

## ‘MIRRORING THE DOUBLE AND THE CRUEL’

Living, Uncaging, Offending, Celebrating, Analysing: considerations on a few artistic experiences that echoed Artaud’s thought

Andrea Pagnes<sup>1</sup>

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3696-2503>

*ABSTRACT: This text focuses on some authors and their artistic experiences, particularly in the sixties and seventies, on which Antonin Artaud’s reverberations are evident or underlying. If the radical theatrical conceptions of The Living Theater firmly found on the theory of the “Theatre of Cruelty” for direct testimony of its own most prominent exponents, John Cage does not deny to have drawn inspiration from the Theater and Its Double in its revolutionary conception of performance. More challenging, perhaps an anomaly, it is to find Artaud’s influence alongside theatrical and performance experiences based on the literary text and on the spoken word, such as those of Peter Handke’s Offending the Audience and of Klaus Kinski’s Jesus Christ the Savior, where the relationship performer/spectator is tensioned in order to dissolve the fourth wall. Artaud was a source of inspiration also for the development of a type of performance which implies on the requalification and implementation of the collective ritual, the role of the performer, the body expressing primordial impulses to celebrate life and the creation like The Theatre of Orgies and Mysteries conceived by Hermann Nitsch. Eventually, disciplines such as Theatre and Performance Studies are, precisely, debtors to Artaud when tackling the notions of performance, performativity and performative.*

*KEY-WORDS: Theatre; Performance; Text; Audience; Ritual.*

## ESPELHANDO O DUPLO E O CRUEL

Viver, Libertar, Ofender, Celebrar, Analisar: considerações sobre diversas experiências artísticas que ecoaram o pensamento de Artaud

*RESUMO: Este texto enfoca alguns autores e suas experiências artísticas, particularmente nos anos sessenta e setenta, nos quais as reverberações de Antonin Artaud são tanto evidentes quanto subjacentes. Se as concepções teatrais radicais do Living Theater vem ao encontro da teoria do “Teatro da Crueldade”, como testemunho direto de um de seus expoentes mais proeminentes, John Cage, por outro lado, não nega ter se inspirado no Teatro e seu Duplo e em sua concepção revolucionária de performance. Contudo, mais desafiador, talvez até anômalo, é encontrar a influência de Artaud ao lado de experiências teatrais e performances baseadas tanto no texto literário quanto na palavra falada, como em Offending the Audience, de Peter Handke, e Jesus Christ the Savior, de Klaus Kinski, nas quais o relacionamento performer/espectador tensiona a quarta parede até dissolvê-la. Artaud também foi fonte de inspiração para o desenvolvimento de um tipo de performance que implica na requalificação e implementação de uma espécie de ritual coletivo, no papel do performer, no corpo que expressa impulsos primordiais para celebrar a vida e a criação, como em The Theatre of Orgies and Mysteries concebidos por Hermann Nitsch. Como conclusão, disciplinas teóricas em estudos de Teatro e Performance tem, de fato, um grande débito com Artaud e com relação as suas noções de performance, performatividade e performativo.*

*PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Teatro. Performance. Texto. Público. Ritual.*

---

<sup>1</sup> **Andrea Pagnes** has been working with Verena Stenke as *VestAndPage* since 2006. They gained international reputation operating in performance art, filmmaking, social theatre, and art community projects. Their performance practice is contextual, conceived psycho-geographically in response to social situations, natural and historical surroundings, urban ruins. Through their live works, writings, and intensive workshops that they offer, *VestAndPage* explore themes such as pain sublimation, suffering, fragility, risk-taking, trust in change, union and endurance to merge from reality poetic elements to contrast the exercise of power and discrimination. Curators of the *Venice International Performance Art Week* since its inception, their last film *Plantain* received the best movie award at the *Berlin Independent Film Festival* (2018). E-mail: [pagnes@vest-and-page.de](mailto:pagnes@vest-and-page.de).



The influence of Artaud is pre-eminent. It has continued to demonstrate extraordinary staying power to the present day, exceeding any expectations he may have had. Outnumbered are those who claim him as their predecessor, “literary magazines, and theatre programs propagate his name; he is quoted as having said things he never said, and he is used as a front for the worst eccentricities”. (VIRMAUX, 1966, p.154) His impact has bestowed upon him the status of a cultural icon. Perhaps it has also produced excessive exploitation of his stances.

However, particularly in the sixties, the reverberations of Artaud's theatre theories are felt through the constant tension of targeting the cornerstones of the representation to deconstruct it. Drawing inspiration from his ideas, a rising generation of American and European ground-breaking artists began to question in-depth its constitutional elements, their effectiveness and application: text, character, *mimesis*, plot, storyline, coherence and completeness, meaning, fiction, repetition. In the line of Artaud, also they radically eschewed the notion entertainment, of vain “artificial amusement, of an evening's pastime” (ARTAUD, 1994, p.60) because it implies that the intrinsic value of art is divorced from any formative, ethical, or utilitarian function.

Precisely in the concept of unworldly art, that is of those artistic expressions which are unaware of the reality and therefore are useless to stimulate reflection on life matters and the human being, Artaud recognized “a decadent notion, an unmistakable symptom of the emasculatory force within us”. (ARTAUD, 2010, p.55) He urged the creative spirits to react because “there are too many signs that everything which used to sustain our lives no longer does so and we are all mad, desperate and sick”. (ARTAUD, 2010, p. 55)

From a conceptual perspective, Artaud's theoretical approach to theatre has revealed the illusion of the theatrical event and the theatrical space, making the entire fictional system of the scenic action manifest, to demonstrate the illusory nature of representation but also of the tangible reality of the spectators themselves. His idea of inserting elements proper to reality to overcome the scenic fiction (the make-believe), has facilitated actors and performers to develop a new awareness of themselves, of what they play and perform on stage, alongside the possibility to break the fourth wall between them and spectators.

The urgency to address and provoke the audience directly to shake them from the indolence that poisons the soul pushed him to redefine the theatre space. To do so, Artaud foresaw the use of evocative sounds and primordial noises. He uncaged the actor from the dictatorship of the script. He gave back to the voice its organic potential so that words and language should emerge from a dimension placed “somewhere, between gesture and thought”. (ARTAUD, 2010, p.63) He imagined the lighting setup



in a way that the lights function as a dance of incandescent blades: dazzling, flashing, blinding.

Artaud's founding principle, that one that opposes the separation of theatre from reality, echoes from the post-war period to the present. It continues to inspire the broad spectrum of performing arts in general, as all art should source from life and take root into it, ultimately to produce an experience that “wakes up heart and nerves”. (ARTAUD, 1989, p.120)

## Living

Between the sixties and the seventies, *The Living Theatre's* multimedia, radical experimentations are among those that best reflect Artaud's influence in the attempt of dissolving the fourth wall.

Officially founded on April 26, 1948, by Julian Beck and Judith Malina, the philosophical harbingers of *The Living Theater* take root in the period of the second artistic avant-garde, which flourished in the United States after the II WW in the wake of the first European avant-garde. The centre of the new avant-garde was the Black Mountain College, an art school established in Asheville (NC) by John Andrew Rice in 1933, inspired by John Dewey's principles of holistic learning and the idea that art should source from ordinary people's everyday life. Several students became influential artists in the years to come. Among them Merce Cunningham and John Cage who helped Beck and Malina to find a stable space for rehearsal in New York in 1958.

In the early fifties, Beck and Malina practised Poetics Theatre, described as “a demonstration of language in its social-body making and undoing capacities”. (SCHUMACHER, 2011, p.220) They ventured into Meta-theatre, in the main consisting of “the play within the play, the ceremony within the play, literary and real-life reference within the play, self-reference”. (HORNBY, 1986, p.7)

However, despite its quality of defying theatre's pretence to adhere to reality, Beck and Malina recognised in Meta-theatre a deceitful scheme to outwit the audience. As their purpose was to find a genuine relationship between actor and spectator, for them it was not an honest means by which involve the public.

In the late fifties, non-narrative performances aiming to re-discuss the relationship between performer and spectator began to take hold. The Happenings theorised by Allan Kaprow, carried out by the *Fluxus Collective*, alongside John Cage's revision of “the meaning and the use of the musical score and the nature of the sound to integrate them in relation to the theatre” (MORSE, 2016, p.38) were revolutionizing the creative processes, the way of thinking and making art.



With this, the Beat generation poets were breaking up the rules of writing, not only technically, but in the contents, that had to be more truthful and explosive than the reality itself.

Beck and Malina found themselves in this vibrant artistic environment, in turn hosting interventions by cutting edge artists in their space: Simone Forti with his minimal performances, or Robert Morris's mobile sculptures for the performance *The Column* by minimalist avant-garde composer La Monte Thornton Young (BRYAN-WILSON, 2013).

In 1958, Mary Caroline Richards brought to Beck and Malina her English translation (at that time still unpublished) of *The Theatre and Its Double* by Artaud. In *Theatre of Cruelty* they found the access-keys to radicalise their artistic purpose and the confirmation that the performer, to produce impacting actions, should rely on “the use of the personal self in performance”. (SNOW, 2016, p.26)

A year later, in 1959, understanding that Artaud's idea of cruelty is “a means of sensitising the spectators to the everyday violence hidden behind the façade of civilisation”, (KOUTSOURAKIS, 2016, p.1) with their production *The Connection* written by Jack Gelber, *The Living Theater* started to attract widespread national attention.

*The Connection* is a plotless play within-a play or, more correctly, “a specimen of life not a play” (DONAHUE, 1971, p. 272) It is a harsh portrayal of a bunch of drug addicts trashed not on a stage but in their own environment, a flat, while waiting for the drug-dealer. The language is unpleasantly rough but captivating, jarring, drenched of equally harsh tones and words. Questions and criticism hit hard the bourgeois mentality of the time. An overdose of heroin becomes a revelatory near-death experience: the needle penetrating deep inside the vein, the substance flowing through the thin interface that separates life from darkness. “In time, the production convinces playgoers that they are not just observing a performance but are in the presence of individuals on the stage who are real junkies”. (DONAHUE, 1971, p. 272)

Theatre, to be effective, should attack the audience by making them feel shaking emotions through violent scenes “but with a higher level of explicit self-reflexivity about its status as a performance”. (TYNAN, 1960, p. 8). Eventually to destroy violence through its re-presentation, or, otherwise said, to exorcise real violence through theatrical violence.

Focusing on the solution of the problem of the relationship between performer and spectator, *The Living Theater* grasped a fundamental function of the scene, which will inform at large contemporary theatre and performance art over time: unravelling, hitting, slamming in the face of the spectator the harshest side of reality.



*The ghost of Artaud became our mentor and the problem that we faced as we began our work on Fourteenth Street was how to create that spectacle, that Aztec, convulsive, plague-ridden panorama that would so shake people up, so move them, so cause feeling to be felt, there in the body, that the steel world of law and order which civilization had forged to protect itself from barbarism would melt. Why? Because the steel world of law and order did more than just protect us from barbarism; it also cut us off from real feeling... Artaud believed that if we could only be made to feel, really feel anything, then we might find all this suffering intolerable, the pain too great to bear, we might put an end to it, and then, being able to feel, we might truly feel the joy, the joy of everything else, of loving, of creating, of being at peace, and of being ourselves. (BECK, 1965, p. 25)*

These words by Julian Beck make his anarchist-pacifist ideology opposing all wars and in favour of the abolition and demolition of all prisons, shine through, reaching his peak with the ground-breaking theatre performance *The Brig*, premiered on May 13, 1963, in New York. Based on a manuscript of about forty pages sent by mail to Beck and Malina by young marine Kenneth H. Brown, it depicts a typical day of a military prisoner in his ship, subjected to violence and harassment of all kinds. Especially it criticises the absurd prohibitions aimed at the depersonalization of the individual. Beck and Malina saw in this text the ideal work to fully realize the Artaudian *Theatre of Cruelty*. They understood that *The Brig* should not be represented relying on fictional expedients but experienced in the first person. Performers thus become real prisoners, just as real are the acts of violence suffered and inflicted to them during the play. The audience empathically shared their suffered tortures.

*Though Artaud is kidding when he says his kind of theatre might purge civilization of its characteristic criminality, The Living Theatre, intending such a purge, has picked up not only his stage tricks but his idea for content, the misery and cruelty of civilization... enacting something like the anarchist revolution. (BRECHT, 1969, p. 52).*

It is also to take notice that *The Living Theater* was “not only a radical political theatre but were also psychologically radical as a performance group”. (SNOW, 2016, p.26).

In fact, one of their main concern was to “psychologically attack repression in the individual – the original repression, self-repression, the source and origin of repression in society” (BRECHT, 1969, p. 48) not so much to communicate ideas and arguments, but rather “to alter the consciousness of the spectator” (GORDON, 2009, p. 281).

To portray the excluded and rejected from society tends to subvert the existent social order. However, subversion is incomplete in its very own nature. There is no certainty that it could provide the seeds to regenerate that order in the future, transform it anew and put an end to repression, unless all the consciences of human



beings commit to moving in harmony in this same direction. Consciousness, for Artaud and also later for Foucault, is in extremis, and the condition is a permanent one. “All one can do is struggle against this condition, engaging in a continual guerrilla warfare, in a political theatre of cruelty directed against the existing order”. (MEGILL, 1987, p.188).

In 1964, when Beck and Malina, convicted and sentenced briefly to jail for tax violation (later proved false), had forcibly to close *The Living Theater* in New York, soon after they decide to leave the United States to undertake a five years' journey to Europe. During this voluntary exile the company became nomadic and their anarchic-pacifist ideology more accentuated. They began to operate without hierarchies constituting a community based on the life and artistic labour. They continued to produce and perform works implementing Artaud's precepts and enforcing their political stances: “The Theatre of Emergency is the theatre of feeling. For a feelingless society, feeling. For a fractured people, unification. Realization. The people as one, one. A theatre not for people, but at one with people”. (BECK, 1991, p. 33) The culmination of the European period took place in 1968 with the creation of *Paradise Now*, a 4-5-hours collective performance that foreseen the direct and massive participation of the public, including a final apotheosis in the streets outside the theatre. *Paradise Now* called in to question what performers and viewers represent “to each other in the social environment of the theatre” (BECK, *Our Mission*), therefore the notion of the community of individuals in the social fabric.

In the Seventies, the will to break down all the barriers and the conventions proper to the theatre leads Beck and Malina to perform more and more in streets and squares. The performer must “move from the theatre to the street and from the street to the theatre”. (BECK, *Our Mission*) If the streets belong to people, so does Theatre. They also perform for free inside factories, in a steel mill in the city of Pittsburgh. They put on plays in prison when jailed in Brazil, taking the dreams of the inmates, distil what they have in common with them and perform them. (ELSTER, 1971)

During the Eighties, with collaborations including *The Body of God*, *The Living Theater* involved in their performances also homeless people, this way proposing a theatre as an autonomous social act to deconstruct whatsoever repressive, elitist and ideological form which could corrupt their idea of the performative.

If the past is often an obsolescent lie and the future just an illusory dream, the only reality is now. In the legacy of Artaud, the works of *The Living Theater* are aesthetic-revolutionary experiences that struggle against the deceptive variant of tradition, the impositions of its rules and the slavish obedience to them. By rejecting the stage, *The Living Theater* eliminated the dualism of art and life; therefore, the existing boundaries between actors and spectators, pursuing the dream of Artaud of the theatre breaking into life. They stripped theatre from any unnecessary artificiality. They privileged the



minimal gesture, the nakedness of the body and the use of humble objects of everyday life because “we are in great need of reality in our time” (BECK, 1991, p. 29) and our lives are “too full of pain and dissatisfaction”. (BECK, 1991, p. 55) If our time is a time of emergency and the purpose of theatre is to serve people's needs, “emergency theatre is the theatre of awareness”. (BECK, 1991, p.55)

The legacy of Artaud is unquestionably substantial also in the oeuvre and theories of greatest seminal European theatre authors and directors of that time. For instance, Jerzy Grotowski, to break down performer's resistance, advocated a way of proceeding that he called “*via negativa* – not a collection of skills but an eradication of blocks” (GROTOWSKI, 2002, p. 17). In other words, the inner world of the performer, his spirit, should merge precisely through the body and with the body, to reach its full expression in a performance when “the body vanishes, burns, and the spectators see only a series of visible impulses” (GROTOWSKI, 2002, p. 17).

When Peter Brook conceived his *Theatre of Cruelty Workshop* within the *Royal Shakespeare Company*, he adopted the techniques theorised by Artaud “to reinvigorate the theatre through a theatrical vocabulary not tied to language” (ARONSON, p. 25). Also, for Brook, the reality is the final goal. The performer should evoke emotions, feelings and reveal human nature through the physical, even when he is motionless. In his theory of the invisible, Brook claimed that the spectator might not realise how much the emotions move him. However, he is moved by them: “It's like crossing an abyss on a tightrope: necessity suddenly produces strange powers”. (BROOK, 1971, p. 50) Brook insisted on the invisible because it “contains all the hidden impulses of man”. (BROOK, 1971, p. 71) By accessing them, the actor can establish “a human connection that is inherent in the audience”. (THERIAULT, 2009, p.1)

Indeed, the effects of Artaud's theorisations are a flashpoint coalescing in various avant-garde artistic explorations.

## Uncaging

The names of John Cage and Antonin Artaud rarely appear together in a text dealing with theatre or performing arts. Documentary shreds of evidence are rare and uncertain. However, there are invisible threads that seem to combine the research of these two innovators, especially in the years between 1930 and 1952, those that lead to his revolutionary thought.

In that period, Cage often draws on French culture and its most avant-garde expressions. Innovative musicologist Edgar Varèse was fundamental to Cage's



research on organised noise as well as Pierre Schaeffer, the father of concrete music. Satie was one of his most inspirational composers.

Cage interlaced an intense epistolary correspondence with composer Pierre Boulez. Marcel Duchamp was his friend and teacher, not only of chess. Mallarmé was among his most favourite poets for the pure sound and phonetic ambiguity of his poems, together with René Char, whose poems speak of resistance against a repressive, conformist society.

For his performances, Cage seemed to have drawn inspiration from Artaud to a certain extent. If his immersive studies in Oriental philosophies pushed him to silence, the randomness, indeterminacy, the attempt to break down the barriers between the arts and redefine their functions seem to source in the principles of *The Theatre and Its Double*. (PASTORE, 2014)

However, few traces that highlight differences and concordances of thought between the two artists exist in interviews and conferences.

When French composer Pierre Boulez introduced *The Theatre and Its Double* to young pianist David Tudor, collaborator of Cage, Tudor, in turn, gave it read it also to John Cage in 1949. Cage and Tudor together produced the legendary *Untitled Event* in 1952 at the Black Mountain College, “an unscripted multi-disciplinary, multi-media performance in which students and teachers contributed individually to the spectacle (...) Cage explicitly attributed the blueprint of the event to Artaud”. (PAWLIK, 2010, p. 7)

The *Untitled Event*, also known as *Theater Piece No.1* is considered as a milestone for the birth of the Fluxus movement and performance art in general, marking its history in the United States and beyond.

If in some interviews Cage spent the name of Artaud, mostly referring to the *Untitled Event* at Black Mountain College, he never deepened the reasons for his reference.

Among the few studies that investigate the influence that Artaud's theory had on Cage, is the one of William Fetterman: “The work of Antonin Artaud, in particular, provides a theoretical impetus for Cage's first total theatre compositions” (FETTERMAN, 1996, p. 36). Fetterman recognizes the influence of Artaud's on Cage about chance and chaos as compositional means and “integral to the creative act” (FETTERMAN, 1996, p. 37) and in the notion of “anarchic dissociation”(FETTERMAN, 1996, p. 37) as a confirmation of Cage's sensibility.

Probably, the most direct testimony is by Cage himself. In his letter to Pierre Boulez on May 22, 1951, he wrote:





*And I have been reading a great deal of Artaud. (This because of you and through Tudor who read Artaud because of you.) I hope I have made a little clear to you what I am doing. I have the feeling of just beginning to compose for the first time. I will soon send you a copy of the first part of the piano piece. The essential underlying idea is that each thing is itself, that its relations with other things spring up naturally rather than being imposed by any abstraction on an artist's part. (BOULEZ, CAGE, 1993, p. 95)*

The *Untitled Event* took place in the dining room of the Black Mountain College. The public was arranged in four triangular zones converging to the centre and divided between them by corridors so that the actions surrounded the public, and there was not a privileged point of view. A score was drawn up in one afternoon of only time modules in which the performers would have to perform their actions. There were no rehearsals, and the duration of the performance was about forty-five minutes. Each performer used the language most appropriate to him/her. Merce Cunningham danced. John Cage read his *Juilliard Lecture* standing on a ladder. David Tudor performed Cage's *Water Music*. Robert Rauschenberg put discs on an old phonograph sitting under his blank canvases. Nicholas Cernovitch projected his film on the ceiling. Charles Olson read some of his poems, as did Mary Caroline Richards.

The actions were not arranged linearly but co-occurred, without a logical thread or a unique message. No practice or artistic discipline dominated the other, but each one carried out its actions independently using its temporal module as per score.

From this brief description, *Untitled Event* seems to take up Artaud's thought of theatre as a means of change that occurs through a process of alchemical transformation. In addition to this, it adheres to his vision of an event where actions are not frontal to the spectators and follow each other without logic in a space where words and dialogue are not predominant. It expresses the urgency of freeing theatre from the artificiality of representation. Eventually, in the line of Artaud, Cage also succeeded in organising the performance space as a place where life and its expression are coherent because one can always choose to act rather than describe, analyse or compare.

John Cage tackled an existential question that also worried Artaud. Mankind has placed between themselves and life a whole series of filters and barriers that prevent their immediate perception and understanding of reality. Hence, the artist's task is the unveiling of all the deceptions created by man's conscience to return to a fundamental understanding of life and its natural laws. A man should choose the "infinite outside" (ARTAUD, 1995, p. 293) instead of the "infinitesimal inside" (ARTAUD, 1995, p. 294), to let life manifest in all its richness and mystery.

To get closer to life, Cage, like Artaud, realizes that the artist should prevent any repetition, whether of forms, gestures or events, expressing his aversion to repetition already at the time of his studies with Schönberg. (NEFF, 2014)



The performer should give the impression that what is doing is unforeseen and unrepeatable, like any act of life, like any event produced by circumstances.

*In other words, repetition really has to do with how we think. And we can't think either that things are being repeated, or that they are not being repeated. If we think that things are being repeated, it is generally because we don't pay attention to all of the details. But if we pay attention as though we were looking through a microscope to all the details, we see that there is no such thing as repetition. (KOSTELANETZ, 2003, p. 237)*

Also, Cage agrees with Artaud on the principle that art is a means to meet life, although looking at life from a different perspective. For Cage, influenced by Zen Buddhism and Indian philosophy, life is made up of everything that exists because every living or inanimate being is at the centre of the universe. The human being should open to the world outside and discover that life is all mystery and wonder. For Artaud, on the other hand, life is crossed by dark and mysterious forces of a metaphysical nature, which can overwhelm or elevate man. Life is a phenomenon to which to look with courage, without veils and masks, through evocations or exorcisms, being conscious of the fact that these forces can throw us into the abyss. The artist is an enlightened being who has cast a glance over the truth and does not withdraw from it. Life, for Artaud, turns into a perennial conflict with a society hostile to any attempt to leave the representation of itself. For Cage, instead, the artist is integrated into society. He constitutes a tool that society can rely on for its progress and improvement. On this matter, Artaud's and Cage's positions are nothing but the reverse of the same coin: two opposites that attract and reconcile each other both of them calling for a process of liberation.

Indeed, a strong point of contact between the two authors, perhaps the most interesting concerning Cage's theatrical performances and where the extent of the Artaudian influence on his poetics is quite evident, is the conception of spectacle and scene.

Artaud suggested the abolition of a division between the scene and the audience:

*We intend to do away with stage and auditorium, replacing them with a kind of single, undivided locale without any partitions of any kind and this will become the very scene of the action. Direct contact will be established between the audience and the show, between actors and audience, from the very fact that the audience is seated in the centre of the action, is encircled and furrowed by it. This encirclement comes from the shape of the house itself (...) Special places will be set aside for the actors and action in the four cardinal points of the hall (...) Several actions at once (...) However, a central site will be retained which, without acting as a stage properly speaking, enables the body of the action to be concentrated and brought to a climax whenever necessary. (ARTAUD, 2010, p.68)*



In these passages, the similarities with the *Untitled Event* are evident: the structure of the performance space; the relationship established with the audience; the simultaneity of the actions; the public divided into four triangular areas oriented towards the centre of the room. The actions took place in the centre of the room, in the side corridors and the areas behind the spectators to fully wrap them. The event consisted of numerous simultaneous actions, the overlap of which was generated by a graphic score with temporal modules.

First Artaud and then Cage rejected the common practice of the Humanism to favour a central point of view determining the perspective illusion and the idea of a form in front of which the audience place themselves rather than being in a situation with which they enter in a tighter relationship. The separation between the scene and the audience became necessary when the society demanded a point of view that privileged a particular perspective, abandoning the medieval multifocality. The idea of surrounding space, outdoors and indoors, linearly and circularly, is that of a space that shapes itself over time, in the succession of actions and the gazes. It denotes the rejection of the frontality and function as a relational situation. (PASTORE, 2017)

For Artaud, despite the explosion of shapes and spaces, a theatre performance should be re-knotted and have a common thread. Here, Cage goes even further than Artaud. As the scene is the place where life flows freely, there is no need for control (by a director), but to delegate to the public the perception of the whole.

*The structure we should think about is that of each person in the audience. In other words, his consciousness is structuring the experience differently from anybody else's in the audience. So, the less we structure the theatrical occasion and the more it is like unstructured daily life, the greater will be the stimulus to the structuring faculty of each person in the audience. If we have done nothing he then will have everything to do.*  
(CAGE, KIRBY, SCHECHNER, 1965, p. 55)

In other words, renouncing all forms of control, not only on the execution but also on the material used and on its placement in space determines that the artist must do nothing but create the conditions for which life may appear.

Like Artaud, also Cage considers theatre as a form of art independent from literature. To unchain the theatre from the subordination to a text, for Artaud it meant to restore dignity and autonomy to the theatre, setting it free to manage its language, which is primarily physical, without having to adhere, interpret, represent and understand something else but itself. Cage intends to free theatre from its subjection to external principles so that life can appear without being an illustration of something other than itself and will recognise Artaud's influence on him, precisely in the years spent at the Black Mountain College.



*What The Theatre and Its Double taught me was the notion of a multi-dimensional theatre. We were all greatly influenced by Artaud at the Black Mountain. (...) In each case, it is a question of developing a form of theatre without depending on a text. It is as simple as that – for me at least. But words can enter into these happenings. But the principal thing is that they not begin with a text or try to express its aesthetic qualities. That was what Artaud had already envisioned. (CAGE, CHARLES, 1981, p. 166)*

Also, Cage shared with Artaud his existential urgency: the necessity to activate a lucid, cruel look at life that allows people to know what surrounds them beyond any possible consolatory representation that civilization opposes in order to forget our transient fate. The disclosure of truth (*Aletheia*) through art undermines the sense of protection and replaces the false reiteration of the beautiful, the amusing and the productive that society tries to package.

*Isn't there something of that same insistence in Artaud, in the business of the plague and cruelty? Doesn't he want people to see themselves not in a pleasant world but in something that is the clue to all things that we normally try to protect ourselves from? (CAGE, KIRBY, SCHECHNER, 1965, p. 56)*

## Offending

Since Artaud, different forms of provoking the spectators have become a trait of a large part of modern theatre production. “To offend, shock or assault its audience is characteristic of the twentieth century art in general. Music has rejected traditional harmony and fine art has overturned traditional criteria of aesthetics and composition”. (BRADBY, 1991, p. 62)

The fields of contemporary, experimental theatre, performance art and body art, relying on immediate, live contact with the audience have “resorted to shock tactics more frequently event than other art forms”. (BRADBY, 1991, p. 62)

It may seem paradoxical, according to what Artaud theorized about the need for abandoning the literary text, but to shake the public, as he hoped, is also achievable by performing a text in a way that the provocation succeeds.

In the sixties, Artaudian reverberations also manifest in new ways of writing and performing a literary text written to address and openly provoke the spectators. Texts of such kind deeply meditated and performed consequently, in theatre and performance arts function quite well still today. They occur with particular frequency often reaching the desired effect “because of the captive nature of the theatre audience”. (BRADBY, 1991, p. 62)



*Publikumsbeschimpfung* (*Offending the Audience*) is a clear example of how the provocation of the audience advocated by Artaud also functions when a text is written purposefully to disrupt the rules of conventional theatre, the usual criteria of a script and performed deconstructing the conventional rules of acting. Written by Peter Handke in 1966 (at the age of twenty-two years old), *Publikumsbeschimpfung* is an anti-play based on a text with no plot, characters, script, actors. It is a text for a theatre piece or performance conceived to challenge the passivity of the audience and its laziness of thought. It was performed for the first time in June 1966 at the *Theater am Turm* in Frankfurt as part of the “*Experimental Theater Week*”. Until then, in the history of the theatre, there had never been anything even distantly similar.

When the curtain rises, the stage is empty but for four performers. Initially, they ignore the spectators. Then they begin to address them directly. They engage the audience in a crescendo of verbal abuses. They release statements that reject the usual expectations that the audience may have about the nature of the play. They incinerate any illusions of the spectator about his relationship with the stage. Finally, the four performers congratulate the spectators for having been so entirely realistic and thank them for having been such good performers.

For Artaud, the notion of syntax dislocation is not spatial but internalized within the actor/performer (and director), and meaning is not something fixed. Although envisioning “a theatre of pure presence (...) on a deeper level Artaud understands that every present, especially in theatre, is always already a repetition”. (CORMAC, 2008, p. 69) As Derrida put it, Artaud “cannot resign himself to theatre as repetition and cannot renounce theatre as nonrepetition”. (DERRIDA, 1978, p. 249)

In *Offending the Audience*, a significant passage echoes Artaud's meditations on the notions of representation, presence, repetition, illusions and time:

*This is no manoeuvre. This is no exercise for the emergency. No one has to play dead here. No one has to pretend he is alive. Nothing is posited here. The number of wounded is not prescribed. The result is not predetermined on paper. There is no result here. No one has to present himself here. We don't represent except what we are. We don't represent ourselves in a state other than the one we are in now and here. This is no manoeuvre. We are not playing ourselves in different situations. We are not thinking of the emergency. We don't have to represent our death. We don't have to represent our life. We don't play ahead of time what and how we will be. We make no future contemporaneous in our play. We don't represent another time. We don't represent the emergency. We are speaking while time expires. We speak of the expiration of time. We are not doing as if. We are not doing as if we could repeat time or as if we could anticipate time. This is neither make-believe nor a manoeuvre. On the one hand we do as if. We do as if we could repeat words. We appear to repeat ourselves. Here is the world of appearances. Here appearance is appearance. Appearance is here appearance.* (HANDKE, 1997, pp. 15-16)



Handke, like Artaud, contends that Truth is absent in the surrounding world. However, his provocation has no interest to trigger immoderate or derisive reactions. His offence is intellectual but no less excruciating and unsettling than extreme physical actions. Handke makes use of a word to influence, shift, confuse and push one to reflect on what is beyond the world of appearance: this world, as well as the world of theatre. At times manipulative, these are words that hammer the attention of the spectators. They flow as an extension of the invisible. They seek what lies beyond the membrane of the apparent configuration of the reality, to function as a performative device capable of contaminating all levels of space.

If Artaud's criticism of the elements of theatre is capillary and revolves around the problematic of the sign and its expression, Handke understands that the dominion of the articulated word suffocates the expression of meaning and loses its capacity of direct engaging, of penetrating the intellect and spirit. So, he modifies the purpose of the text: not any more words to make-believe, but words as the actual content of the performance and the of the collective performative act itself.

Artaud, while searching for bodily, concrete writing, a physical, material language thanks to which theatre can differentiate itself from the word, did not mean to erase the word, but to subtract it to the mystifying mechanisms of society. Handke, to disrupt those mechanisms, understands that theatre can still wrest from the word its possibilities of semantic and philosophical expansion.

It looks perhaps like an anomaly paradox that a literary text such as “*Offending the Audience* by Peter Handke should seem to exemplify the anti-literary theories by Antonin Artaud (...) as much in the stage imagery” (LEACH, 2004, p. 187). Notwithstanding, it calls into question if theatre is just an illusion useful to soothe our jadedness of a passive, consumerist public. What is to take notice, it is that Handke's operation unmasks the hypocrisy of the domination of a language of words taken for granted to put at stake our precarious certainties and beliefs. It is a daring operation, as it provides an ultimate solution regarding the fascinating decomposition of meaning, and of all those conceptual elaborations and explanations, which try to explain the constant state of crisis and consequent discomfort that we people carry within ourselves.

The sixties are years of intense protest. All the arts express the need for a frontal attack on the productive, economical and also linguistic system.

Handke questions the nature and the function of the literary text to introduce elements of instability within the notion of dramaturgy to negate the narrative system. The deconstruction of the scenic fiction and the implosion of representation serves to find an anthropological foundation of the theatre praxis. Handke chooses the segmentation of the text: the text should act autonomously, defiles the relationship performers/public with continuous variation of meaning to involving both on a high



intellectual level at their own risk and danger. It is as if the performer condemned the spectators to chase the meaning in his place, but without them even noticing it.

*In Europe, no one knows how to scream any more, particularly actors in a trance no longer know how to cry out, since they do nothing but talk, having forgotten they have a body on stage, they have also lost the use of their throats. Abnormally shrunken, these throats are no longer organs but monstrous, talking abstractions. (ARTAUD, 2010, p. 99)*

An “attack on the spectators' sense of linguistic and moral properties as well as on their sense of what is important, logical or real” (BRADBY, 1991, p. 63) is that one of Klaus Kinski's legendary monologue *Jesus Christus Erlöser* (Jesus Christ The Saviour).

This unconventional solo performance premiered November 20, 1971, at the Deutschlandhalle of Berlin-Westend. The audience, at thousands, consisted of radical students, religious devotees and believers, and those attracted to witness the performance by Kinski “the crazy guy”.

The text, about 40 pages typewritten by Kinski, was inspired by Jesus Christ's speeches in the New Testament. Fuelling his monologue with his firm, stentorian voice, at times aggressive, Kinski shifted perspective several times while reciting the text, puzzling into it dissonant, scathing passages to address the political establishment, the Church and the war in Vietnam.

The public got confused: were they watching an Evangelist preacher, or a blasphemous heretic accuser and not an actor? Kinski was none of these. His Christ was part Kinski himself, and part a revolutionary anarchist.

The performance meant to last ninety minutes, but soon it transformed into a fierce verbal duel of insults and provocations between Kinski and the audience. The actual event became a minor matter. A member of the audience accused Kinski of being too rude. Kinski called him on stage replying in kind. Once on stage, the spectator blatantly criticised Kinski for his aggressive behaviour, and that he could not claim the right to speak as if he were Christ because Christ was patient and did not silence who contradicted him using a caustic, disruptive language. Kinski broke off and fulsomely yelled at him that Christ did not just silence them: he took a whip and bashed them in the face. Then Kinski turned to the whole audience and asked the spectators to make a sink-or-swim choice: either those who are not part of the riotous riffraff throw the others out, or else they have spent their money for nothing. Thus, abruptly, he threw the microphone on the floor and left the stage. When he came back, the climax in the Deutschlandhalle was still hostile and quarrelsome. Other spectators went on stage. One tried to take away the microphone from Kinski's hand. Kinski



pushed him away and interrupted the performance again. He reprised and completed his monologue a few hours later in front of a significantly reduced audience.

In 1999, in the movie *Mein Liebster Feind-Klaus Kinski* (My Best Fiend, literally: My Dearest Foe), director Werner Herzog blamed the audience of not having had an actual interest in watching a smooth performance. They just wanted to provoke Kinski deliberately to see him going on rage.

The fascinating aspect of this event is that a certain point of the performance any idea of staging has come to fall unexpectedly. The reality of the here and now became the real spectacle or rather, the antithesis of it, questioning the very function of the representation.

*The dissolution of the boundary between representation and the real, the insistence that Kinski himself is an order, or organ, of representation and a component of the reality he represents, establishes the avant-garde bearings of a self-conception in which the distinction between aesthetic experience and the everyday breaks down. The echoes, probably not deliberate, of Antonin Artaud, are fairly clear. (MCCANN, 2018, unpagged).*

Hands clutched to the microphone. His hollow gaze. A bundle of nerves before his words. Kinski's monologue morphed into forceful emotional diatribe between the performer and the audience. All that happened was mercilessly real, not pre-scripted, not-foreseen, not-pre-imagined. A performer, a person alone suffering the verbal slings and arrows of an outrageous multitude and that by opposing, he tries to end them.

As a stage actor, Kinski

*was probably even more powerful than as a movie actor, because his uncertain position on that line, maybe crossing it and maybe not, would have been more unnerving for a live audience. A tightrope walker needs a live audience for the act to have its full impact. As that fierce Jesus makes manifest, Kinski was a performer of the school of Antonin Artaud – theatre as an aggression on the audience. (PEREZ, 2000, p. 186)*

Kinski spoke out his verses and bitter statements— words carved in his mouth with an axe. His performance, and how the whole event went, carried out an unflinching insight into contemporaneity, posing fundamental questions to man, life, civil society and the burning issues that affect it. Exposing himself as he did in *Jesus Christus The Erlöser*, before his political ideas, the question on the role and function of the performer on stage becomes crucial. Engaging with the audience so directly, the boundaries between the real and representation dissolve. Kinski, the performer, does nothing but presents himself as he is in the here and now: the vessel of the reality that the reality itself represents.





Artaud's statement "ALL WRITING IS GARBAGE" (SONTAG, 1988, p.85), called the reader to consider that no supposed meaningful, intellectual words can shake the soul. If anything, the word should morph into flesh, blood, nerves. Kinski's monologue risked being compromised irredeemably, but his presence, passion, anger, despair, dejection, sustained the performance, shifting it to another level, more real than it could ever be.

When Kinski reprises his monologue, he is in between a wise tormented, sacrificed prophet and the lucid fool on the Golgotha that replaced Christ on the cross, incidentally bearing the despicable and "the filthy marks of the hands of man". (ESSLIN, 1976, p. 60).

*It is in this respect that it is possible to talk about Kinski in the same way that Susan Sontag talks about Antonin Artaud: as an artist without works, the artist whose inexhaustible personal totality exceeds anything he was capable of producing". (MCCANN, 2018, unpagged).*

For Sontag, this modality implies the romantic conception that writing, in modern literature, is "a medium in which a singular personality heroically exposes itself" (SONTAG, 1988, p. xviii), raising the question related to the myth of the modern artist in contemporary society. This modality "posits a disharmony between the self of the artist and the community and measures the artist's effort by the size of its rupture with the collective voice (of 'reason')". (MCCANN, 2018)

Personalities like Artaud's and Kinski's seemed to portray well the myth of the modern artist. A myth nourished by inhabiting the liminal space between the different artistic practices and their outcomes: poetry, drawing, theatre, filmmaking. However, "as one medium seems to renew itself through another, the "rupture" with the collective seems to intensify in relationship to its public exposure (...) and the opposition between autonomy and incorporation becomes all the more difficult to sustain". (MCCANN, 2018).

Artaud-Christ lives in his boiling written pages and radio recordings. In *Jesus Christus Erlöser* live performance, Kinski takes over the part of Jesus Christ, but not of that Christ "who plays his role on the cross for you and that you beat on his mouth when he falls". (KINSKI, 2006, p. 12).

Kinski-Christ is the disobedient, the restless one, fed up of rituals, holy feasts, celebrations, slogans, manifestos. He wants to free prisoners, homeless and junkies. He is against possession. He is not a guarantee of success. For him, the smell of incense is disgusting: it stinks of burnt human flesh. It is a Christ who publicly exposes himself at its own expense. He is fearless, confrontational, at times ranting because of frustration, at times yelling out his love like a wild beast for all those who do not want



to listen, eager to inject love in all hearts to wake them up to life. Moreover, he speaks out his uncompromised truth, precisely as Artaud did.

Kinski's avant-gardism lies in having unleashed the audience into a feverish chain reaction not planned before-hand: one against many.

The individual clashing against a multitude — resisting, responding, deserting, abandoning, resisting again and, as a last resort, overcoming the notion of resistance itself through poetry and performance-making — implies the political. The Christ of Kinski is a man uncaged but adrift in the sea of hypocrisies. Tears wet his eyes because he is vulnerable. However, he is capable of transforming his human fragility into courage and make of his existence an act of poetic revolt.

Showing one's fragility, bare to the bones, in front of an entire community to which one belongs, not only raises fundamental questions about the rights of the individual concerning the private and public spheres. It also overturns the traditional concept of strength.

Kinski's performance is interrupted again. The turns of the event continue. Someone accuses Kinski of being a fascist because he pushed someone down the stairs of the stage. Some other screams that he should apologise. Finally, another member of the audience addresses the whole audience, saying that people have no right to just come up on stage. He asks to stop the provocations against Kinski because there are people who would like him to continue. One last time. Kinski reprised his performance. Stepping down the stage, he ended it among the audience.

“Every man alone is sincere”. (EMERSON, 1983, p. 347) In the wake of Artaud, Kinski performed from his pain, suffered abuses, inner solitude. Indifference towards an unjust society is his worst enemy. As Artaud's, Kinski's subversive, fiery poetry brings into being something that perhaps did not exist before, or perhaps already existing, but that nobody wants to accept or pretends not to see.

Kinski-Christ is not “the official Church-Jesus Christ tolerated among policemen, bankers, judges, executioners, officers, church bosses, politicians and similar representatives of power”. (KINSKI, 2006, p. 12) He is not Christ “your superstar!” (KINSKI, 2006, p. 12). He is here “in principle to denounce a certain number of officially consecrated and acknowledged social filths”. (ARTAUD, 1995, p. 323)

In a letter to Henri Parisot, written on December 6, 1945, only a couple of years before his death, Artaud wrote, as if he was Christ himself, that despite he was held innocent of any crime “the immense people of imbecility rose to demand that I be crucified”. (ARTAUD, 1978, pp. 72-73) Kinski's *The Saviour* redeems Artaud-Christ's from the Golgotha. He bangs his truth into the brain of the sluggish like a hammer on an anvil. He drives the slothful out of the temple, the proscenium: theatre, the sacred space of art that speaks of life.



## CELEBRATING

Artaud's legacy has also informed the orientations and developments of performance art and body art consistently, from Gina Pane to Marina Abramović, Ron Athey, Franko B, and many others. With this respect, the use of bodily fluids and real blood as poetic-expressive elements is a practice that never ceases to exert attraction also in the performers of the younger generations. For example, VestAndPage used their blood as a poetic medium in their performances to write actual poems, hence ritualising it, applying a core passage of *Coleridge the Traitor*, the letter that Artaud wrote to Henry Parisot on November 17, 1946:

*“I say real poetry, poetic poetry, etc: charming hiccup with a bloody backdrop, the backdrop forced into the poematic, into the cracks of a bleeding haemorrhaging reality. For afterwards, let's say after the 'poematic' will come back the time of blood. Since ema in Greek means blood, so po-ema should mean: afterwards: the blood, the blood afterwards. First let's make poems, with blood”. (HIRSCHMAN, 1965, p. 131)*

A pioneer in this sense, conceiving a kind of a performative theatre that certainly has an Artaudian trait, implying the dimension of the feast, searching for new spaces and expressive languages in close relationship with the public, is *The Theatre of Orgies and Mysteries* by Austrian painter Hermann Nitsch.

Nitsch conceived his idea of theatre in 1957, and he carried it on throughout his career. It is the idea of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* (total work of art), enriched by real events which are staged to involve all the senses of the participants and the spectators. Nitsch was inspired by the medieval theatre tradition and by the “Dionysian Mysteries” where intoxicants and trance-inducing techniques (like dance and music) were adopted to overcome inhibitions and social constraints and liberate the individual to return to a natural state.

The ritualistic aspect of the actions, the conspicuous use of organic materials and fluids such as offal and blood, the slaughtering of animal carcasses deprived by their entrails combined with the wild physical contact of the performers, were the linguistic conditions of Nitsch's earliest experiments.

The aim was to find live images having a strong shocking visual impact, whose genesis take root into painting but whose development entails the notion of a total work of art.

Nitsch rooted into the theatre the devices of ancient rituals and religious cults. He designed performative events to pervade the lives of those who participate, placing them physically in a state of otherness and of displacement from everyday life. To do



so, he devised a form of performative theatre highly cathartic. So, art itself becomes a tool to propagandise the primordial beauty of the life force: “there is a philosophical sense, so to speak, of the power which nature has suddenly hurling everything into chaos”. (ARTAUD, 1994, p. 62)

Influenced by the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud and Artaud's *Theatre of Cruelty* and *The Alchemical Theatre*, the idea of Nitsch was to attract and repulse the spectator swinging between live images that seduce and disgust, depicting the earth and the human “under the action of a terrible dance” (ARTAUD, 1995, p. 320).

The performance should produce a violent, dazzling sensation both in who participates and who is watching. The bodies should give the impression of being in a condition of constant, ecstatic distress. The spectators somehow should fear that not just the performers' bodies are on the verge of being viscerally assaulted but even their own, sooner or later. This idea is detectable also in the earliest performances by the Catalan group *La Fura dels Baus*, deploying mobile installations and wild physical actions to attack, cram, contain and move the public around the performance space at their will.

If in Nitsch's performances, the audience may feel guilty and ashamed of witnessing something conventionally immoral at first, when the performance unfolds, they can perceive a transformation taking place into them also, responding to violent solicitations that are happening before his eyes. A shocking visual solicitation brings, also, excitement, pleasure, morbidity, ecstasy. Mainly, this may happen when the spectator participates actively in the performance.

For Nitsch, pouring real blood on a body or tearing apart a lamb carcass, are ritualistic actions by which one can overpass his psychic blocks.

Reprising Artaud, for Nitsch, a theatrical performance ritual should vibrate “with instinctive things but brought to that lucid, intelligent, malleable point where they seem physically to supply us with some of the mind's most secret perceptions”. (ARTAUD, p. 43)

Indeed, the essential trait of *The Theatre of Orgies and Mysteries* is how to reach the catharsis because “what matters is that our sensibility is put into a deeper, subtler state of perception by assured means, the very object of magic and ritual, of which theatre is only a reflection. (ARTAUD, p. 64)

In the mid-sixties, when Nitsch found the movement “Wiener Aktionismus” together with Günter Brus, Otto Mühl and Rudolf Schwarzkogler, to realise performances increasingly involving deeper physical states such as excitement and liberation from inhibitions to reach catharsis, became the stylistic code of the group.

Being Nitsch also a visual artist and painter, he searched for a fundamental pictorial quality in his performances: the blood of skinned lambs becomes the primary



colour, poured and sprayed not just with brushes but with the hands and the body. The performer should look at his body as if it were a living canvas. Bodily fluids and animal's bowels fill the performative space as sculptural connotations of a para-religious ritual enacted for a cathartic purpose. Performers replace Jesus Christ crucified, chained on crosses and sprinkled with blood, not to re-enact Christ's suffering but rather to glorifying existence and the creation through an aesthetic ritual.

When the performance turns into pictorial action and no longer serves to generate a picture (like in Jackson Pollock), it becomes an aesthetic experience because of its performative nature notwithstanding its substantial pictorial implications.

Over time, Nitsch has refined his theatrical performances as interventions inside reality itself, therefore impossible to take place in institutional theatre spaces. He used the most diverse environments for his actions until 1971 when he purchased the Prinzenhof castle in Southern Austria, which will become the ideal home for the permanent realization of his performative theatre.

In Prinzenhof, Nitsch's Aktionen (actions) consisted of about 500 participants. Each of them lasted for almost a week non-stop, unfolding in the spaces of the castle, the adjacent cornfields, the alleys and taverns of the nearby village, thus engaging the audience to take part in a free, autonomous performance event. Everyone who participates is both a sacrificial victim and a redeemer, and an independent creator himself.

As it was for Artaud, also for Nitsch the sensual should defy the rational with an impact force that immediately involves the sphere of the senses, and through an alphabet of signs having the objective to make the spectator reach the original dimension of the performative. To this, the dramatic tension manifested through the bodies in action contribute to the deconstruction of the compositional process to bring it back to its original fragmentary dimension.

## ANALYSING

The analysis of the relationships between theatre and performance depends on the very notions of performativity and performative.

The notion of performativity highlights the action in itself rather than its mimetic value with regards to the representation. It calls into question the idea that theatre is inextricably linked to the imitation of an action, to the representation of meaning, whether it is through words, gestures or images. It rejects the idea that theatre is necessarily narrative, fictional and therefore a bearer of meaning.



This link between the action and the representation is what in essence Artaud wanted to overthrow. However, despite all efforts over time, theatre seems that cannot escape representation, notwithstanding that these very different efforts are what makes the history of contemporary theatre.

The pre-eminence that the performative theatre gives to action constitutes one of the fundamental aspects highlighted by the performance. The performance is something that happens and comes close to the real. It underlines the same reality in which it inscribes itself deconstructing it, while the presence of the performer, inhabiting the imperceptible interface that exists between illusion and reality itself, engage the competences of the spectator.

This radical “performance turn” in the theatre practices began in the Sixties. Also, a similar turning point happened concerning Theatre Studies and Performance Studies, two disciplines that intertwine each other, both privileging the creative processes over products, on the one hand, and abstract systems, on the other. Theater Studies consider the work in itself, be it a text or a performance, from the procedural point of view, or the performative point of view. Performance Studies often put the accent on the performative aspects of theatrical phenomena, or on the fact that they consist of relationships (starting from the actor-spectator relationship) and events, rather than works-products in the proper sense, not easy to delimit or objectify. Both disciplines draw from Artaud

constitutive elements of the dimension of self-referential presentation. They question the notions of presence (beyond and before that of representation) and the production of sense (beyond and before reproduction). (DE MARINIS, 2014)

This dimension can be considered one of the levels of organisation of the theatrical fact, the event, concept which also Artaud undertook in *The Theatre and Its Double*.

To dedicate special attention to the creative process, its procedural qualities, variables and outcomes, also concerns the anthropological, as Victor Turner and Richard Schechner have significantly analysed in their studies. The performative dimension of the event (and its actualization) depends on the modalities of the receptive act. It means that is also up to the analyst (who is watching) to activate each time the performance experience, operating a de-sublimation and de-semiotization procedure of space, content, signs and symbols. (DE MARINIS, 1992). Notwithstanding, not just the spectator but also the actor and performer can always activate their point of view.



## References

- ARONSON, Arnold. The Empty Stage. **The New York Times**. New York: NY Times, 24, Apr., 2005, p. 25.
- ARTAUD, Antonin. **Watchfiends & Rack Screams: Works from the Final Period**. Boston: Exact Change, 1995.
- ARTAUD, Antonin. **Artaud on Theatre**. London: Methuen, 1989.
- ARTAUD, Antonin. Lettres. In: **Œuvres Complètes: Suppôts et Supplications**. XIV, 1978. Tr. By the author.
- ARTAUD, Antonin. **The Theatre and Its Double**. New York: Groove Press, 1994.
- ARTAUD, Antonin. **The Theatre and Its Double**. Richmond (UK): Alma Classic, 2010.
- BECK, Julian. Our Mission. **Living Theatre Mission Statement**. Website. Available at: <https://www.livingtheatre.org/about>. Accessed: on 25, Oct 2019.
- BECK, Julian. Storming the Barricades. In: BROWN, Kenneth H. **The Brig**. New York: Hill and Wang, 1965, pp. 1-36.
- BECK, Julian. **The Life of Theatre**. New York: Limelight Editions, 1991.
- BOULEZ, Pierre; CAGE, John. **Correspondence**. NATTIEZ, Jean-Jacques. Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur, 1991.
- BRADBY, David. **Modern French Drama: 1940-1990**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- BRECHT, Stefan. Revolution at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. **The Drama Review**. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1969, pp. 47-73. Available at: DOI:10.2307/1144457. Accessed on 30, Oct. 2019.
- BROOK, Peter. **The Empty Space**. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1971.
- BRYAN-WILSON, Julia. **Robert Morris**. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 2013, p.27.
- CAGE, John, CHARLES, Daniel. **For the Birds: John Cage in Conversation with Daniel Charles**. London & Boston: Marion Boyars, 1981.
- CAGE, John, KIRBY, Michael, SCHECHNER, Richard. An Interview with John Cage. **The Tulane Drama Review**. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1965, pp. 50-72. Available at: DOI:10.2307/1125231. Accessed on: 29, Oct., 2019.
- CORMAC, Power. **Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre**. Amsterdam & New York: Editions Rodopi, 2008.



- DE MARINIS, Marco. Performance e Teatro: Dall'attore al performer, e ritorno? **Comunicazioni sociali**. Firenze: Casalini Libri, n. 1, 2014, pp. 29-46. Available at: DOI: 10.1400/225723. Accessed on: 28, Oct..2019.
- DE MARINIS, Marco. *The Semiotics of Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. **Writing and Difference**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- DONAHUE, FRANCIS. Anatomy of the "New Drama". **Southwest Review**. Dallas: Southern Methodist University, Vol.56, No. 3, 1971, pp. 269-277. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43468322>. Accessed on 24, Oct, 2019.
- ELSTER, Elenore. Living Theatre: Jailed in Brazil. **The New York Times**. New York: NY Times, 15 Aug. 1971, p. 1-3.
- EMERSON, Waldo R. Friendship. In: **Essays and Lectures**. New York: The Library of America, 1983.
- ESSLIN, Martin. **Antonin Artaud**. London: John Calder, 1976.
- FETTERMAN, William. **John Cage's Theatre Pieces: Notations and Performances**. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- GORDON, Robert. **The Purpose of Playing: Modern Acting Theories in Perspective**. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2009.
- GROTOWSKI, Jerzy. **Towards a Poor Theatre**. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- HANDKE, Peter. **Offending the Audience. Plays: 1**. London: Methuen Drama, 1997, pp. 1-32.
- HIRSCHMAN, Jack, (Ed.). **Artaud Anthology**. San Francisco: City Light Book, 1965.
- HORNBY, Richard. **Drama, Metadrama and Perception**. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1986.
- KINSKI, Klaus. **Jesus Christus Erlöser**. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2006. Transl. by the author.
- KOSTELANETZ, Richard. **Conversing with Cage**. London & New York: Routledge, 2003.
- KOUTSOURAKIS, Angelo. **Introduction. Image [&] Narrative**. Leuven: Faculty of the Arts, Vol. 17, No.5, 2016, pp. 1-5. ISSN 1780-678X. Available at:





<http://www.imageandnarrative.be/index.php/imagenarrative/issue/view/82>.  
Accessed on 24, Oct, 2019.

LEACH, Robert. **Makers of Modern Theatre: An Introduction**. London & New York: Routledge, 2004.

MCCANN, Andrew. Kinski Speaks Villon: Literary Media and the Poète Maudit, 1952–1962. **Modernism/modernity**. Evanston: John Hopkins University Press, Vol. 3, Cycle 3, Oct 17, 2018, unpaginated Available at: <https://doi.org/10.26597/mod.0072>. Accessed on: 25, Oct., 2019.

MEGILL, Allan. **Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida**. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987.

MORSE, Meredith. **Soft is Fast: Simone Forti in the 1960s and After**. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, 2016.

NEFF, Severine. Point/Counterpoint: John Cage Studies with Arnold Schoenberg. **Contemporary Music Review**. London and New York: Taylor and Francis, Vol. 33, No. 5-6, 2014, pp. 451-482. DOI: 10.1080/07494467.2014.998414.

PASTORE, Enrico. **L'Incontro impensato tra John Cage e Antonin Artaud. Enrico Pastore: Da Torino lo sguardo alternativo alle Live Arts**. Blog, 23, Aug., 2017. Available at: <http://www.enricopastore.com/2017/08/23/cage-artaud/>. Accessed on 24, Oct., 2019.

PASTORE, Enrico. 1952: un anno chiave nella produzione teatromusicale di John Cage. **Passarnous**. Firenze: EdiPsy Editrice, No. XVI, 2014. ISSN: 2281-9223. Available at: <https://www.psychodreamtheater.org/rivista-passarnous-xvi-numero---psychodream-review---1952-un-anno-chiave-nella-produzione-teatromusicale-di-john-cage---un-saggio-di-enrico-pastore.html> . Accessed on 24, Oct., 2019.

PAWLIK, Joanna. Artaud in performance: dissident surrealism and the postwar American avant-garde. **Papers of Surrealism**. No. 8, Brighton: University of Sussex, 2010, pp. 1-25. ISSN 1750-1954. Available at: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/56081>. Accessed on: 23, Oct, 2019.

PEREZ, Gilberto. Films in Review: Bad Boys: Klaus Kinski & Werner Herzog. **The Yale Review**. Vol. 88, No. 2, April 2000, pp. 185-194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0044-0124.00410>. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/0044-0124.00410>. Accessed on: 27, Oct., 2019.

SCHUMACHER, Alec. Review of Collapsible Poetics Theater: Considerations on Body, Language and Labor. **Latin American Theatre Review**. Lawrence, University of Kansas: Centre of Latina American Studies, Vol. 45, no. 1, 2011, pp. 220-222. DOI:10.1353/ltr.2011.0038.



- SNOW, Stephen. Influences of Experimental Theatre on the Emergence of Self-Revelatory Performance. In: PENDZIK, Susana, EMUNAH, Renée, READ JOHNSON, David (Eds.). **The Self in Performance - Autobiographical, Self-Revelatory, and Autoethnographic Forms of Therapeutic Theatre**. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016, pp. 21-35.
- SONTAG, Susan. Introduction. In: ARTAUD, Antonin. **Selected Writings**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- THERIAULT, Sawyer A. The Development of Theatre: Peter Brook and the Human Connection. **Inquiries Journal**. Boston: Northwest University, Vol. 1, No. 12, p. 1-1, 2009. Available at: <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/a?id=101>. Accessed on: 25, Oct., 2019.
- TYNAN, Kenneth. Preface. In: GELBER, Jack. **The Connection**. New: Grove Press, 1960, pp. 7-11.
- VIRMAUX, Alain and SANZENBACH, Simone. Artaud and Film. **The Tulane Drama Review**. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 154-165, Autumn 1966. DOI: 10.2307/1125279.

### ***Acknowledgments***

*My wife and art partner Verena Stenke for the gift of the poems by Klaus Kinski. My former theatre directors, teachers and mentors Alessandro Fantechi and Elena Turchi for having given me the chance to perform Artaud's and Peter Handke's texts. Friend, theatre director and critic, Enrico Pastore for his competence and suggestions on John Cage with whom I share the authorship of the paragraph dedicated to the American artist.*

*Received on November 4, 2019*

*Accepted on December 2, 2019*

