Maria Shevtsova

Stanislavsky to Grotowski: Actor to Performer/Doer

Stanislavsky's 'life of the human spirit' is at the heart of his understanding of how the actor could become an organic actor rather than a player of borrowed actions and lines. In this article Maria Shevtsova explores the links between Stanislavsky's aspirations for the actor and Grotowski's 'holy' actor, the latter providing the impetus for a theatre of presence rather than one of presentation – one that is concerned with the embodiment of fictional bodies and souls. The notion of actor 'training' is re-examined in the light of Stanislavsky's practice concerning the actor's mindful and probing work on himself/herself. Grotowski's work on presence-in-action, the basis first of the performer and then of of the doer, has been a catalyst for the singer-movers of Teatr ZAR and this group's goal of spiritual journeying, shared also by its spectators. Maria Shevtsova holds the Chair in Drama and Theatre Arts at Goldsmiths, University of London. Her most recent book is the *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Directing* (co-authored, 2013). She is co-editor of *New Theatre Quarterly*.

Key terms: 'life of the human spirit', 'holy' actor, ensemble theatre, presence in acting, song.

THE ACTOR is not new. However, the fact that this entity has existed at least since antiquity by no means diminished the question of definition for Konstantin Stanislavsky and Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko when they founded the Moscow Art Theatre in 1898. Who and what is the actor and what can he/she become?[1]

It is well known that Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko discussed for eighteen hours and more the pros and cons of the 'new kind of art' envisaged for this new theatre and what kind of actors should people it.[2] So familiar has the story become and so seemingly obvious its achievements that it is all too easy to forget the shock of the Moscow Art Theatre's overturning of established conventions. These conventions were not surface effects but were deeply rooted in theatre practice and thus difficult to dislodge: the actor as star; the actor as ham actor (Stanislavsky's *cabotin*); the actor as supplier of his/her own costumes, usually for the purposes of claiming the limelight, since the coherence of role to costume and decor, and to the other actors, was of little or no significance; the actor as something of a beggar in an insecure profession marked by inadequate working conditions and equally poor human relations. Stanislavsky's reflections on these and other factors are detailed with such precision, yet so movingly, in his *My LIfe in Art*, profiling conditions that would appear to be from another, archaic age, were they not still evident in many well-dressed, let alone struggling, theatres today.[3]

The 'new' of the MAT is characterized by more than the overthrow of this status quo, which after 1917 was judged by the revolutionary avant-garde, spearheaded by the company's brilliant actor Meyerhold, to be not only 'bourgeois' but 'old' – indeed 'dead', in the 1921 observations of Vakhtangov, who was another luminous pupil of the MAT.[4] But even these few items at the base level of Stanislavsky's and Nemirovich-Danchenko's deliberations on the future theatre are vital for understanding several points that are key, as regards the actor, to this article.

The first concerns the idea of ensemble theatre through which not only is an individual actor's performance enhanced by the co-ordinated play of all the actors in interaction with each other, but so, too, is the

  doi:10.1017/S0266464X14000670

quality of the collected whole – that togetherness of acting focus and energy which, as in mathematics, is greater than the sum of its parts.

The second has to do with the notion that the actor is more than an actor: certainly more than a court jester–entertainer and a being worthy of attention over and above immediately tangible accomplishments, starting with the actor's consciousness of himself/herself. Grotowski was to include in this domain of such importance to Stanislavsky the almost-invisible of the subtle energy that is consciousness beyond the ego and which, for Grotowski, as will become clear, is the precondition for the transformation of the actor first into the performer and then into the doer.

Ensemble theatre, which has been one of the MAT's lasting world legacies – aided, also, by the ensemble blueprint later provided by Brecht – required that the quality of play, singular and plural, should be repeatable rather than random. This meant that actors needed to fix what they had achieved and, further, to grow with their roles. Stanislavsky coined, for this process, the term 'score', which Grotowski borrowed (as had Meyerhold before him) in order to specify how the actor was to work both spontaneously and with discipline: the aim was to prevent the actor from indulging in free-fall fantasy, which, for Grotowski, was nothing less than 'narcissism'.[5] The 'score', as in music, provided a frame, and so structural restraint, for the freedom of creativity.

The paradox of fixity and change in the actor – always in relation with similar mutations in other actors – necessitated a repertory structure. Ensemble *repertory* theatre, then, helped to ensure, besides employment, the possibilities of ongoing exploration into the craft and art of acting without which, Stanislavsky believed, actors would fall back on their routine tricks (*cabotinage*), foreclosing the continuous discovery that was the very purpose of acting.

This point concerning the continuous process of the actor's research cannot be stressed enough, since it has been overshadowed for too long by the notion of actor training understood, reductively, as the acquisition of techniques. Vestiges of this instrumentalist perception of training are to be seen even in the broader ideas-filled endeavour of Eugenio Barba, who is cited here because of his tireless concern with training and who in his entire corpus, both practical and discursive (witness his abundant writing), champions Stanislavsky's exploratory approach to the making of theatre. But the instrumentalist idea of Stanislavsky's teachings has been above all exploited in the pragmatic Anglo-American cultures, where emphasis has fallen on know-how together with the applicability of techniques on the assumption that techniques are 'tools' with which the actor can master craft.[6]

None of this is to suggest that Stanislavsky did not value the training of actors. He certainly did, and his project to find out how an actor can act, and for which reasons, led him to the laboratory-like research or 'system' that his co-actors at the MAT derided, virtually from the beginning. Stanislavsky himself refers to it in rather self-deprecatory terms. Thus, when speaking of the MAT actors' complaint that he had 'turned rehearsals into an experimental laboratory and that the actors were not guinea pigs', he accepts their irony against him, aware that his project to find productive, if not conclusive, methods for acting smelled of grandiosity;[7] and yet he persisted by setting up his studios to further and strengthen his research.

The Actor's Research

There is no denying that the preparation of actors was fundamental to Stanislavsky. What needs to be remembered, however, was that such preparation was not so much about technical training, which Stanislavsky equated with dressage, as about the actor's thoughtful, conscious, and probing 'work on himself'. The phrase not only belongs to the titles of his volumes on the subject of developing the actor, but also quite clearly indicates that training in the sense of 'dressage', or, indeed, in the sense of providing 'tools', was far from his central aim. The aim was the awakening

and sustainability of capacities – some of which, nevertheless, were a matter of rudimentary technique, like learning to play notes of music – that could be absorbed, organically metamorphosed, and channelled for playing and performance.

Of crucial importance to this discussion is the fact that instrumentalist appropriations of Stanislavsky today tend to use them exclusively for psychological realism for which his 'system' and his subsequent 1930s 'method of physical action' were, in fact, designed – 'designed' in so far as his aesthetics as both an actor and a director revolved around the psycho-emotional and psycho-physical aspects of human behaviour, and the actor's task was to make them plausible on the stage.

Non-instrumentalist or what might be called organic appropriations, for their part, also generally tend to work within these parameters. They have, on the whole, come out of theatres in Russia, where the direct, oral transmission from Stanislavsky's pupils to their pupils, and their pupils, has perpetuated the aesthetics of psychological realism. Such, notably, is the case of Lev Dodin (pupil of Boris Zon, pupil of Stanislavsky) at the Maly Drama Theatre of St Petersburg, whose actors' abilities to find within themselves the emotional resources of their characters is nothing short of breathtaking. Yet using their imagination freely while they go through this inward search is integral to the embodiment of emotions, since the Stanislavsky tradition as relayed to Dodin was clear that stage realism was never a matter of merely photocopied 'reality'.

Dodin adapts Stanislavsky's principle of ongoing research to make training (which, like Stanislavsky, he distinguishes from dressage) an all-encompassing activity: it goes from the formal schooling of the actor to the development of the actor in rehearsals, and then to his/her continual development through performing and re-performing productions in repertory over many years. Duration is central to the Maly, affecting the director as much as the actor in that all modify their work during the course of time. Dodin calls it a 'journey without end', a journey where, as well, collaborative discovery nurtures the co-authorship between actor and director at every stage of the working process, which eventually leads to the productions shared with audiences.[8]

And training does not stop here, since the actor's interaction with spectators opens up fresh pathways for perceiving and doing whatever is being played. As a consequence, older productions in the repertoire also undergo some degree of transformation as newer ones shed a different light on them. It could be said that, apart from contributing to the ongoing training of the Maly actors, this complex criss-cross in which spectators are influential – and are no less so for being anonymous – stimulates the ongoing training of Dodin the director.

Non-instrumentalist appropriations have also come from countries within the (former) Soviet political sphere of influence, where Russian teachers taught Stanislavsky (canonized in the Stalinist period) to several generations of actors and directors who founded local schools of acting that were at once derived hegemonically and culturally specific. Salient examples are Georgia and Lithuania, where directors have fashioned with their repertory companies a strong aesthetic counterpoint to psychological realism in highly theatricalized grotesque, absurd, or surrealist modes.

Take Robert Sturua in Georgia, for instance, and Eimuntas Nekrosius and Oskaras Korsunovas in Lithuania. What is particularly striking about all three is how their Stanislavsky schooling has served them well, facilitating independence from psychological realism while allowing them to draw on principles for the actor that were elaborated in tandem with the latter.

The fact that the principles at issue have proved useful beyond their original framework raises the question of whether they would be use*less* for the category of theatre that has not altogether jettisoned verbal playtexts, while rejecting what Thomas Irmer recalls as the 'well-made' play, with its beginning, crisis, dénouement, and end, but qualifies in all or most other respects as so-called 'post-dramatic' theatre.[9] In other words,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X14000670 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is the type of actor discussed here unthinkable for this type of theatre (keeping in mind that it is not of the same order as the theatre of non-actors exemplified, also for Irmer, by Rimini Protocol)?

The 'Human Spirit' and the 'Holy' Actor

That question must remain for discussion. What needs to be addressed now is the second point of key interest left behind some pages back, and this concerns the idea of the actor who is more than an actor. The idea in this particular context refers not solely to the actor's consciousness of himself/herself as an aware, sentient, and responsive performer (not yet in Grotowski's sense of the word), but as an actor who has a dimension other than a visible, immediately physical one. For Stanislavsky, the actor's invisible dimension involves emotions, which the actor learns to materialize in performance. Yet the actor's inner life in which emotions reside is the seat of something greater still that Stanislavsky termed 'the life of the human spirit'.[10]

The task of training the actor is to develop that spirit, to develop the human being who is the actor so that acting transcends play-acting and show. The more the actor grows spiritually, the greater the resources of the actor become. At the same time, the more the human being grows spiritually, the more he/she evolves along what Grotowski called 'verticality', that is, along the ascending ladder (to use a biblical image) that leads to the divine – call it a vision of perfection, or transcendence, or God.[11] Once a feel of this transcendence enters the actor's play, it surpasses banal technique to coalesce with the invisible dimension that powers human life.

Grotowski was shy of evoking religious connotations notwithstanding his Catholic culture, which consistently resurfaces in his productions with the Theatre of Thirteen Rows in Opole and the Laboratory Theatre in Wroclaw (1957–69). It is visible primarily in early variants of the martyr figure, culminating in the Christ-martyr archetype of *The Constant Prince* (1965). Moreover, this archetype represents, as well, the actor-martyr 'gesticulating through the flames', as Artaud so famously put it, and to whom Grotowski willingly refers both by association in his theatre and in his various writings.[12]

His Catholic culture is, equally, evident in the very epithet of the 'holy' actor, by which Grotowski alludes to the idea fundamental to his perception of the actor, namely, that the theatre does not fill a job but has a *calling* to act. Further, acting is sacred in so far as it is neither commercial nor banal: it is not bound by the 'everyday', which is anathema to Grotowski and which prompted him to reject realistic representation of any kind. His rejection of the everyday took form in the montage structures and stylization – theatricality – of his early Meyerhold-style productions and, subsequently, in his research into the psychophysical, mental, emotional, and spiritual energies that powered the actor from within. The actor undertook such a searching process as a personal rite, and this also made him/her 'holy'. Ryszard Cieslak was, of course, the epitome of such an actor.

Grotowski's debt to Stanislavsky is strongly evident in the 'holy' variant of his rejection of realistic representation, and he acknowledges Stanislavsky's great influence freely, adding 'I *continued* his research and did *not just repeat* what he had already discovered'.[13] That he made this particular claim in the context of reflections upon the nature of the 'impulses' that dynamize the actor's actions and make them 'true' rather than fake (fakeness could be called 'acting at acting') is all the more eloquent regarding his indebtedness, not least to Stanislavsky's own experimentation with impulse as a felt (thus truthful) principle of articulation in the here and now, in *this* very moment and not before or after it. In this aspect pertaining to what Grotowski calls the 'craft' of the actor – the actor's ability to embody accurately and precisely (anything less would be emotive 'self-expression', which Grotowski deplored) – lies, too, the inner, 'spiritual' development of the actor.

His Catholic culture sensitized Grotowski to the other-than-material dimensions of human existence, and it by no means cancels out his affinity with Eastern religions, of which he had considerable knowledge. The

latter inspired his recourse to yogic practices, both personally and for the purposes of his theatre. His interest in religious teachings and yogic practices already fuelled his experiments in Opole, perhaps anticipating his travels to India in the later 1960s, which endorsed his search for a 'spiritual' that was not denominational in any sense of the word. And he sought, for the sake of craft, corporeal means by which to free up the actor's 'spirit'.

Processes of Interlacing

None of this contradicted the essential that he had gleaned from Catholicism, any more than Stanislavsky's adoption of the idea of *prana* for relaxation and breathing exercises contradicted his ingrained Orthodoxy. Indeed, Stanislavsky's Orthodoxy was at the heart of his concern with the 'life of the human spirit', and his research into Hindusim, largely inspired by his assistant and friend Leopold Sulerzhitsky, led him to explore the implications of these particular teachings on the development of the actor who necessarily, at the same time, developed him/herself as a human being. Development thus conceived and practised could not solely be horizontal, in time. It was also vertical in space and in the spirit in the sense in which this notion was understood by Orthodoxy.

We have, on these points, a fine but strong process of interlacing. In the first place, there is the interlacing of Orthodoxy and a component of Hinduism together with the secular preoccupations of making theatre (since Stanislavsky never set out to create liturgical or any other type of ritual compositions for religious purposes). In the second, there is the interlacing between Orthodoxy and Catholicism, which emerged from Grotowski's systematic appropriation of Stanislavsky.

The second interlacing materialized in Grotowski's evolving notion of the spiritual, which, if initially founded on the 'holy' actor, was increasingly worked into Grotowski's concentrated, very textured, explorations of what he called the 'different techniques of sources'. This involved, notably, Sufi and shamanic practices, which included Haitian voodoo and the singing of the yogi-bards from Bengal. These explorations followed Grotowski's proclamation in 1970, in the rather apocryphal tones to which he was prone, that 'we are living in a post-theatrical epoch'.[14]

For such an epoch he devised Paratheatre, which was a 'theatre', metaphorically speaking, of meetings between people rather than one of the construction of performances; and these meetings, not altogether unlike hippy happenings, were designed expressly to allow participants to discover the joys of 'self-penetration' (a term here borrowed from Grotowski's description of the 'holy' actor for non-actors in a non-acting situation) along with the joys of encountering others. Encounter, in this context, was intended to be transparent, with all social masks dropped in what, at the risk of parody, can be characterized as a para-spiritual event, not too far from a kind of hippy-happy love-in.

However, on a more serious note, Paratheatrical manifestations were, in fact, steps along the pathway of Grotowski's research on the actor towards his abandonment of the actor for the sake of the performer. In other words, Grotowski's 'post-theatrical' embraced the end of his making productions, and so, also, the end of his being a director directing them. By the same token, it firmly fixed his focus henceforth on the development of the human being on the vertical ladder.

The ladder, though it also went downwards to failings and disappointments, had, for purpose, striving upwards. The performer was the traveller who no longer incarnated fictional bodies and souls, since the latter were part of the fictitious, play-acted universe of the theatre; and theatre, regardless of its aesthetic structures (psychological realism, stylization, surrealism, absurdism and any other 'ism' or 'post' to be invented) was a matter of presentation of something else that was not there – not present, one might say. The performer, by contrast to the state of affairs dominating the theatre *per se*, inhabited only him/herself, seeking within this ever-evolving, ever-changing person the very moment of his/her presence-in-action.

Grotowski's celebrated essay on the subject of the performer need not be glossed.[15] It

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X14000670 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suffices to add that Peter Brook coined the phrase 'Art as Vehicle' for this last stage of Grotowski's lifelong trajectory, by which he recognized Grotowski's distinction between, in Brook's terms, 'theatrical creativity' and 'theatre as a vehicle through which a spiritual inner search can be developed'.[16]

The Theatre of Presence

It is on the basis of such a distinction that Grotowski separated the theatre of presentation from the theatre of presence, where the performer replaced and superseded the actor. The performer made no effort whatsoever to present (or represent by standing for) anybody else, and so had neither character nor narrative to sustain. Second, the performer wove performances from each and every step of the 'spiritual inner search', and did so to such an extent that the flow of these steps was the very content of the performance itself: the performance was the process. Further, it was the process of activated energies that took shape and form, and this – now in Grotowski's words – looked 'to create the montage not in the perception of the spectators, but *in the artists who do it*. This has already existed in the past, in the ancient mysteries'.[17] The actor, by contrast, according to Grotowski, 'works on the vision that should appear in the perception of the spectators'.[18]

It is worth adding that what I here identify as 'the performance was the process' should not be confused with a parallel phenomenon occurring in the work of Robert Wilson or Elizabeth LeCompte with the Wooster Group, to name but a few of the many practitioners who adapted the Jasper Johns dictum that 'meaning' was not the objective when the work was only about itself – that is, about its process of making. And, indeed, among the several factors that characterize the differences between Grotowski's practice of process and that of the North American practitioners is Grotowski's focus on the 'life of the human spirit'. 'Spirit' in the Stanislavsky–Grotowski sense of the word has little room for these practitioners, who concentrate on the assembly of devices used in composition.

The issue regarding the performer, as formulated by Grotowski, places the onus, in the theatre of presence, not on the *interaction* between the performer and the spectator, but on the performer's *action* as the bringing into being of energies that suffice as such: as bringing/coming into being *tout court*. In fact, as Grotowski increasingly developed this practice in Pontedera with Thomas Richards and Mario Biagini from 1986 until his death in 1999, he no longer talked so much about the 'performer' as the 'doer'.[19] The notion of doing (always by contrast with acting) stressed the personal, even private, nature of the 'montage' of the theatre of presence. At the same time, it threw into relief Grotowski's redefinition of performance as 'Action', and, as well, that of the spectator as a 'witness'.

The spectator is essential to the theatre of presentation in all its manifestations, including, it seems likely, the non-actor types of theatre alluded to previously. A 'witness', on the other hand, is not essential and can, or can *not*, be invited to an Action. His/her position is that of something of, let us say, a 'guest' who is there to share what the host wishes to offer from within his/her spiritual-physical stock. In this way, Grotowski observes, the 'quality of the work is tested' and the work is 'not purely a private matter'.[20] The nuance of ' not purely' is crucial, since it prevents an Action from being an arcane affair. Grotowski draws attention to its concreteness thus:

> In Art as Vehicle, from the point of view of technical elements, everything is almost like in the performing arts: we work on song, on impulses, on forms of movement, even textual motifs appear. And all is reduced to the strictly necessary, until a structure appears, a structure as precise and worked out as in a performance: the Action.[21]

Reference in this quotation to song is discreet, but signals, nevertheless, a central aspect of the doer's work, which is to travel within. Song is a means of connection to unknown and unconscious recesses in the body – stored in its cells, so to speak. In tapping into them, song also releases this or that stream that constitutes the spiritual 'self' – if 'self' (or

'selves') is now the correct term. However, regardless of whether the term is correct or not, the connection is of primary concern; and connection of the kind identified here raises the question of how far the doer can go in this practice before it is no longer capable of being 'witnessed' as an Action.

In other words, although the witness is dispensable, what might be the *point,* at a certain point, of having a witness at all? Testing the quality of the work – Grotowski's reasoning – might well be useful to the doer, but what is its value to the 'witness'? Does the doer's journey become the connecting trigger for the witness's own connection to his/her own deepest-emotional-spiritual 'self' ('selves'). Or is it a proxy, a stand-in that obliges the 'witness' to stay at a distance – precisely as a priest of any Church or congregation does when he carries out rites that are meant to 'speak' symbolically to all, but presuppose a hierarchy of place and order in the ritual, which keeps the congregationists at bay?

Coda: Teatr ZAR

Whatever the answers to these question might be, it is worth noting that offshoots of Grotowski's Art as Vehicle appear, even if not intentionally as 'Grotowskian', in the song theatre to be found in Poland, where they are grafted without much effort to the tradition of singing of that country. The song theatre of greatest interest to this paper is that of Teatr ZAR in Wroclaw, first because its singing is of the highest quality, giving priority to singing over any other aspect of its work; second, because it fully embraces the spiritual dimension researched by Grotowski, without, however, ever having been taught by him or having been directly influenced by him; and, third, because it has retained the notions of 'performer' and 'spectator'. Teatr ZAR has no qualms whatsoever in claiming that it makes *theatre.*

Fourth (with reference to the second question above), ZAR does, indeed, have in its project the stimulation of spectators' connection to their own emotional-spiritual being, spurred on by ZAR performers. ZAR, in other words, fulfils the goal of spiritual journeying but does so bypassing the doer and the doer's potential, or actual, solipsism. In electing to follow the bypass, ZAR hopes to establish the sensation of union, however fleeting, between performers and spectators, and, just as important, *among* spectators. The moment of congregation, as it would best be called, has no 'priest' acting for the congregation (or, for that matter, representing it emblematically in any way), since all its members are together, equal, and breathing as one.

This, albeit in a totally different framework, may not be completely different from the desire for emotional union through empathy between stage and audience sought by Stanislavsky. What has changed radically in ZAR's particular movement from actor to performer is the explicitly spiritual nature – the 'life of the human spirit', to return to Stanislavsky's formulation – of the desired union. And the conditions for union to occur are made possible through song and singing: through song, specifically through polyphonic song, because of its religious character – funeral hymns, Orthodox hymns, *Irmos* from the Byazantine liturgical tradition, liturgical chants from the Sioni Church in Tbilisi, paschal chants from the Castelsardo brotherhood in Sardinia, among others; through singing because singing opens up a space for listener-spectators who are moved, above all, viscerally by sound. The sound and breathing of the performers creates energy that seeps into the energy streams of the spectators.

Sound in ZAR's triptych (2003–2009), the only pieces it has composed so far in its ten years of existence, involves, besides singing, the sounds made by the singer-performers with their bodies (drawing breath, the stamping of feet, the slap of hands on the floor, the thud of someone falling), with objects (earth, oranges, water, and wine glasses that fall, bowls and buckets that touch, scrape, or hit when they are placed on the floor), and with musical instruments (bells, chimes, cellos, violin, piano, drum).

This sonosphere always takes its cue from the tone of the song being sung and the timbres of the voices that sing it. Further-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X14000670 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more, the sonosphere guides the kinetic quality of movement together with the type of movement imagery that is made. At times, notably in the first piece of the triptych, *Gospels of Childhood*, it determines the type of narrative fragments that may appear, or even only the intimations of narrative that filter through the flow of the whole. The fact that the polyphonic songs sung are predominantly, if not exclusively, Christian guarantees the sacral quality of performance, even though Jaroslav Fret, ZAR's leader, insists that the group did not set out to be 'spiritual', does not discuss spirituality, and its members do not necessarily belong to any religious confession.[22]

All this suggests that one contemporary avatar of 'performer' is the singer-mover (and occasionally speaker) exemplified by ZAR, which offers a hybrid of the theatre of presentation with the theatre of presence. That the 'actor' has been defined out of this universe by no means spells out the death of the actor, since the actor continues to live in other types of theatre (Dodin's psychological realism, Korsunovas's theatricality, as cited here, though the list could continue through various forms of theatre holding sway in Europe today).

The ZAR type of performer simply extends the range of 'performer' and even a brief examination of the latter is a catalyst for understanding with greater nuance the complexities of making theatre and the complexities of the genres of theatre in play in the opening decades of the twenty-first century. The necessity of nuance is just as relevant for the work of practitioners who disclaim 'genre' or break the borders of genres in order to refute their existence. The latter may well amount to claiming a one-off, aleatory, even maverick status in a sea of activities until its repetition names it.

Notes and References

1. This text was first presented with the title 'Actor to Performer/Doer: Stanislavsky to Grotowski and Teatr ZAR' at the Novy Sad conference in Serbia, 'The Actor is Dead, Long Live the Actor', Fourteenth International Symposium of Theatre Critics and Theatre Scholars, 26–27 May 2012. There are here a few minor adjustments to the oral presentation, including the subtitles. I wish to thank the International Research Centre 'Interweaving Performance Cultures' in Berlin for my Fellowship at the Centre, where the reflections giving rise to the presentation found time and space.
2. For the phrase cited, see *Moya zhisn v iskusstve* (Mosow: Vagrius, 2000, p. 424, and in English *My Life in Art*, trans. and ed. Jean Benedetti (London; New York: Routledge), p. 337.
3. Ibid., p. 202–9 and 158–64.
4. Lyubov Vendrovskaya and Galina Kaptereva, comp., *Evgeny Vakhtangov* [notes by Vakhtangov, articles and reminiscences], trans. Doris Bradbury (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982), p. 140–1.
5. Jerzy Grotowski. *Towards a Poor Theatre* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), p. 246.
6. See, for example, Bella Merlin, *The Complete Stanislavsky Toolkit* (London: Nick Hern Books 2007).
7. *Moya zhisn*, op. cit., p. 325; *My Life*, op. cit., p. 257.
8. *Puteshevstviye bez kontsa* (St Petersburg: Baltic Seasons, 2009); in English as *Journey without End*, trans. Anna Karabinska and Oksana Mamysin (London: Tantalus Books, 2006).
9. 'Novaya nemetskaya drama posle padeniya Berlinskoy cteny' ('The New German Drama after the Fall of the Berlin Wall'), *Voprosy Teatra*, Nos. 3–4 (2011), p. 199–218.
10. *Moya zhisn*, p. 342; *My Life*, p. 270.
11. From the Theatre Company to Art as Vehicle', in Thomas Richards, *At Work with Grotowski on Physical Actions* (London; New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 121.
12. *Towards a Poor Theatre*, p. 117–25, 205–6.
13. Thomas Richards, 'Conclusion on Realistic Actions', in *At Work with Grotowski*, p.105.
14. Cited in Zbigniew Osinski, *Grotowski and His Laboratory* (New York: PAJ Publications, 1986), p. 120.
15. 'Performer', in Schechner, Richard, and Lisa Wolford, ed., *The Grotowski Sourcebook* (London; New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 376–80.
16. Peter Brook, *With Grotowski: Theatre is Just a Form* (Wroclaw: Grotowski Institute, 2009), p. 40.
17. Grotowski, 'From the Theatre Company to Art as Vehicle', in Richards, op. cit., p. 120 (Grotowski's italics).
18. Ibid., p. 119.
19. Ibid., p. 122, for the shift in vocabulary whereby 'performer' and 'doer' become synonymous terms.
20. Ibid., p. 131.
21. Ibid., p. 122.
22. Unpublished interview with Fret, December 2010.