

4-2012

Practices of Dramaturgy Here, There, and Everywhere

Lisa Wiborg
University of Redlands

Follow this and additional works at: http://inspire.redlands.edu/cas_honors



Part of the [Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wiborg, L. (2012). *Practices of Dramaturgy Here, There, and Everywhere* (Undergraduate honors thesis, University of Redlands). Retrieved from http://inspire.redlands.edu/cas_honors/22

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at InSPIRE @ Redlands. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of InSPIRE @ Redlands. For more information, please contact gabriela_sonntag@redlands.edu.

Lisa Wiborg

Dr. Victoria Lewis

Theatre Capstone

13 April 2012

Practices of Dramaturgy Here, There, and Everywhere: A Capstone Project

I cannot even begin to express how many articles, books, and webpages I have read about dramaturgy that spend an absurd amount of time explaining that there really isn't a concise way to define the subject, let alone the actual practice of dramaturgy. As stated in the introduction to the book *Dramaturgy: A Revolution in Theatre*, Mary Luckhurst reflects eloquently on this very problem: "The meaning of the words dramaturg and dramaturgy are unstable, sometimes bitterly so- few terms in contemporary theater practice have consistently occasioned more perplexity" (Luckhurst 5). My initial thought about this was that I could surely come up with a clear and to the point explanation of my own after a bit of research and some practice in the field. Throughout my reading and my own experience of dramaturgical work, I have discovered that I can be grouped among the mass amount of scholars whose writing on dramaturgy exceed what can be defined as concise. In order to contribute to the writing on dramaturgy and share my experience that has lead me to some conclusions about the work of a dramaturg, I first feel it necessary to introduce some of the things I have learned about the subject and its relationship to the professional world of theatre. In other words, I will try my best to define dramaturgy and the job of a dramaturg.

AN INTRODUCTION TO PROFESSIONAL DRAMATURGY

The reason that the job of a dramaturg is so difficult to define is because it can include a variety of different tasks and forms. There is no set in stone formula for being a good dramaturg. Even dramaturgs who have been in the field for years do not necessarily have a checklist of tasks that have to be done for every show. I do not think it pertinent to explain in depth every potential job that a dramaturg could be in charge of, because the list would go on for days. However, there are certain parts of production that are often times strongly associated with the

production role of dramaturg, although in some theatres these various tasks might not necessarily be a dramaturgs' job. If you would like to see a list of possible parts of production that a dramaturg might be responsible for, the following webpage is very useful

http://ee.dramaturgy.co.uk/index.php/site/comments/what_does_a_dramaturg_do.

If there is one thing that a dramaturg definitely does, no matter what kind of theatre they work at or type of role they have at that particular place, the job of a dramaturg always involves reading. From choosing a script to learning about the history of the particular place in which a scene takes place, a person of dramaturgical expertise must be able to analyze and read into a text. In many professional theatres dramaturgs are responsible for reading all of the new scripts that are sent in from playwrights to be considered for production at that theatre. This is not the case in every theatre, but for some, it is the primary job of the dramaturg to help select the shows that will be produced for the season.

Reading new plays to consider for production is not something I have experienced as a dramaturg; this is because in my university's theatre department the faculty chooses the season. To gain more information about this, I turned to a professional dramaturg for help so that I could better understand this aspect of professional dramaturgical work. Pier Carlo Talenti is the Resident Dramaturg/Literary Manager at Center Theatre Group in Los Angeles. Talenti was an absolute joy to interview. He never exactly planned on becoming a dramaturg; he actually wanted to be an actor at one point. When he told me this I was somewhat shocked because it had always seemed to me that that this job would require a lot of schooling and studying before it could be done professionally. This is partially because the word dramaturgy has always sounded extremely fancy in my mind, and according to other articles that I have read; I am not the only one who has thought this. In Terry McCabe's article against the use of dramaturgs in theatre, he states, "dramaturgy is an unappealing word but a vital idea" (McCabe). In an interview titled "How to Talk to a Playwright" conducted with playwrights and dramaturgs about their relationship within the world of theatre one playwright named Steve Carter explained his dislike for the word "dramaturg" as well, "one of the first things I'd like to get rid

of, when talking to playwrights as a dramaturg, is the word 'dramaturg.' They like to be talked to in English, so I get rid of that word right away" (Carter 186). As can be noted from these authors, dramaturgy seems to be an intimidating word for a lot of people, even those who know what it is.

Even with my limited experience in dramaturgy, I agree with these scholars' understanding that the buzzword "dramaturgy" can often be associated with a sense of astuteness or lead people to think that there is special jargon that one needs to be aware of when discussing things related to dramaturgical workings. When my interview with Talenti began I had a list of questions in my hand that I was prepared to ask and had this looming connotation of "dramaturgy" over my head, along with a fear that his answers to my questions would undoubtedly be over my head. However, I found that he was easy to talk to and that our conversation flowed nicely. It occurred to me afterward, that it was silly of me to think of a dramaturg as someone that I couldn't have an easy conversation with, because one of the main components of dramaturgical work is communication.

Pier Carlo gave me insight into the general workings of a dramaturg for a professional theatre. Some of the main components we discussed were his relationship to the texts he works on and his relationship with the director and playwright. I was surprised to find out that he is not responsible for providing historical context for the cast of the show, since that is often one of the main duties of a dramaturg in an educational setting. This is not a part of his job, however, because the cast and production team are required to do their own dramaturgical work as part of their job. Talenti expressed that he mostly works with new plays and he reads a lot of them to find ones that he is excited about. This is also something that I found expressed in "How to Talk to a Playwright" by John Glore, who was also a literary manager and dramaturg, "a dramaturg should strenuously avoid working on a play that he or she doesn't love or can't come to love quickly, because if you don't have that commitment to the project, you have not business trying to exert and influence on it" (Glore 182). With this aspect of dramaturgical work comes a lot of responsibility to read, analyze, and critique a play with care and diligence.

As a dramaturg Talenti is also tasked with communicating with playwrights about their work: letting them know if their script will not be used, asking questions to further understand their vision of the play if the script will be used, and taking the steps necessary to create that vision. Talenti emphasized the word “genuine” when we discussed talking to a playwright. When he said that word, it brought me back to the idea of working on a play that he is excited about, which, in this case is vitally important if he wants to have the ability to be honest with a person about their work. This is especially important when asking questions about a work.

This word also ignited in my mind the idea that there is a sense of respect, empathy, and community that comes along with this type of role as a dramaturg. Talenti had a very understanding position when talking about working with a playwright and his ability to empathize with playwrights is probably one of the reasons he is successful in his job, as he told me “new playwrights get nervous, they wait to hear it [the script] read by actors” (Talenti). Production dramaturgs have to be very careful about how they communicate, they are to help protect the work of the playwright by making sure that it is accurately portrayed, but also work with the director and the theatre to produce a play that people will want to see. This can sometimes involve examining the script and making sure that everything in the script is there for a reason, possibly leading, in some cases, to cuts in a script. In my attempt to do research on dramaturgy and the work of a dramaturg, I found my interview with Pier Carlo Talenti to be the most helpful piece of individual research. It was a fruitful conversation that taught me a lot about what a professional dramaturg does, but also lead me to new paths in my study of dramaturgy.

WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING ABOUT DRAMATURGS

Before my conversation with Pier Carol Talenti I not did do a lot of in-depth thinking about how to analyze the relationship between a director and a dramaturg or a dramaturg and a playwright. Those relationships were things that I was obviously aware and cautious of, but I was not cognizant of what could come out of the analysis of these relationships. It wasn't until I found the interview “How to Talk to a Playwright” that I discovered the incongruity in how

different jobs in professional theatre see the function of the relationship between a dramaturg and a playwright. Some people don't even think that a dramaturg should talk to a playwright, for instance playwright Eric Overmyer states in the interview, "I don't believe that dramaturgs should talk to the playwrights in the best of all possible worlds, meaning production. I believe that the dramaturg should talk to the director, and the director should talk to the playwright" (Overmyer 180).

There is also discrepancy among theatre scholars about whether or not there should even be dramaturgs. Terry McCabe argues in his essay, *A Good Director Doesn't Need a Dramaturg*, that the use of a dramaturg in a production is unnecessary because a director can also do the work of a dramaturg. The following quotation is an excerpt from his article, where he clearly defines the importance of dramaturgy to a production:

The concerns that a dramaturg addresses have always existed, so in this sense dramaturgy is as old as theater itself. It has always mattered that a play be as well written as possible, just as it has always mattered that it be designed and staged in a way that makes sense, and that the actors know what their characters are talking about. But the people in the theater who have traditionally worried about these dramaturgical matters have been the playwright, the actor, the designer, and, since 1875 or so, the director (McCabe).

In addition to this statement, he goes on to examine the fact that a director's duties should also encompass the work that is usually part of a dramaturg's role and makes the claim that dramaturgs are unnecessary. As part of that argument he explains that a dramaturg can get in the way of the artistic vision of the director by having the authority to be the only person to communicate with the playwright. McCabe notes that, "the actors and the others see the dramaturg as the official giver of feedback to the playwright (a role dramaturgs tend to promote for themselves) and feel they're expected to keep their own opinions to themselves" (McCabe).

In contrast to McCabe's writing, I read an article by Michael Zelenak called, *Why We Don't Need Directors: A Dramaturgical/ Historical Manifesto* that argues exactly the opposite

of McCabe's work. Zelenak writes, "Dramaturgs have been tolerated in America because they are usually benign presences who rarely have any authority to do or change anything of consequence. But the fact remains that we don't need critic-dramaturges in theatre or the rehearsal hall any more than we need specialist directors" (Zelenak 106). He argues that directors should no longer be part of the process to create a work of theatre because they take away from the collaborative nature of theatre. With this he also explains that we, as theatre artists, need to take back dramatic license and make a world of theatre where the playwright and actors become dramaturgs or "makers of theatre" and use the text of the play to create a staged work as a group.

Both McCabe and Zelenak point out interesting ways to adjust the defined roles that we often see in today's theatrical world. While I do not agree with McCabe's proposal to do away with the dramaturg, I agree with him that a director should also have a key role in dramaturgical work by interpreting the play, doing outside research, communicating with the playwright (either through the dramaturg or on their own), and by asking questions of the text. Zelenak also makes the excellent point that all of the roles in a production from actor to playwright have a duty in their process to make drama. The collaborative model that he gives is something that I think could definitely be a dynamic and fun way to create a production, especially with his idea that dramaturgy should be more strongly emphasized in all production aspects. However, I believe his disdain towards directors, as noted in the following line: "Let us destroy the parasite directors and return theatre to the dramatists!" is a bit over the top (Zelenak 108). Perhaps he should take a note from McCabe and begin to look at the role of director as someone who should also be invested in the dramaturgy of a text and become a dramaturg in his or her own way.

What people are saying about dramaturgs and dramaturgy is important since it is still being defined. It is important for dramaturgs to listen and understand how playwrights want to be talked to. It is equally important to be able communicate with those who do not view the dramaturgs role as vital to the production of theatre. Understanding the argument against

dramaturgy is the only way to make an articulate argument for the use of dramaturgs. The whole of what I have read on the practices of professional dramaturgs, the argumentative essay about the use of a dramaturg, and varying descriptions of what dramaturgy is, have opened my mind to what a dramaturg is capable of, both in the professional and academic realms of theatre.

ADAPTATION OF PROFESSIONAL WORK TO AN ACADEMIC SETTING

At the University of Redlands I have been dramaturg for two shows. Both of which I was given the opportunity discuss the play with the author. The first play was *Mrs. California* by Doris Baizley and the second was *Pe'er Gynt: An American Odyssey* by Steve Shade. The latter was an adaption of Henrik Ibsen's dramatic poem *Peer Gynt*. Even though I have done an extensive amount of reading and talking about dramaturgy, most of what I have learned was by practicing it in these shows. When I started my work as a dramaturg with *Mrs. California* I had no idea what I was in for or what exactly a dramaturg was suppose to do. However, as I started reading the text, I found that investing in the script was something that came naturally to me. As a literature major, I am taught to read deeply into texts and I am constantly looking for outside sources to help me understand novels, poems, etc.

Another reason I think I was a good fit to be a dramaturg is because I understand many aspects of theatre. I have participated in many shows and have done a variety of different jobs ranging from acting to stage-management. This came in handy because I know how to analyze a script from different perspectives. I also know how to relate to the people who are doing jobs that I have done before. Whilst reading about dramaturgy I found that these skills are things that other people look for in a dramaturg. For example, in *How to Talk to A Playwright*, the playwright Eric Overmyer states: "It is my experience that dramaturgs are weak on the practicalities of theater. I would encourage you all to get your hands dirty a bit. The more you know what actors and directors and designers do, the better your work is going to be" (Overmyer 188). Eric Overmyer would most likely approve of my liberal arts education in

theatre, since I have gotten my “hands dirty” at least a little bit in just about every aspect of theatre.

As Dramaturg for *Pe'er Gynt: An American Odyssey*, my job started off in a very confusing place, for there was no script for this show when I gained the title of my role. The only things I knew were that it was going to be based off of Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* and that Steve Shade would serve as director as well as the playwright. Over the summer before the production began rehearsals and before I even received the play, I did as much research as I could on Ibsen and his original work, so that I could try to get an idea of what I would be working with in the fall. Once I received the script from Shade, I read it over and over and over again. The play spans over sixty years of American history and has an extensive amount of references. I was lucky enough to have another dramaturg, Cambria Chichi, working on this show with me, since there was so much information to analyze and historical references to research.

As the playwright, Shade had already done much of the research, but Chichi and I were tasked with presenting it in a fun and interesting way. This was to help the cast become aware of doing their own dramaturgical work since many of them had to play characters that were based on people in history. During the course of my research on dramaturgical work, while reading an article titled *Dramaturgy and Silence* by Geoffrey Proehl, I found the following quotation that does a terrific job of describing how I saw my role in this production, “The central significance of having someone called a dramaturg work on a production is that attaching this name to a living presence encourages everyone involved in a production to attend more carefully to what is ever present but often under examined: the inner workings of a play” (Proehl 27). I found that my job as dramaturg was precisely that; finding ways to get the cast invested in the script.

Cambria and I had weekly meetings with Shade to go over the material we hoped to use to make a research guide and presentations for the cast of the play. What was difficult about this was that Shade had done so much research with the writing of the play, that we were months

behind him. There were times that our research didn't align, which ended up in more research to. Therefore it was both a blessing and a trial to constantly have Shade at our disposal.

It was also difficult to solidify my role as dramaturg while working with a director/playwright. As an example, the following quotation was part of an email conversation that Shade and I had where we discussed some of the primary characters in the play, "the archetype of Pe'er as the bad boy who we still love has stayed with us through many reincarnations in pop culture--movies, celebrity, books. Is Charlie Sheen Pe'er Gynt? I dunno". Understanding that this was the director talking, I had to ask myself the question: is he, as a director, going to integrate a Charlie Sheen-type attitude to the character of Pe'er? But when thinking of him as a playwright, was this Charlie-Sheen-type aspect something that was supposed to be obvious? It was important for me to realize that he was both the director and the playwright. I had to be able to give honest feedback about the play, while not offending or asking the wrong questions about the script.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Researching and reading all of the materials from various scholars about the ideas they have about the practices of dramaturgy and the methods they have discovered has led me to realize that I have ideas and experience to contribute to this field, even though I have only been part of it for a short while. While researching and attempting to fully understand the world of dramaturgy both at my university and in the professional world of theatre, I came to discover that my experience as dramaturg for a playwright/director was quite unique. I believe that the role I had as dramaturg had to be explored in ways that were different from how one might go about the practice of dramaturgy for a play where these roles of director and playwright are distinctly different. I had to be able to ask questions of Shade to better understand what type of message he was trying to portray, while understanding that as the director he would be able to make his vision come alive. However, I needed to be there to help get everyone involved interested in becoming invested in Shade's script, while also remembering the legacy of Ibsen and his work as well.

Another thing I have noticed is that what it means to be a dramaturg is constantly changing or is adjusted in some way to fit the play that is being worked on. What I found in working on the adapted version of Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* and with researching the practices dramaturgy is that an adapted play is a good metaphor for working as a dramaturg. Just like Shade took the themes and general story line from *Peer Gynt* to make something new, we must take and adapt the best dramaturgical practices to make them our own for each play. Adaptation is inherent in the creation of good a dramaturgical practices.

Works Cited With Annotation

Chemers, Michael M. *Ghost Light: An Introductory Handbook for Dramaturgy*. Carbondale [Ill.: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. Print.

I wish I would have known about this book before I actually acted as dramaturg for a production. This book is extremely well organized and the index at the end of the book is very helpful. *Ghost Light* gives a great overview of what dramaturgy is and what a dramaturg does or can do for a production. It also goes over a variety of different types of plays (adaptation, documentary, etc.) that one could dramaturg for and the differences you might find as a dramaturg with each type of work. This is a great introduction for anyone to read, even if they aren't a dramaturg or considering being one because it

explains and lays out all of the terms of theatre in a way that is easy for a non-theatre person to understand. For my research, one of the most helpful sections is the first chapter titled, "What the #\$\$%@ Is a Dramaturg?" because Chemers has a very clear way of explaining why dramaturgy is important and I think his material will help support my project, since I will also be arguing dramaturgy is an integral part of theatre, especially in a university setting. This book also helped me discover that I wanted to write about the relationship between a dramaturg and a playwright/director. There is a section in the middle of the book that goes through the different production roles and explains a little bit about working with each type of person, but I realized as I was reading this, that I had done something that has not been written about, which is one of the reasons I find it important to write about my experience in doing just that.

"Dramaturgs'network." Dramaturgs Network. Web. 12 Feb. 2012.

<http://ee.dramaturgy.co.uk/index.php/site/comments/what_does_a_dramaturg_do>.

This is a useful webpage that I found as a link in the article I read by McCabe. It has great quotes about what dramaturgy is, links to interesting articles about dramaturgy, and information about conferences and networking opportunities for dramaturgs. It would be a great place for anyone to start learning about dramaturgy, but also is handy for those who have experience in the field. It is well-rounded and fun site to look around.

"How to Talk to a Playwright." Interview by Eric Overmyer, John Glore, Sandy Shinner, Philip K. Gotanda, Steve Carter, and Constance Congdon. *Dramaturgy in American Theater: A Source Book* 1997: 180-89. Print.

This interview from the book *Dramaturgy in American Theater*, it was a helpful piece of research because it gave a variety of differing opinions from people with various jobs in the theatre, instead of just one opinion which is often the case in many of the articles that I read. The comments from the playwrights, dramaturgs, managers, and the dramaturg/playwright were all useful in getting me to think about my relationship with the directors I have worked with in my experience as a dramaturg. It was interesting to

compare what they had to say about working with a playwright to my experience, since I worked with two playwrights in my experience at the University of Redlands. One of the things that stuck out at me when the non-dramaturg's talked about dramaturgy was that they seemed to have a stigma about dramaturg's or the idea of dramaturgy as being somewhat pretentious. To me, everyone seemed to have a different idea of what a dramaturg should do, which is funny because all of the people interviewed work in theatre professionally.

Ibsen, Henrik. "Full Text of "Peer Gynt: A Dramatic Poem"" *Internet Archive: Digital Library of Free Books, Movies, Music & Wayback Machine*. Web. 11 Jan. 2012.

<http://www.archive.org/stream/peergyntdramatic00ibseuoft/peergyntdramatic00ibseuoft_djvu.txt>.

Although quotes from the play may not be included in my paper, I find it important to add this to my bibliography at this stage because it is at the root from which all my experience, ideas, and work stemmed. This work was also used heavily in the making of the research guide that was part of my dramaturgy work for *Pe'er Gynt: An American Odyssey*. I read many different translations of *Peer Gynt*, but this one was most accessible for use on the research guide because it was online.

Jonas, Susan, Geoffrey S. Proehl, and Michael Lupu. *Dramaturgy in American Theater: A Source Book*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College, 1997. Print.

This book made up of a compilation of articles about dramaturgy. The articles are grouped into five different sections titled: Precedents and New Beginnings, Towards a Dramaturgical Sensibility, Models of Collaboration, New Contexts, and Developing New Works. I have included a few of the articles from the book into this annotated bibliography. The articles in the book range from dealing with the education of dramaturgy to interviews with dramaturg's about their practices. I found this book extremely useful for my project as a whole since it has such a variety of articles. I believe this book and its articles are geared more towards people that already have an

understanding of what a dramaturg does and what dramaturgy is. I would recommend reading a book like *Ghost Light: An Introduction to Handbook Dramaturgy* before delving into these scholarly articles that could be confusing to understand without background knowledge that could be gained from a book like *Ghost Light*.

Luckhurst, Mary. *Dramaturgy: A Revolution in Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

I picked this book out at the Armacost Library because it was one of three books that came up when I searched “dramaturgy” in the library catalogue. At a glance, I thought it would be useful in gaining insight into the history of dramaturgy. However, it didn’t end up being a material that I found extremely helpful or conducive to the work I am doing. It was a little too historical and referenced a lot more dates, people, historical details about the language of theatre, and places than I really needed to know. Although it is something I am undoubtedly interested in learning about, it is a very long book that is not broken up well for my usage on this project. When I read the Introduction there were a few good sections about the history of the term dramaturgy that I found interesting and might consider putting in my paper. However, I found that other books and articles were a lot clearer and easier to navigate and gave enough history for me to understand how dramaturgy has functioned in theatre.

McCabe, Terry. "A Good Director Doesn't Need a Dramaturg." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 47.42 (2001): B10-2. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 13 Jan. 2012.

In this article, McCabe argues exactly what the title states. I read this particular article because I found the title intriguing, why would anyone, especially a director like McCabe, argue against having a dramaturg? Since the backbone of my project is rooted in the idea that what I did as a dramaturg is meaningful and necessary to the theatre, I found it important to understand why other people might disagree with that idea. McCabe had a lot of well thought out arguments, one of the ones that stood out to me was that he thinks a dramaturg takes away from the directors closeness with actors and

that since the director should be doing his own dramaturgical work, it might take away from his vision if the actors look to the dramaturg for answers to their questions. He also argues that with the dramaturg being the one to protect the vision of the play comes a stigma against directors, who now become the ones whom we need to protect the play against. This article also has a very nice introduction to the idea of dramaturgy and gives a bit of background on the history of it as well.

Proehl, Geoffrey S. "Dramaturgy and Silence." *Theatre Topics* 13.1 (2003): 25-33. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 2 Jan. 2012.

Proehl examines the silence, listening, and the voice of the dramaturg during the rehearsal processes. He looks at the different types of silence and their impact from a dramaturgical standpoint: silence as frustration, silence as imposition, silence as invisibility, silence as power, silence as pleasure, silence as safety, silence as humanity, silence as necessity, silence as potential, and breaking silence. The way he understands the job of the dramaturg and how silence plays into it is very beautiful. My new favourite quotation about the role of a dramaturg is from this article. "The central significance of having someone called a dramaturg work on a production is that attaching this name to a living presence encourages everyone involved in a production to attend more carefully to what is ever present but often under examined: the inner workings of a play." I love this quotation because it is straight to the point; it doesn't over examine what a dramaturg does and doesn't even need to explain every job of a dramaturg. It gives a great overview and all-encompassing view of the central job of a dramaturg.

Shade, Stephen. *Pe'er Gynt: An American Odyssey*. Redlands CA: Stephen Shade, 2011. Print.

This play was adapted from Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*. It was performed at the University of Redlands in the fall of 2011 and it was a show that I participated in as dramaturg. The research guide I created was for this production and I spend a lot of time analysing this script in order to properly accomplish my job as dramaturg. Quotes from this play may

not appear in my final capstone paper, but it will definitely be mentioned and would also be necessary for anyone to read or see to understand the breadth of material that was included in the dramaturgical work for the show.

Talenti, Pier Carlo. "Pier Carlo's Dramaturgical History." Telephone interview. 17 Feb. 2012.

I conducted this interview with Pier Carlo over the phone and recorded it on my computer. I came into the interview with a series of questions that I wanted to ask him, but as the interview went on I ended up throwing my questions out the window because he would often times say something that lead me to a new question. Before the interview I thought that there were aspects of dramaturgy that every dramaturg was responsible for. For instance, I was under the impression that most dramaturgs gave presentations to casts of a show about background information for the play, I guess that is because it is such a big job of a dramaturg here at Redlands. However, Pier Carlo does not do that at all, he said that was the duty of the cast, directors, and designers to do the background research themselves. It was also fascinating to learn about how he got started as a dramaturg; he had very little background in theatre. The interview was helpful in giving me a better understanding of what a professional dramaturg does and was also a fun way to gain research about the subject.

Zelenak, Michael. "Why We Don't Need Directors: A Dramaturgical/ Historical Manifesto."

Theatre Topics 13.1 (2003): 105-108. *ProQuest Research Library*. Web. 3 Jan. 2012.

This article is very short, but it is a nice contrast to the article written by McCabe who argues that there doesn't need to be a dramaturg if there is a good director. Zelenak argues that the role of a dramaturg is equally as important as a director, and that we could do without directors in American theatre. He argues that the history of drama shows that the "makers of drama" or dramaturgs need to regain the collaborative model of theatre that once was.