of the living room, and as one of the main ways to ventilate and cool the apartment during the hot humid summer days. (Shavit & Bigger, 2001, p. 253)

The vibrant life of the balconies was extrovert and linked directly to the street. According to Nitza Metzger-Smoke, "… people on the balconies had loud conversations with people on the street. In the evenings family and friends gathered on the balconies, where they ate, talked and played cards." (ibid ) (reference image)

.

At the same time that it was a "city of balconies," Tel Aviv's urban image was at a low ebb. The city center was abandoned in favor of the new neighborhoods that were built in the city’s northern part. Well-established and young residents moved to the satellite towns, and in the city remained many old people and small bourgeoisie. The abandoned apartments in the city center housed small offices and workshops and the streets were dilapidated (Shavit & Bigger, 2002)

Tel Aviv of the 1970’s was a city of low 3-4-storey houses, arranged in differentiated neighborhoods, which were yet very much alike. Small bourgeoisie immigrants from all over the world occupied the neighborhoods, hence the city contained a variety of customs, foods and languages. The variety of sounds and smells blended in the public sphere through the open balconies and windows, and due to the physical proximity of the apartments.

All these specific Tel-Aviv patterns, encourage comparison and implicit competition, realized in nosiness and prying eyes from the balconies outwards, and from the street into the balcony and the interior of the house.

At the beginning of the previous decade, shutters were marketed aggressively, first asbestos ones, in the late 1950s, and later plastic shutters in the early 1960s (reference image) As a result a trend of closing balconies appeared in the urban sphere (Efrat, 2004). The plastic shutters enabled easy closing of the balcony and including it in the residential area[[3]](#footnote-3) that was "hidden from the sun and neighbors" (Efrat, ibid.). In the residential buildings converted to business in the city center, the closed balconies became storage area.

But, although installing shutters was widespread and the city changed its appearance, many residents continued to use the balcony as they did before. Thus, though shutters allowed closing of the balcony, its use was usually as a partition with open grooves, and in many cases shutters were left wide open during the day ((תמונה של סבא ואיתמר. Closing of private spaces with nightfall and its reopening with sunrise is another layer that was added to the balcony’s relationship with the street, as a result of the use of shutters. Consequently, despite the strong linking of the balcony to the interior privet areas of the house, the direct connection to the street continued to exist throughout the day and evening, through active action (the opening of the shutters). Accordingly the connection to the street remained as it was and the voyeuristic atmosphere was even intensified.

**First show: *Ya’akobi and Leidental*: Stuckness and vitality, balcony and street**

In 1972, the play "Ya’akobi and Leidental" was premiered at the Cameri Theater. According to playwright and director Hanoch Levin it was "A play with songs about a triangle that is not the most romantic: Two sour men and a sour woman miss life”.

The show started with the sounds of with a piano playing in the background while the stage remained dark. A beam of light appeared and illuminated a section of the stage floor and the back screen. Into this light came the actor who played Ya’akobi and spoke. According to the play, in the fictional world, he was on the street. In other words, from the opening of the show, the situation of being in the street was translated into images of the theater: a red screen, the stage floor, a beam of light and an actor. Other meanings were added during the performance with the exposure of the scenography. At the center of the stage a red curtain appeared at a height of about 2 meters, leaving an empty area between it and the stage walls, and a game area of about 2 meters wide In front of the curtain. On this front area, adjacent to the screen, on the stage right, stood two chairs, and another, identical chair, on the stage left. Above the solitary chair was an iron balustrade attached by its bottom to a podium that is concealed by the screen. In a mirror image of the railing, above the pair of chairs - a black frame that forms a window. (Reference image)

At first glance, it seems that on the stage are very basic elements and theatre props. However, a closer examination raises their arrangement in a typical grid of a building façade in a Tel Avivian street (see picture ...). The street scenes takes place across the stage, thus creating a movement along the long axis of the stage, mirroring street traffic. The balcony railing, the window and the playing area (that mirror the street) created a relationship similar to the one existed in the city, between the balcony, the window and the street. Moreover, the width of a typical Tel Avivian street ranges from 9 meters to 15 meters. This width allows the viewer from the sidewalk or from the opposite balcony to perceive the facade of the building along with the pavement below it. Thus, placing the scenography on the stage in a typical grid of the façade, places the audience in the voyeuristic position of those who gaze at the events from the opposite balcony or sidewalk - as aforesaid, a typical everyday life situation and urban experience of Tel Aviv at the time.

The play starts with Ya’akobi’s declaration on the street, and immediately passes to Ya’akobi and Leidental, who are on the balcony of the latter's apartment: "Can’t you see that I am a busy person!? That I don’t have time to full around!? Ya’akobi bang against the stunned Leidental, " How long do you think I will continue to stink with you on the balcony?! ... I'm a busy person, I'm busy, busy. "(Ibid., Act 2). Ya’akobi, who has just realized he was "born to live," demonstratively leaves the balcony back to the street, and from this moment a fundamental difference exists between the one who left and the one who remains seated.

In this scene, the balcony is a street definer, and the relationship between the balcony and the street is characterized by the activities taking place in each of them and by the pace which they are attributed.

The balcony, according to Ya’akobi and Leidental, is a place of relaxation and friendship, of the small routine rituals of life. Seating on the balcony in the evening also includes refreshments and social activities such as - eating herring, drinking tea and playing dominos. This ritual, consists of simple and familiar activities, draws on the characters a sense of security, closeness and intimacy. "... I think we are deeply immersed in happiness ..." Leidental declares just before Ya’akobi surprises him with a refusal to "stink on the balcony."

Ya'akobi seek to return to the street and participate in the stream of life. The street is portrayed as a dynamic place of important and urgent occupations, busy, crowded and vital. Most importantly, it is a place that allows for accidental meetings, unexpected events, and following these - for changes. "We are not the same kind" Ya’akobi says to Leidental, meaning that he see himself as belonging to the street while Leidental belongs to the balcony. He (Ya’akobi) belongs to the busy people, whose lives are meaningful, take action, have a future, participate in life. And Leidental belongs to those who watch from the sidelines.

This situation is completely different from the urban functioning of the Parisian balcony, for example. Temma Balducci (reference) discusses the balcony in the urban life of Paris after Haussmann, as reflected in Manet's paintings and other Impressionist. The Parisian balcony is described as an 'extended window' that allows viewing the city from within the interior of the house. Paris of the 19th century is a "spectacle to be enjoyed" and the balcony allows the French bourgeoisie protected street viewing without the need for contact. In other words, in this case there is a distance between the street and the balcony, balconies residents are not involved in what is happening on the street, but only gaze in it from the interior or the small balcony. Moreover, the social status woven with metaphors of 'high' and 'low' was preserved. One who is on the high balcony above the street also "elevates" themselves from a class standpoint. The Parisian balcony, if so, allows viewing and therefore control through the gaze from above.

The urban experience associated with the Tel Avivian balcony, as evidenced by Levin's work, is almost the opposite. A person on the balcony is not tone who raised themselves but someone who is "stuck" in it, and cannot mingle with the stream of life afforded by the street. In the theatrical situation described above Ya'akobi seeks to uproot himself from the degeneration offered by the balcony. The street is the vein of life, therefore the ones who belongs to the street are young people and couples going out to enjoy themselves. The old, the lonely, and the sick remain on the balcony like abandoned objects. Thus, for example, in one of his segments of prose, Levine describes an old man looking from the balcony of his second-floor apartment on a young man standing in the street (reference image). The position of the old man's passive viewer is illustrated by the identification of him with the space in which he is located: "He sat on the peeling plaster balcony, his bones pushing from weakness and his mouth full of insipid sourness .... From the rows of rags hanging over the old man's head - old towels, woolen socks, tank tops, yellowish underwear wide as a woman's dress, And even a plastic bag that had been washed and now drying - among these rags a big shout is willing to hatch..” (reference image).

The old man wishes to participate in the dynamic life of the street, and to gain existential recognition, so he shouts to the young man who threw his cigarette box on the sidewalk: "Sir! This is not a garbage can!”, but aside for a grin, he does not get a response.

The observer's position on the Tel-Avivian balcony, therefore, is characterized not as a position of power, but as a position of ‘no choice’. The view to the street is described not as a subversive act, but as a “remainder of an action," whose importance is to confirm the vitality of the street by way of contrast.

Additionally, there is a fundamental and important difference between gazing from the balcony and peeping from the street into the balcony. This difference stems from the degree of privacy of each of the spaces from which the viewing is carried out. The street is an urban-public space and anyone who goes out on the street knowingly 'playing the game' and prepares to be watched, whether by others walking on the street or by those who sit in a café, on the balconies or standing by their shops doorways. Therefore, one who goes out on the street wear a desirable image using clothes and accessories. For example in the play Ya’akobi and Leidental, David Leidental is carrying a suitcase in order "to look like a busy man hurrying somewhere ..." (Jacoby and Leidental, act 6).

Ruth Shechash (the female figure), mocks her fate in the end of the play and sings: "... and then again I have to get up, go out into the street / heavy with jewels and frozen smiles ..." (Yacobi and Leidental, Act 28).

This is different from being on the balcony. One who is on the balcony may physically be outside the house and in a way on the street, but cognitively they are in a private space. Thus, while the prying eyes from the balcony to the street may be critical, the voyeuristic gaze from the street to the balcony is an invasion and even exposure of those who are in it.

Another example from Levin’s prose demonstrates this invasion. a piece named Szczecki begins as follows ( reference): "Szczecki liked to walk in small streets of residential buildings, on the main street, the senses are sinking with great traffic, with loud noise and crowded shops, while Szczycki prefers to enjoy his senses in peaceful sights of people on the balconies of their homes or half of people in the windows of their rooms, or in their blurry figures behind the closed curtain, making gestures to eat, stretch out, or carry out acts painfully pleasing, sometimes he would be lucky to see a young girl in a balcony sitting at the table eating fruit and writing… . "

The Tel Avivian balcony as a dual space between private and public, and the voyeuristic atmosphere woven in it, is reflected as well in the paintings of David Gerstein, exhibited in the summer of 1980 at the Horace Richter Gallery in Jaffa. Yona Fischer wrote in the exhibition catalog: "... three stories, one in front of the other ... all are neighbors, all are fortified from everyone else, all with passive curiosity looking at everyone else.... Out of the ambush behind the window he [The painter, AS] is looking down or up at the balcony across the street, stopped to document ... the boundary of a visible and hidden, of exterior and interior - between a street and a dim lit apartment - the mark of a strange living space, kind of a small and peaceful botanical cage. "(Fisher, 1984). (See drawings - withdraw authorization)

Voyeurism as an urban experience anchored in the language of the unique space to Tel Aviv, and first and foremost on the balcony stands at the core of the play "Krum," which premiered in 1975 at the Haifa Theater.

**The second play: Krum (1975): Balconies, voyeurism, gaze as a critical idea**

The scenography for the performance of "Krum" in Haifa theatre was the only Levin and Dar’s set that situated an identified place. It was based on actgraphs and paintings of the streets ‘Geula’, ‘Jonah the Prophet’ and ‘Rabbi Kook’ located in the center of Tel Aviv). (See Sketch No.) Yet it was never explicitly stated that the urban space is Tel-Aviv’s.

On either side of the stage painted coulisse, depicting a sequence of low-rise grayish-pink buildings, creating a perspective of a street descending to the sea.

The back of the stage is elevated with a podium of about 40 cm in width, and in the lower part symmetrically stood: a bed wrapped in a blanket- on the left side, and a kitchen table with a pair of Thonet chairs - on the right. Behind them, still on the lower part attached to the podium, two elevations of about 20 cm enclosed in the railing. Between the elevations, two pairs of square wooden chairs arranged next to two square tables. Except for those described, center-stage was free of scenery and objects.

Deep in perspective, a large and smooth sky curtain, and a horizon line of the sea. (See drawing ......)

Neighborhood voyeurism realized in this production in the choice to create a hierarchy of openness in the representation of the four apartments on stage. The two front ones are completely exposed and reduced to a bed and a kitchen table as representative furniture accessories. The other two apartments are hidden behind shutters and the characters’ lives are exposed only through the balconies, or the departure of these figures into the public space of “the street”, in the center of the stage.

The stage arrangement described above may also be interpreted as the layout of two buildings on both sides of the street. In the typical architecture of Tel Aviv, the first floor is built on, or slightly above, the street level and exposed to the invasive look of whoever passes by. The argument is supported by the accepted claim[[4]](#footnote-4) that Levin's social hierarchy is physically expressed in the direction of the mise-en-scene, by spatial relationships between the characters[[5]](#footnote-5). Thus, a strong figure will raise itself - for example stand on the table, while a lowered figure would lower itself physically - shrink in fetus style under the table.

However, prying and gazing as a feature of the Tel Aviv urban experience form a deeper layer, as these become a central theme of the show.

We have seen in *Ya’akobi and Leidental*, how the set on stage created the parallel to the daily experience on Tel Aviv streets, by placing scenographic-theatrical elements within a grid of a typical Tel Avivian building facade.

Looking on case of Krum's, directing and scenography realized gazing as a theme in three interrelated ways: through perspective, by creating a multi-site stage, and by the presence of actors on stage even in non-participating scenes. Namely, Actors/characters are present “in a cafe" on stage, watching other Actors/characters together with the audience in the theater hall, in a scenario that happens to be inside an apartment. This meta-theatrical status emphasizes the similarity between the peeping from the street, and the gaze from the theatre hall (See picture ........ (number)).

The multi-site stage and the present of two and sometimes three locations on stage at the same time, enabled not only viewing of private situations, but also from the audience's point of view, watching different situations in the neighborhood simultaneously. The multiple situations echoed each other and thus created a sample that proves the rule: every apartment echoed other apartments that created a street that is like other streets, to go on to the neighborhood, the city and so on.

Furthermore, the use of the multi-site stage created the situation in which there was almost no need to insert and take out scenery elements. During the entire show, all the places remained open to the gaze of the audience and the exchanges between places were made by the lighting and by actors’ switching location on stage.

Thus the dramatic choice of Dar in the multi-site stage, intensified the penetration of the gaze through the shutters and turned it into a mechanism that roles the overall change of scenery and therefor progress of the plot.

 In other words, the act of viewing, the gaze is the mechanism that promotes the plot, creating a breakage of the partitions between visible and invisible, hidden and exposed, open and closed.

In this context it is interesting to look at the very choice of the perspective scenery for this production, which stands out in its variance compared to other sets of Levin plays, by Dar and others.

The perspective scenery is a well-known pattern in the history of stage design it is serves here for several reasons: First, it creates an imitation of the streets descending to the sea on which it is based on. Second, it focuses the viewer’s gaze on the sea, as a single point of escape from the stage space, and therefor from the neighborhood (which is proven false right at the beginning of the play). Third, like the multi-site pattern it creates multiplicity by duplicating of buildings, and accordingly streets, neighborhoods, and cities[[6]](#footnote-6).Consequently, urban experience presented on stage grant its meaning as a typical urban experience, from the echo of parallel situations in the public/ audience consciousness.

Moreover, the choice of the perspectival scenography implicit viewing itself as theme.

It imitates the gaze on the work of art, and in the case of the theater - the gaze of the audience, which is an immanent component in the theatrical event.

In the Renaissance, perspective was used to imitate reality. Here perspective emphasizes the fact that the scenography **itself** is a representation, in other words, a meta-theatrical reference that raises the notion of ‘point of view’ to the level of awareness. The viewer becomes aware of one's own viewing action, and consequently to the presence of other viewers around, as part of the audience. The awareness of viewing also illustrates the very fact of watching the theater as a 'cultural event'. Thus, the 'point of view' is returned to the audience as a community and raises both local and universal social meanings. This act of arising awareness to ‘the gaze’ can be attributed to the rise of the concept of 'gaze' in Western thought at that period of time, namely the 70s, as a very critical interpretation of power and gender relations. (See Foucault, Golden, Molloy - insert the references in the note). [[7]](#footnote-7).

**Urban enclosure**

The 1980s and 1990s brought a great change in Tel Aviv's city life. Gradually, office and residential towers appeared along Rothschild Boulevard, south Tel Aviv and especially in the northeast of the city. In addition, the city spread as residential neighborhoods continue to develop the north of the city, beyond the Yarkon River. In the 1990s, the skyline changed completely and the towers became a prominent urban feature. Azaryahu argues that "the skyline has become the most important configuration in one’s viewing of the city" (Azaryahu, 2005, p. 346). The proliferation of towers expressed the realization of Tel Aviv's ambition to be the “New York of the Middle East”, that is the realization of its image as a large, international and cosmopolitan city[[8]](#footnote-8). It is important to emphasize that the change in the skyline was more than an expression of urban renewal, or a way to overcome the shortage of land reserves (Shavit & Bigger, 2002), It was even more than realizing Tel Aviv's ambition to be the 'New York of the Middle East'. The change in the skyline implied a fundamental change in the Tel Aviv’s urban experience.

For pedestrians, the towers hid the sky and the horizon narrowed. The towers cast a shadow over the street and gave them a threatening and diminishing sense due to their height in relation to the human body. But most importantly, the height of the towers led to a disconnection between the street and its borders. The towers, especially those who deliberately isolated themselves (as gated-communities, exclusive institutions, ex.), turned a cold neck to the street, which was expressed in a unified facade, with small windows and narrow balconies, if at all.

Aronis (מראה מקום) notes the contribution of technologies such as air condition, intercom and elevator to the enclosure of the buildings towards the street and to obliteration of the social function of the balcony. The detachment from the street was also reflected in the materials from which the new towers and buildings were built. The rubble and local materials were replaced with metal and glass, which added to Tel Aviv's international image, but created a cold, convergent and anonymous atmosphere.

The high-tech fashions that characterized the construction of the towers influenced the appearance of Tel-Aviv as a whole, and the shutters that closed the balconies throughout the city were gradually replaced by glass and aluminum windows, assigning the balcony exclusively to the interior of the house (see picture ...). Since the renovation toke place in a relatively low buildings, many balconies were closed in dark or reflective glass to prevent the look inside (see picture ...). In terms of urban space, these glasses create a state of greater opacity relative to 'ordinary' glass because they reflect the viewer. That is, the window, the glass, is not 'only' present like a wall, but returns the viewing immediately to the viewer. Further, with nightfall, and the reversal of lighting conditions, private interior is exposed. Yet, unlike the exposure of one seating on the balcony, the private sphere is completely disconnected from the surrounding apartments and urban life. To the viewer from the street, the space is revealed beyond the glass, as in television scenes (see picture ...), existing independently of each other, regardless of others or the street. Squares of floating light float in the space of night.

**The third play: Krum (2000): enclosure comes to the theatre**

These changes in the urban fabric and in the daily experience of the city are expressed in the production of Krum, from the year 2000 at the Cameri Theater, directed by Michael (Miki) Gurevitch, and designed by Ruth Dar.

This time the scenery is very dark and closed the stage, creating a cube like space with only one long narrow opening at the back-center. Through a balustrade is seen, and behind it a curtain of sky that was most often illuminated in red. In the high dark walls of the scenery a few bright, square openings, covered with bright curtains. On the left stage, close to the audience, a slightly raised podium, enclosed by a railing. Behind it, on the left-center stage, a black staircase leading to a balcony with a railing and a doorway that is used as a door, also covered with a curtain.

On the right side of the stage, symmetrically to the lower podium, a small, clear surface that differentiated the corner from which it is located from the rest of the stage. A square chair and a small table were placed on the surface. Above it, in height, is a balcony with a doorway. Further on, on the right-center of the stage, a lighted doorway shows the lower end of a staircase and postcards, which facilitated the character of an entrance to a residential building. Except for the mail boxes, space have no specific characterization: the windows are square openings, devoid of any features, the stairs are generic, almost technical and all painted uniform black. (ראו צילום..ציור....)

The scenery seems like a black box that coordinates and directs all action into it. Moreover, in the 1975 production, horizontal axes of stage were emphasized, while in this production (2000) dominant vertical axis. The emphasis on the vertical hinges gave the space inhumane, operatic proportions, which created an alienating and suffocating urban feeling, a large space that closes on the characters and closes the characters within. Even the narrow opening at the back of the stage, which was the only source for exits and especially entrances to this urban box, was not open all the way to the floor. At the bottom of the opening was a small staircase leading to an elevated horizontal podium, a kind of balcony to the horizon that intensified the detachment and closure of the stage space from the world outside. It should be emphasized that through the narrow opening in the back there was no horizontal line and hardly any sky.

Acts of the stage reveals the scenography, but according to Rut Dar's, " … the structures were invisible ... it disappeared in the dark ... only the windows show ... the walls disappeared ... it disappeared in black, and only the windows define the place ... windows And doors. " (Dar, 2017). In other words, according to this stage interpretation, a Tel Avivian neighborhood is no longer a street to which balconies are facing, but a closed space where windows and doors float as squares of light through which the interior is visible. The gaze to the horizon is also framed and illuminated like a picture, using the vertical groove. Delimitation of the private space and the inward integration took on another face in this setting. The tow front apartments that located in the premiere on the stage floor, in one level to the fictional street is now gathered into a balcony with a railing or to a distinguished corner. Above these tow located the other tow apartments. As in the production of the premiere, but more explicitly, this layout emphasized the reflection of the Tel Aviv building pattern. However, unlike the premiere, stairs led to the second floor. To say that, in the scenery, as in the actual city space, a mediated space was added between the street and the house.

To continue this idea, it can be said that since the setting created a closure of the private space and its detachment from the public sphere, the interaction between them is generally a violent one. So, instead of a crowded neighborhood where the sights and sounds naturally blende through the openings, the production reflects relations of invasion and trespassing. As an example, in addition to the protagonist frequent intrusion on his lover’s balcony / bed, I will point out the entrance of a neighbor named Felicia to Krume's mother's house. Felicia's outburst is interpreted as more strained and provocative than in the premiere, because the "open doors" culture and the close neighboring relations are no longer an accepted urban feature. Accordingly, this entry into someone's house without prior notice does not fit in with the convergent space that the scenery presents and to the experience of the audience from their daily life in the city.

**Epilogue**

This article focused on the archetype ‘balcony’ by observing its particular appearance on the theatre stage, in light of the balcony’s specific characterization as a Tel Avivian type in the quotidian urban.

As a Tel Avivian type, the balcony played a significant role in the urban life of the city in the 1970s. Its urban significance derives from its being an active intermediate space that links directly to the street and thus connect external and internal, private and public, seen and unseen. Its function as a central social-urban feature expressed in the direct transition of words, views and objects from the balcony to the street, and even more so, from the street inward to the private space.

As a comparison, the Parisian balcony was presented. Carrying a completely different character, the Parisian balcony is an ‘opening in the interior’, reflecting the spectacle of the street inward to the bourgeoisie watching from a distance. It elevates the viewer from the boulevard and enables control through the gaze from above. The Tel Aviv balcony, however, is physically close to the street, and thus more than it allows viewing of the street, it exposes whoever occupies the balcony to the invasive look of whoever passes by, and to the prying eyes from other balconies.

Thus the theater illuminates the voyeuristic atmosphere as an essential urban feature, and the Tel Aviv balcony as a place in which this feature is both physically and spatially realized. The distillation of the experience relating to balcony as a type in the theatrical works of the duo Levin-der, present it as a place of degeneration and viewing from the side, while the flow of life and vitality belong to the street. Therefore, the view to the street is characterized as 'a remnant of action', whose importance is in confirming the vitality of the street by way of contrast. The gaze at other balconies – voyeuristic, prying, implicating competition and comparison- revealing urban space as an exposed and public even when it seems private.

A broad look at the re-production of the play "Krum" in 2000 raised the theater as an effective tool that also reflects the metamorphosis in the interaction of private and public in the urban space, and the change in the characterization of the balcony as a Tel Avivian type.

Therefore, the theatrical performance constitutes an "x-ray", a mimesis of urban space, distilling the character of the Tel Avivian balcony through the meanings it carries for the viewers, through their day-to-day urban experience, at that time.

But beyond that, I claim that theatre not only interprets the pattern as a type in regard to quotidian local meanings, but also granting it universal social meanings by virtue of the symbolizing nature of stage. Through the scenography as a representation element, and by turning gazing into a central theme of the show, the gaze returns to the audience as a public. The meta-theatrical technique applied by Levin and Dar routed the viewers as they identify parallels between urban voyeurism and theatrical viewing. This led the viewers to a conscious position that expands voyeurism as an urban feature to be a critical stand point, enriching the theatrical image with universal meanings. To say that the spatial archetype (Patterns) is merely a frame, constitutes its meaning by its realization as a type in a specific city and time. Theatre distilling this realization and grant it meanings as a representation.

The representation as part of the symbolizing power of stage allows viewers to simultaneously capture the distillation of the experience associated with the type, and in the same time to abstract the type back to a theatrical archetype, as a universal social allegory. And so, the spatial archetype becomes, in the power of theatrical experience, a theatrical archetype. The relationship between the first archetype and the second one, suggests an interesting observation. It might be for example, that the former is more connected to the exterior space, while the later to the interior space.
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1. Many residential buildings in Tel Aviv that were built in the framework of ‘Geddes plan’ (1930’s) and in subsequent years included a large front porch and an additional service balcony adjacent to the kitchen. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As a general rule, three types of front balconies can be discerned in the Tel Aviv area, which have different relations with the building from which they grew and with the street (Metzger-Smoke, 1994, Etgar, 2011).

1 - A small square or rounded balcony that protruded from the wall and sometimes from the corner of the building. In view of its dimensions (c. 1.20 m x 1.20 m), this terrace was mainly used as a design element or as a seating area for a single person or couple. Sometimes it was built three steps above the level of the street, and therefore was more exposed to the street than other balconies. (Reference to image).

2 - A square or rounded balcony with an open or semi-open railing made of iron bars, usually protruding from the line of the building. This balcony, which characterized the buildings of the tenements and was usually 1.90 meters deep, was a direct continuation of the public space (the living room). Its open railing allowed ventilation and a view to the street, but also revealed the event to the front of the length embryos (reference image). Carolyn Aronis (Aronis 2016) notes that since the apartments in the housing buildings were usually small and consisted of 2-3 rooms, the balcony was a significant spatial addition to the apartment space, and additional space to stay in, apart from the living room and the kitchen.

3 - Another type of balconies were sunken in the building volume and covered by an opaque railing and a shading apron (reference image). These balconies formed the 'film window', a characteristic element of international construction style. In contrast to the terrace with the open rail, this balcony made it possible to look into the street under the cover of the sealed railing and the shadow given by the upper 'apron' throughout the day. Given the white plaster glistening in the strong sun, the shaded space of the porch created a 'black stripe' that hid the people almost completely. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In her article, Aronis (Aronis, 2016) presents evidence of the need for residents to close the balconies and use this space for various purposes from the 1920s, but this need was established as a trend since the 1960s. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The characters in Levin's world are placed in a hierarchy in which at the bottom a man is found, single, sick and aging, and at the height a healthy and beautiful young woman. In the range the rest of the characters struggle for their place in the hierarchy, which is given to them in view of their proximity to the aging man or the young maiden. Female characters appear as idols on one hand and as worthless on the other. Masculine figures like a long rooster according to whom the world terns, alternatively as a ‘thing’ or an object, a rag. The edges of Levin do not appear in isolation from each other. In other words, the elevated one exists in all its splendor only in the presence of humiliation and reversal. The greatest humiliation is from a figure who is at the top of the hierarchy, in the sublime. A special place is saved for couples. Which on the outside is the object of envy for the single bachelor, but inside, among themselves, exists the same set of powers between the exalted and the humble. As the parents of the 'controlling poppy', the couple gets high status, but as a pair of aging beggars they are at the bottom. From a spatial understanding, this element is clearly expressed in the Sanskrit script for Jacobi and Leidental, who placed one chair in front of a pair of chairs. On this subject, see (לאור, 1999) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. In a critique of the play, Bilha Feldman noticed that: "It was not in vain that Hanoch Levin took these two houses out, he who has nothing to lose has nothing to hide ..." (Feldman, 1967). About the characters living in the ‘second floor’ she argues they "are immersed in their efforts to externalize a positive image and conceal their suffering" and the other one "has absolutely nothing to hide, because she is worth something, since two men are interested in her" (ibid.). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In her book (2015), Ruth Dar describes the moments in which the houses, balconies, shutters and life experience behind them were identified as the essence of Tel Aviv's urbanism:

"" Take a picture, "says Hanoch.

"What?"

"The houses, but what?"

But why? They are almost exactly the same houses as the Johan the Prophet st.. What is the difference?"

"Exactly, there's no difference, because of that," says Hanoch. "Take a picture." "(P. 127)

"The landscape repeats itself with minor changes: apartment buildings, three to four stories, plaster again because of the proximity to the sea, narrow entrances to dark stairwells, open balconies on the ground floor and gray stone railings and tile flooring in old geometric patterns in orange and brown colors.” (ibid) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. לקריאה נוספת ראו למשל:

[Edward J Golden](https://www.amazon.com/s/ref%3Ddp_byline_sr_book_1?ie=UTF8&text=Edward+J+Golden&search-alias=books&field-author=Edward+J+Golden&sort=relevancerank), *The Gaze of Jean-paul Sartre*, Dover: Massachusetts, Saint Stemphen’s collage,1969

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*, Harmondsworth : Penguin, c1977 (French 1975)

 Mulvey, Laura. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”**,** *Screen*, Volume 16, Issue 3, 1 October 1975, Pg. 6–18. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In his book Maoz Azaryahu refers to the image of Tel Aviv as 'Israeli New York '. He also compares the silhouette of the skyline that appears in the Tel Aviv symbol from 2002 to the silhouette of the New York skyline. See Azaryahu, 2005, pp. 162-158, 183. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)