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Theory’s Theatricality and Architectural Agency
Lisa Landrum

ABSTRACT  This paper argues for a pre-theoretical and pro-theatrical understanding of theory. To begin, it considers the Greek tradition of *theōria* as practiced around the fifth century BCE in the period just before Plato appropriated the cultural practice of *theōria* as a model for philosophical inquiry. As will be shown, this proto-philosophical practice of *theōria* was profoundly theatrical, which is to say, spectacular and dramatic in social, situational, and symbolic ways. Such events of *theōria* involved diverse citizens participating as active witnesses in recurring festivals that had both intimate and far-reaching political, religious, and aesthetic significance. Reflecting on some present-day settings and occasions for practicing theory, this paper concludes with a disciplinary provocation: the re-engagement of *theōria*’s fundamental theatricality can reanimate the social, situational, and symbolic dimensions of architectural theory, without sacrificing either its relative independence or its capacity for heuristic wonder.
Before Theory

Before theory was a thing, it was a practice. In ancient Greece *theōria* was a spatiotemporal practice thoroughly intertwined with socio-political experiences and endeavors. The cultural practice of *theōria* involved traveling to a foreign place, primarily for the sake of witnessing a spectacular festival and/or consulting an oracle, then returning home to share with others an account of events seen and understandings gained. All three stages of *theōria* – traveling, spectating, and returning with a report – were vitally important. Individuals would temporarily leave behind the familiarity of their local conditions, assumptions, and problems to immerse themselves in intensely social, synesthetic, and metaphysical encounters at a Panhellenic festival. They would then return home with the obligatory challenge of communicating the truth of what was witnessed to those who stayed behind.¹

Being the most culturally intense and personally transformative, the middle event – spectating at a festival – was crucial for the full enactment of *theōria*. Spectating at ancient Greek festivals involved the reciprocity of seeing and being seen at a major event (comparable with a present-day Rio Carnival or Venice Biennale); festivals included competitive displays of dramatic, athletic, and musical contests; various rites of elaborate processions, gift offerings, speeches, sacrifices, feasts, songs, dances, and revelry. According to Cicero, the keen viewing of such spectacles exemplified a kind of philosophical activity.² For Plato, as Andrea Nightingale has shown, the threefold practice of *theōria* provided a paradigm for the philosopher’s journey toward apprehending truths and relaying these to others.³ Although viewing spectacular events was central to *theōria*, doing so in the multisensory conditions of such festivals amid throngs of participant-observers was never exclusively a visual experience; neither was it a disengaged solitary sport. Rather, as philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer asserts in his *Praise of Theory*, to perform *theōria* in socially entangled and culturally charged circumstances demanded being “completely present” and “engrossed.”⁴ Such a vigorously embodied and potentially moving mode of spectating, as Gadamer elaborates elsewhere, required “a true participation [...] being totally involved in and carried away by what one sees.”⁵

Theoric Settings

In traditional practices of *theōria*, all festival activities would take place in a sacred sanctuary, a delineated place for collective participation. This setting was not only topographically meaningful, being part of a politically and mythically charged landscape, or *chōra*,⁶ but also architecturally impressive, being replete with ornate temples, treasuries, statues, porticos, dining rooms, a stadium, and a theater. The sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi is among the most well-known and best-preserved examples. Such elaborate settings not only situated and choreographed practices of *theōria*, but also presented themselves as primary phenomena to be viewed and interpreted during festive occasions.
Evidence of this is provided in Athenian drama. For instance, in Euripides’ *Ion* (c. 418–412 BCE), a tragedy staged in the Theater of Dionysus at Athens, a chorus of sightseers standing before the Temple of Apollo at Delphi implore one another to “see” and “look here” at the fair columns, sculptural reliefs, and mythic narratives carved into the stonework of the temple’s “twin” facades (lines 184–218). In this way, these representative performers of theôria would effectively lead spectators gathered in the Dionysian sanctuary (in Athens) to imagine and contemplate cultural meanings implicit in the remote but related Apollonian site (in Delphi). Similarly, in Euripides’ *Andromache* (c. 425 BCE), the ill-fated son of Achilles is said to have spent three days beholding the splendors of Delphi before consulting the oracle: “giving over three bright cycles of the sun to seeing the sights, we feasted our eyes” (lines 1086–7).7 Allusions to now lost plays, together with archaeological remains, further suggest that pilgrims visited sanctuaries to inspect architectural and sculptural works as much as to witness religious rites and festivities.8 The spectacle of sacred architecture, with its sculptural manifestations of myths and gods, augmented the spectacle of sacred events. These settings were not neutral receptacles; rather, they actively provoked and amplified experiences of theôria.

Sanctuary sites for enacting theôria were spread across the Panhellenic region, forming a vast network. The coherence of these dispersed theoric settings was reinforced by a shared calendar of seasonal festivals, structuring each site’s periodic activation. Except in the case of Athens, festival sanctuaries were usually located outside urban centers, such that individuals from each participating polis would assemble in a relatively neutral, marginal, or intermediary domain, overseen more by shared gods than by a single political entity. As Nightingale has emphasized, “In this unique ‘space,’ the theôroi [those performing theôria] participated in a religious event that transcended – and, to some extent, challenged – the social, political and ideological structures of any individual city.”9 Thus, as much as theôria was intrinsic to a religious institution, it was also constitutive of regional democracy.10 By participating in theôria, citizens from dispersed city-states (often divided by rivalry and conflict) united to enact and interpret the common bases of their alliance, rehearsing shared stories, principles, and practices, thereby cultivating mutual understanding, regional diplomacy, and potentially widespread peace.

**Seeing (and Saying) What Is**

In ancient Greece, individuals might perform theôria for their own personal enrichment and edification. For instance, Solon, the sixth-century BCE Athenian lawmaker and founder of democracy, was said to have traveled the world “for the sake of theôria,” wandering and wondering for ten years in search of wisdom.11 However, individuals were more frequently appointed to perform theôria as official representatives of their home city, being sent to a foreign festival or an oracular site
as part of a delegation. These envoys, acting as roving eyes, ears, mouths, and conscience of the city, were obliged to bring back from afar discerned insights that might benefit the polis. As Plato explained, “no government can maintain and improve itself without sending theoroi to foreign cities” (Laws 951a–c). Each delegate on the journey was called a theōros (plural theōroi); the leader of the delegation was an architheōros. Each theōros was typically selected from a noble sector of society, but the most important qualification was neither status nor wealth, but honesty. According to the sixth-century BCE poet Theognis, “a theōros must be more straight […] than a carpenter’s compass, rule and square,” for when reporting back to one’s city a theōros must not add anything nor take anything away from what had been disclosed, or else any potential benefit of the exchange would be lost. In other words, with even more careful attention than a skilled artisan, a theōros was obliged to relay precisely that which is true and just, without unduly bending what was witnessed to arbitrary angles or personal whims. Performing théoria was a profoundly constructive act with serious social consequences.

Twentieth-century architect and author Le Corbusier echoed the obligations of an ancient theōros when he offered this advice to students: “One must always say what one sees, above all one must always, and this is more difficult, see what one sees.” Only by acknowledging the existential and phenomenal difficulty of motivated yet unbiased seeing and saying can we begin a hermeneutic encounter with théoria. In this radically hermeneutic sense, practicing theory requires a willingness to perceive critically one’s own fallible preconceptions and limits of knowledge, balanced by a potentially transformative receptivity to what is strange in the familiar and familiar in the strange. This approaches what Gadamer has called, “the root of what we can call theory: seeing what is.” Far from passively observing “what is merely present-at-hand,” this entails actively interpreting and understanding the full “complicated context” – the suppositions, questions, and expectations giving rise to events. This challenging and ambiguous responsibility for “seeing what is” is not only integral to the traditional practices of théoria, but also remains implicit in the word “theory.” To recognize this, we must make an etymological detour.

Sights, Insights, Foresights
Theory stems from theōrós (θεωρός), a compound word joining orós (ορός) “one who sees” (from the verb ὄραω, “to see”) with either thea (θέα) “a sight/spectacle,” or theós (θεός) “god.” Scholars are unable to determine a single correct root. Most now regard the etymological link to theós as erroneous, even though this divine root was claimed by Greek philosophers, purported by Roman lexicographers, and promoted by modern interpreters, including Martin Heidegger. Eschewing the divine, one may translate theōrós literally as “sight-seer,” and théoria as a “sight-seeing [event].” While these familiar expressions convey the exotic travels associated with théoria, they obscure the sacred dimensions of
theoric journeys and trivialize its socio-political and heuristic aims. Thus, as others have urged, we should accept (as the ancients did) a combined sense of spectacular and sacred vision. This casts theōrōs as a seer of sights and insights, discerning truths beyond ordinary comprehension, and theōria as a profoundly symbolic and potentially transformative encounter. Such encounters are also fundamentally theatrical and wondrous, since thea is the shared root of the Greek terms for “theater” (theatron), “spectators” (theatai), “spectacle” (theamata), and the act of “ beholding” (theaomai) sources of wonder.

This theoric manner of seeing also entails vigilance, a detail rarely acknowledged in etymologies of “theory.” The orós of theōrōs implies keeping careful and earnest watch. This mode of vigilant seeing is active in a series of compound terms: a “seer” of doors (thur-ōros), gates (skeu-ōros), and coastlines (akt-ōros). These official door-watchers, gatekeepers, and coastguards preserve social institutions (house, precinct, and polis) by discerning threats at thresholds, limits, and horizons. This theoric agency of vigilant vision is both enacted and cultivated by Athenian drama. As Froma Zeitlin explains in her essay “The Artful Eye,” the mode of viewing activated in Greek theater “not only arouses spectators’ affective responses but also engages their cognitive skills in learning how to recognize, evaluate, and interpret the visual codes of what they see.” There are numerous instances of an actor appealing to a character, god, and even spectators directly, urging them to “look upon these things,” to witness a tragic sight or unjust deed, so as fully to see and comprehend what is at stake in the situation. Such meta-theatrical and proto-Brechtian calls – to “look!” – jolt spectators out of complacency, compelling them to interpret and anticipate transformative actions. This vigorous manner of interpretive seeing enables poignant recognition of human limits, failings, and capabilities, mixing dread with the wondrous delight of cathartic understanding, catharsis being not only a therapeutic release, but also, as Leon Golden argues, a visceral climax of near-total comprehension following uncertainty: “that moment of insight which arises out of the audience’s climactic intellectual, emotional, and spiritual enlightenment.”

**Theatrum Theoreticum**

As suggested above, architectural settings actively contributed to the complex festive practice of theōria in ancient Greece. Ornate architecture constituted a meaningful aspect of what was seen and interpreted during festivals. The configuration of a sanctuary site, including the orientation of its temple, stadium, and theater, also situated the social experience of cultural comprehension in relation to broader geopolitical and cosmopoetic horizons. Architecture’s theoric agency is most prominent in the paradigmatic setting of the Greek theater, which was less a building than a circumscribed outdoor place for viewing. Arrayed on a hillside, the practitioners of theōria could view not only the activities framed within the open performance area, but also the
surrounding social body of fellow spectators, as well as the expansive political landscape and storied milieu. The scenic conventions and theatrical mechanisms, including a back wall equipped with central doors and stage machines, enabled dramatic disclosures: hidden interior tableaux, drawn out from behind the doors, and otherworldly entities, revealed from above or below. As Zeitlin argues, the Greek theater, being organized spatially and conceptually around the dialectic of what can and cannot be seen, extended “the practical problems of vision and visibility […] into an epistemological concern with insight, knowledge, revelation, and truth.”

In his essay “Theatrum Theoreticum,” philosopher Rodolphe Gasché retraces the longstanding theatricality of theory. He finds it especially in Plato’s *Theaetetus*, in Socrates’ tragicomic anecdote of the first philosopher Thales, who – with eyes fixed on the heavens, aloof from reality – is witnessed falling down a well. Gasché identifies theory’s theatricality with Plato’s dialogue form and use of public forums, as Socrates’ refutations were always enacted before an audience; with Western philosophy’s frequently reciprocal metaphors of light, visibility, and illumination (from Empedocles to Hans Blumenberg); and with pre-philosophical practices of *theôria*, which put divine matters on display and subjected mortals to divine gaze. To be recognized and understood, the activity of theory – seemingly invisible – must be somehow staged. Thus, Gasché concludes, “*theoria* clearly cannot be thought without the theatre.” Gasché’s essay persuasively demonstrates theater’s constitutive role for philosophy. However, by limiting the problem to how theory’s invisibility is made visible, he obscures the force of theory’s social and situational agencies. These arguably more architectural agencies make what is at stake in *theôria* (its suppositions, questions, and expectations) not only visible, but also available for engagement, comprehension, contestation, and change.

As I have elaborated elsewhere, the bonds between architectural agency and theatrical *theôria* are made dramatically apparent in Aristophanes’ *Peace*, a comedy staged in the Theater of Dionysus in the midst of the Peloponnesian War (421 BCE). In a climactic scene, the protagonist – a farmer, called upon “to architect” – leads a chorus of laborers to unearth Peace (in the form of a statue) together with two lively attendants, Harvest and Theôria. These unexpected allies of Peace make sense if we recall that farming and traveling to participate in theoric festivals were endangered activities during wartime. Ultimately, the architect-protagonist restores Theôria to a seat amid “honest” councilors in the theater’s front row; permanently “installs” the statue of Peace in the orchestra; and takes Harvest as his wife, initiating a marriage feast, which all the spectators are invited to join. Through these dramatic events, all those assembled in the theater are encouraged to “see what is” – to recognize, among other things, that their present practice of *theôria* is a vital means to cultivate the comprehensive peace they desire.
Spectacular Speculations

It would be naïve to infer that the ancient institution of \textit{theòria} was infallible. Indeed, there is much evidence that it was abused. Solon's withdrawal from Athens to perform \textit{theòria} abroad was considered by some as avoiding accountability for laws he had just established. Some practitioners of \textit{theòria} were said to have pursued not enlightenment but private distinction, attending festivals not to witness events and learn from others but to make shows of themselves. Sophists attended less to discover wisdom than to display and sell their own supposed expertise. Others allegedly used the time away from home to indulge in improprieties. Such abuses led Plato to disparage zealous "lovers of spectacles" (\textit{philotheamon}) and to reinvent the practice as love of wisdom (\textit{philosophia}).\textsuperscript{29} Plato's transformation of \textit{theòria} positively influenced the history of philosophy, yet it also spurred the perception of theory as an elite and aloof obsession.

However much theory may have changed since the flourishing of ancient Greek festivals, the traditional practice of \textit{theòria} remains a valid model for contemporary events of cultural diplomacy and exchange, as exemplified by Olympic games, world's fairs, international biennales, and even academic conferences. University campuses, which typically host conferences, provide modern variations of theoretic settings. They attract and dispatch a multitude of traveling theorists eager to discern and share truths. Somewhat like festival sanctuaries, academic campuses are both part of and apart from cities. Their theaters, lecture halls, and stadia cultivate all manner of learning, sporting, and arts, with galleries and libraries serving as living treasuries. In an era when we are witnessing the erosion of genuine public spaces for assembly and debate, the commercialization of academic and civic environments and the surge of placeless online learning, architectural educators must continue to demonstrate and defend the critical role that theoretic settings, as necessarily architectural, play in fostering cultural exchange and understanding.

There are many ways architectural educators can recuperate theory's theatricality. For instance, by engaging dramatic modes of pedagogy; incorporating participatory debates, dialogues, and short plays into symposia and seminars; and risking more Dionysian acts of public engagement through thought-provoking agitprop theater. The author's own modest collaborative adventures along these lines include staging a student play for a History and Theory seminar; performing an allegorical pantomime dramatizing the struggle of architectural invention at a scholarly conference; and devising a series of Group Costumes for New York City's annual Halloween Parade and other public events.\textsuperscript{30} These Group Costumes manifest monstrous corporeal fragments of the social body (Figure 1). Inhabited as traveling metaphors, metonymies, and synecdoches of collective perception and imagination, these costumes embody and enact the extraordinary potential of
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common bodily senses. They strive to give dramatic representation to the transformative and revelatory agencies of both architecture and theōria.

A compelling precedent has been set by the 2015 inaugural Chicago Architecture Biennial, which included three site-specific performances among its exhibitions (Figures 2–4). These performances transformed existing spaces into theoric settings, provoking critical reflection on particular environments and enabling interactions with diverse citizens – effectively democratizing architectural theory. Some may dismiss such spectacular speculation as idealistic overreaching. But, as Gadamer mused, “Is it so romantic to speak of theory as a life force in which all humans have a share?”

This paper has argued for recuperating a pre-theoretical and pro-theatrical mode of theory, while demonstrating architecture’s crucial role in this tradition. Learning from the cultural practice of theōria in ancient Greece, we may understand the “theatrical” not as mere effects, distractions, or simulations, but as a fundamentally philosophical activity. A pro-theatrical mode of theory would involve diverse citizens in topographically meaningful settings, striving dramatically to manifest interpretive events of shared and open understanding. Architecture and architectural theory are not autonomous things. Rather, they are active factors in the vital yet vulnerable cultural practice of “theory,” which should be regarded with vigilance and engaged with critical inquiry and cathartic delight.
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Notes


2 Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, 5.3.7–9: “The life of man resembles the festival [at Olympia] celebrated with the most magnificent games before a gathering collected from all of Greece. For at
this festival some men trained their bodies and sought to win the glorious distinction of a crown, and others came to make a profit by buying or selling. But there was also a certain class, made up of the noblest men, who sought neither applause nor gain, but came for the sake of spectating and closely watched the event and how it was done; quoted in Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 17.

3 This is exhibited in Plato’s Republic; Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 74–83.


7 Quoted in Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 47.


9 Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 47.


11 Herodotus, Histories, 1.30.2.

12 Quoted in Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 66. See also Rutherford, State Pilgrims, 148.

13 Rutherford, State Pilgrims, 158–9.


16 Gadamer, Praise of Theory, 31.
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20 Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 45, with further references.


25 On the performativity of Greek stage conventions (chōra, skēnē, méchanē,


29 Nightingale, Spectacles of Truth, 78, referring to Plato, Republic, 475d.


31 Gadamer, Praise of Theory, 32.
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