

At the Margins of Theatre. On the Connection Between Theatre and Anthropology

Piergiorgio Giacchè

Scanning the corpus and repertoire of anthropological science, insofar as we wish and are able to, we note that ethnological observations and studies on theatre are not lacking, but that they seem to have been isolated opportunities for investigation that have never grown into a research tradition.

Often it has been a 'theatre-related' event or aspect encountered in the course of a study with a different orientation; sometimes, on the other hand, specific choices have been made to analyse structural components or generic elements of a Theatre that has nevertheless remained an impregnable and above all foreign, not to say unapproachable, domain:¹ we are of course referring to 'art theatre', that is, the art of the professional theatre, whose practices and secrets are normally ignored or rejected by the researcher's interpretation even when they encroach upon or cross the 'anthropological reserve' of popular theatre or the dramatic nature of ritual.

In each case (or rather at each opportunity) the anthropologist's attitude towards Theatre has long remained the same – a distant one – based on the conviction that the objective place of Theatre (or rather, all types of theatre) was within the society whose 'expression' it clearly is.

It is precisely to dispute this clear dependence of theatre on its socio-cultural context that we wish to suggest a few comments, because this reasonable approach, which stresses the link between theatre and the society it belongs to, no longer appears either the only one or the most justifiable one for someone who wishes to interrogate theatre and its culture. Which is to say that too often social and cultural analysis of theatre does not recognize its conventional (but also substantial) autonomy. The dramatic phenomenon is likely to be seen as subsidiary to the social functions that always justify it, and so to be stripped of its meaning, or rather its non-meaning: it runs the risk of not being reconnected with the *process* it consists of and instead of being judged as a *product* that demonstrates other meanings and more general processes. In this way the real aim of all the studies that take theatre as their subject will in the end always be the society in which theatre-as-phenomenon is situated and of which theatre-as-institution is part.

It is correct – one may say – that society is not only the true and ultimate subject of any anthropological research, but also and above all the substantial landscape for all *field work*. In order to pin down a phenomenon as volatile and indefinite as Theatre, constant contact has to be maintained with the 'field' it springs from, because this is the only context that can locate and direct the scientific researcher's 'voyage' of exploration.

How could one do otherwise, and why should one?

In other words, could the 'dramatic' be, as it is often claimed metaphorically to be, a culture? Could theatre manage to free itself from the 'social' category and yet have the substance and continuity of a 'field' in which the concrete footsteps of empirical research could walk? All in all, could theatre offer a complex but unitary definition of itself, that is, provide a researcher with trustworthy and viable *finés* – in the dual Latin sense of 'borders' and 'territories' – in which to conduct an anthropological exploration?

Would it be possible to carry out research which, though it would not ignore the historical and social context, would immerse itself in theatre and explore it from within its own autonomous *finés*? And if this were possible, would it also be necessary and useful?

The first great exploration – undertaken by Jean Duvignaud² – uncovered a rich and overall vision of the dramatic phenomenon, but did not bother to map out beforehand the borders of theatre: rather it supplied charts – and this is understandable and legitimate for a first 'expedition' – that it produced itself as a result of its progressive advance. Naturally the explorer was relying on the undoubted existence of a body of events and texts, places and characters, provided by the history of theatre, but also by the its connections, associations and diversions in other disciplines. This 'theatological' *summa*, accepted as a tradition and raised to the status of a kind of astrological vision, gave us (and often still gives us) a map of the heavens for a phenomenon that is by convention free and indefinable: in it, or under it, selecting and analysing the elements of every possible kind of theatre, each researcher has added his own marks and his own results to a territory that in a way has been laid down and consolidated in his footsteps.

But let us be clear: these were generally (and still are) substantial studies and investigations, carried out efficiently and responsibly, but their undeniable defect was ethnocentrism. In fact the chart produced by these theatre explorers is unlikely to bear much resemblance to the real territory as the 'natives' see and inhabit it. This means that it does not match, and that it respects even less, the multi-faceted practices and theories through which dramatic art has gradually arrived at a definition of itself, and through which it claims its own cultural autonomy and even its separateness from 'society'.³

Duvignaud the 'explorer' is aware of this contradiction, however, just as he is of the arbitrary and illusory effect on the vision of the observer and student of theatre; Duvignaud tracks down and describes the 'collective shades' that appear more clearly and interestingly once it has been decided that theatre-as-object is a historical accumulation of events (but not a History), or when theatre-as-subject opens up like a conceptual and phenomenological panorama (that does not claim to turn into a Philosophy). In the end his approach is resolutely sociological, since it is clearly still based in the genuinely 'territorial' solidity of the relationship between society and theatre, even when it attempts to overlook the imprecise and ambiguous relationship between theatre and culture.

Today methods of exploring and exploiting the mine of knowledge and the landscape of dramatic forms have changed. It is also because of Jean Duvignaud that studies *about* theatre and research *by* theatre have developed and even combined, resulting in other ways of asking – and answering at least partially – the question about the definition of theatre as performative act and social rite. Today especially, on the one hand the adventure and the rereading of the experiments and the avant-gardes of our whole century, and on the other hand the socio-cultural changes that have marginalized the theatre and revolutionized the concept and consumption of the stage show, have contributed to clarifying definitively

finis, in the dual sense of borders and territories, within which thinking and research are starting to locate themselves. Henceforth it is Theatre, understood in and broadened to the sense of 'theatre culture', that is the sky that overarches and determines them.

Some will protest that, on the contrary, today the plural and even gratuitous way in which every dramatic event defines itself leads to a merging of all the traditional genres in an ocean of performative freedom and almost unlimited variety of event, which rather increase the indefinable nature of the dramatic phenomenon; but it is precisely the renovated and liberated concept of '*performance*' that is one of the keys that have allowed us to bring together all theatrical events from different historical periods and different cultures.⁴

'What theatre consists of' is without doubt the end-point of any research on theatre, but it must also be the starting point, at least for the anthropologist, and for two reasons. The first takes up the basic problem we have already mentioned: one must have, not so much a specific object as a viable terrain in which one can carry out 'field work' (where this is absent or impossible, anthropological science cannot be proved or firmly based); the second is a methodological problem that is equally important and equally specific, because we maintain that *a meeting of subjects* must always take place between anthropologist and native – and in the theoretical case that concerns us, between Cultural anthropology and the Culture of theatre. In fact, despite many other researchers' efforts and intentions, the discipline that is anthropology is not of the same order as all the other sciences: *anthropology is a science that cannot be defined according to a schema which separates the observing subject from the observed object and puts them in opposite camps.*

It is not only its methodological frailty, it is also its epistemological ambition that causes it to confuse the two viewpoints and forces it to make the differing cultures coming into contact with each other in the course of the research rub off on each other. Thus, as everyone knows, the anthropologist cannot use or be satisfied with a terrain that is externally objectivized; he also has to get to know what the 'social actors' who inhabit this terrain say or suggest; which means, in the case of Theatre, actors (and authors, and directors and playwrights . . .) who are constantly inventing and adding to their own 'territorial' definition of theatre, as a professional activity – that definitely has to be taken into account – and a crucial one for their own survival.

And, as everyone also knows, alongside and beyond theatre as institution as it exists in different societies, there is a theatre that both precedes and goes beyond the boundaries and functions that are attributed to it from outside: 'A theatre not built of stones and bricks', as Eugenio Barba says, since 'theatre is made by actors'.⁵

Paradoxically it is precisely this 'nowhere' theatre that makes a 'geography' of theatre possible: a human geography able to disobey the conventional forms of history and resist the dictatorship of society. A geography that, quite logically, is continually redefining itself in the present (in our present and every other 'historic present'), drawing liberally on a History of theatre that is freely available in the form of a *tradition*, and constantly defying society in order to fulfil its ineluctable *transgressive* task – which by convention is the role of the theatre, whether by provoking or entertaining. A geography of the 'living theatre' that not only leads one to envisage a new field for research, but quite unexpectedly designates Anthropology the preferred science to conduct this research.

Indeed the theatre – as seen and experienced from within – is justified and defined primarily by its anthropological dimension. Today, however, many actors' and directors'

interests and attention have become over-focused on this dimension and in the end it has imprisoned them. We do not intend to detail here the motives or review the practico-theoretical development of that part, or rather that 'region', of contemporary western theatre which some time ago embraced the cult of the origin and anthropological purpose of theatre; it is certainly no chance that this conversion coincided with the marginalization of the theatre of the 'society of spectacle' and with the historical celebration of theatre as 'cultural heritage', but it would be an error to interpret as a defensive reaction this route, seeking the anthropological value and meaning of theatre, which some time ago opened up, prophetically and in desperation, with Artaud.⁶

The innovation that characterizes the current geography of theatre is the rise of an ever more precise and sensitive 'implicit anthropology', which has probably taken up the space and title of a 'science of the theatre' developed by 'the people who make theatre': a discipline that reorganizes for them the legacy of knowledge and dramatic techniques and serves to keep alive and promote the meaning of theatre in present-day culture and society. There is no question, at least for the present, of assessing the results of this 'science' according to the norms and methods of the social sciences that (also) study the theatre: not until it has been acknowledged how far this explosion of independent anthropological research *by* the theatre has renewed the expectations and revolutionized the prospects for research and studies *about* the theatre. And not until it has been pointed out how this new 'science' of the theatre has succeeded in demonstrating that the anthropological approach functions, not only as an adjunct, but also as a critique of traditional historico-cultural methodology.

So together with this innovation comes an opportunity and, maybe, a responsibility for Cultural Anthropology: indeed it is this discipline's role to open up a dialogue with the experiments and research carried out by what has already started to be called 'anthropological theatre'⁷, and more specifically with the comparative study of the transcultural basis of the actor's art, which Eugenio Barba has defined as '*theatre anthropology*'⁸.

Furthermore it is precisely the innovative nature and even the risk of anthropological studies carried out by the theatre on itself that make a meeting between Theatre and Anthropology urgent, but also possible in the end, since misuse of terminology and use of metaphors by both have brought about a cross-fertilisation, which one could call on equal terms, between Theatre's knowledge and Anthropology's skills. In the light too of the answers the 'science of theatre' is in the process of uncovering, anthropologists should now revisit that no man's land where the paths of both lines or traditions of research – social sciences and art – have long crossed but their methods have been assessed separately, for they are often concerned to advance knowledge of the same phenomena. For instance, ritual, play, representation are common areas that have always been explored by anthropologists and interrogated by actors; and yet both disciplines, Anthropology and Theatre, seem till now to have obeyed Euclid's postulate of parallels that never meet.

Now that postulate can be abandoned if it is true that the aims and interests of the social sciences and dramatic art have clearly converged, or, to continue the metaphor, in fact converge in infinity. Overall it can be said that anthropological science and theatre research, which are both focused on exploring their own basis and retrieving their own meaning, are increasingly often approaching each other's boundaries and making contact to the extent that they are exchanging arguments used by their disciplinary traditions. For example, as regards the effectiveness of symbols and 'techniques of the body', it sometimes

seems to be Theatre's task to continue and refine anthropological research and study; similarly, it is the anthropologist who can relocate the theatre and its productive and reproductive function in the context of what the anthropologist Marc Augé calls *deep or essential alterity*;⁹ after all the theatre is an ancient creator, a conventional but authentic one, of that otherness.

Augé finds that otherness alongside and complementary to a classification running from distant *exotic* alterity to *ethnic* alterity then to *social* alterity; finally 'deep' alterity, in his view, is an ultimate otherness whose basic characteristic is that it is shared and explored, beyond the external observer (the anthropologist, but we could also add 'the spectator'), also by the individual who is its symptom and medium (the social actor who personifies it, but also the theatre actor who acts it). As an example, Augé suggests that we should think of the anthropological literature on concepts of person, interpretation of illness, witchcraft, and he goes on: 'Representations of deep alterity, in the systems studied by ethnology, situate the need for it at the very core of individuality, preventing one at the same time from dissociating the question of group identity from that of individual identity. This is a most notable example of how the content of the beliefs studied by the ethnologist may determine the process attempting to record them: it is not only because representation of the individual is a social construction that it interests anthropology, it is also because every representation of the individual is of necessity a representation of the social link that is inherent in it.'¹⁰

Of course, compared with the totality of social representations that make up a culture, dramatic representations seem minimally significant: among other things, they suffer from the dismissal of fiction and artifice, proof of and synonymous with the *inauthenticity* anthropologists always attempt to avoid or criticize for polluting culture. But, following Victor Turner and his insistence on the continuity between ritual and theatre,¹¹ it is no longer novel or even provocative to include the phenomenon of theatre among the phenomena of ordinary magic and truly extraordinary 'beliefs'. In any case, many researchers and in the end all spectators will at least agree that the non-religious connotation of theatre does not preclude the sacred, just as its theatrical nature does not exclude the visionary, and *fiction* does not negate expressive authenticity, whereas it does undeniably increase the degree of *alterity* of the dramatic performance.

Because in fact theatre is the locus and mode of representation as invention¹² and not only as imitation. Thus it is part of the province of *deep alterity*, at least as a kind of ancient authorized 'extension' (if it is acceptable here to borrow these terms from computing). It could be said that all art or all the arts, curiously ignored in Augé's book, commit themselves to and work hard at this function and in this area: but dramatic art, more than any other and with great daring, 'stages' a process of verification and reification of *deep or essential alterity*, without which this vital concept would remain concrete, it is true, but invisible, comprehensible but intangible.

Theatre is the art of 'fictionalizing' the other (in the etymological sense of 'fashioning', 'shaping'), but it is also 'the art of representation through actions', as its definition has been since Aristotele. And this language of actions *not only confirms but also amplifies the sensation of otherness*.

Proceeding by dramatic actions means producing dynamic, ambiguous appearances and not stable, concrete presences of the character or story represented. Throughout, the actors and their play remain as if suspended and captive to 'the other', in an 'elsewhere'

that is of course primarily a conventional (scenic) *place*, but also constantly underlain by the mechanism of continual appearances and disappearances, that is, by the (dramatic) *mode* of the actions.

So Anthropology finds in Theatre a special, and in a sense reserved, area for research, but strengthening incentives for exploration does not yet mean having a precise, viable 'terrain'. For the researcher the relationship between deep alterity and dramatic alterity works like a promise of fertility that adds very little to the essential, concrete definition of theatre. To achieve this aim it is first necessary to go beyond the idea that theatre is identified with the art of the stage and look in its entirety at the dramatic spectacle it generates.

Of course it is vital to take account of the Aristotelian definition, which refers to dramatic action as the constituent material of the spectacle (just like colours in painting or sounds in music) but, in order to obtain a concrete description of the phenomenon of theatre, it is also important to realize how partial this definition is: in fact theatre does not draw its definition from 'creating a staging of an action', but rather from 'creating a vision'¹³ of that action, that is, also from 'enacting the relationship' between actor and spectator.

The difference from the products and processes of reception of the other non-performing arts is remarkable, since 'the vision' of the spectator in the theatre is not the same as the reception of a message or the chosen and deferred perception of a product; it is the high point of a unitary, organic artistic process, an essential and indispensable part of the dramatic event, occurring wholly within its bounds. *For the theatre, the relation between actor and spectator is its cause and effect, its raw material and its product.*

This is the first feature of theatre that can genuinely be established as a frontier beyond which its 'territory' begins. The direct confrontation between actor and spectator is not only a *conditio sine qua non*, but the threshold across which that short-circuit between action and vision that is theatre passes and occurs. Pausing at that threshold we can recognize that law of specularity that has often been applied simply to the play of identification and projection between the person acting and the person observing; whereas specularity, by contrast, is a basic element of theatre and is always defined as 'its double'. For example, it can be said that theatre is *the representation of a fiction that takes place within the domain of a relation*, but also that it is *a relation that is activated in confrontation with the representation of a fiction*. But it is impossible to say which definition precedes or is superior to the other.

It is true that throughout the history of theatre, on both the actors' and the spectators' side, options stressing now the *fiction* element, now the *relation* element have alternated. These were (and are still today) emphases introduced by the theatre's poetics or politics, dependent on the historico-social context and relating to a theatre that is the expression of the culture of a particular, determining period or society. But fluctuation between these choices does not invalidate the essential duality of a specular and consequently 'autonomous' definition of the phenomenon of theatre.

Currently, and for that part of the theatre that has opened up lines of research to anthropology, the emphasis is placed more, for example, on the *dramatic relation* than on the *fiction staged*. And this contingent (and thus 'historical') choice is not irrelevant to the search for and refinement of the definition of theatre *hic et nunc*, and so the possibility of

exploring it as a field for research. A conventional 'relational' aspect that mimes community and imitates ritual accentuates – more than the artificial representation of fiction does – the 'difference' that separates and protects theatre from other recent languages and products of spectacle in the consumer culture. Discovering and claiming the marginality of 'theatre as fiction' is no longer enough to distinguish and distance it from a culture and society of spectacle that tends to publicize as 'fiction' any and all of its products or processes. But stressing 'theatre as relation' means favouring a choice and a minority status that are less compatible with the processes of the culture industry and less attractive to its market.

Finally, for the observer and student of theatre, there emerge other differences of great value to us in that staged event and fiction can still today be a legitimate subject of study, whether sociological, semiological, historical . . . , whereas the *reduction* of theatre to its relational domain instigates and promotes, exclusively, one could say, the opportunity for an anthropological 'meeting'.

Starting from the centrality or hegemony of *relation*, theoretical research and practical experimentation on theatre – or alternatively its pragmatic 'science' – have revealed other basic characteristics that in fact lead to the gradual transformation of theatre from an *object* of research into a *terrain* for research.

The work of nearly all the masters of contemporary western theatre has been aimed at determining fundamental 'qualities', which are not sufficient to trace the outer limits of the phenomenon of theatre, but nevertheless define and describe it by illuminating it from within. For 'the actors who make it', in any case, there is no other way to define theatre (itself) than to identify and so exploit its fundamental 'properties'. But some of these properties may be seen as the present foundations of theatre insofar as they both represent the highest quality and also act as lowest common denominators for all types of present-day theatre. They may then act as essential catalysts for those *finis* of theatre we are attempting to discover.

Even though the existence of these properties or qualities now seems obvious, even though they can easily be identified from the theories and memoirs of many theoreticians and practitioners of the art of staging and the dramatic relation, it is the case that few theatre people have managed to distil and exploit them throughout a coherent research career; in a few rare cases they have verified them in the course of a lengthy voyage covering the whole of Theatre and venturing beyond its frontiers.

Perhaps they are the only ones who have been able to get the measure of a territory for which any traveller can draw the map, but for which, by contrast, it is very hard to get evidence. To pursue the metaphor from anthropological science, it would be good to have a native guide who could use maps but would only recognize evidence as valuable.

A journey gradually more focused on the essence of theatre – and one of concrete experimentation and verification of that essence – is the one undertaken by Jerzy Grotowski; because of its radical and exhaustive nature it can unhesitatingly be seen as the high point of theatre research in our time, but also the clearest contribution to that definition of theatre that is crucial for the pursuit and renewal of anthropological research on theatre.

We cannot rehearse here Grotowski's long record of research,¹⁴ but will simply summarize its stages – from the Laboratory Theatre to the theatre of participation or 'para-theatre'

and then by way of the Théâtre des Sources to the current research called *The Performer*¹⁵ – in order to stress how much each one revealed the necessary and obvious elements of a *difference* which is the *essence* of theatre, and which thus acts as negative as well as positive evidence for its definition.

Before reviewing these stages, it must be said that the characteristics summarized by Grotowski in the course of his 'journey' are related to the intrinsic qualities of *theatre culture*, isolated for the first time as *the habitat which underlies every performative/dramatic process*, and not as the sum of the practical experiences accumulated throughout the history of theatre. It is already common practice to synthesize these characteristics in the phrases 'the poverty of theatre', 'the paradox of theatre's authenticity', 'art as vehicle'¹⁶, to highlight the link between the three great stages of research – theatre, para-theatre and extra-theatre – that Grotowski himself lists as the successive phases of his exploratory work.

To resume, these *principles* drawn from Grotowski's work are: a) the notion that every theatre performance, however rich and complex it may be, can be reduced to poverty, in other words, the basic element of a *connection between actor and spectator*; b) the discovery that within this connection – that is, in front of and inside a theatre performance – a *free and authentic expression of the self that is the opposite of the required rehearsal of day-to-day social roles* is possible and desirable; c) the idea that the actor's art is not only an art of representation but also *art as a vehicle of knowledge* to the extent that the Performer actualizes, with and in his own body, an authentic and autonomous form of dramatic knowledge.

The basic nature of the dramatic relation, the challenge of the paradoxical authenticity of theatre, the cognitive autonomy inherent in the actor's experience become points where the *essence* is concentrated, or – only if one wants – points where theatre's *difference* is intensified. 'Only if one wants' because, despite the exceptional nature and the rigour of Grotowski's research, it is obvious that the three principles he discovered are not necessarily extremes or extremisms of theatre: taken in and for themselves, they do not represent any utopia and or refer to any mythical roots, even though it would be possible to define them – borrowing from the jargon of mathematics – as the *radicals* of theatre.

In fact they are the exponents and defenders of the indisputable portion of its autonomy and so truly lay the foundations for a general (and not merely generic) definition of theatre: *their truth is valid too when it is reduced to obvious evidence within all the theatre practices and theories now possible*.

A little like the case of the option between 'fiction' and 'relation', poetic and political freedom of choice prevails among these three characteristics – for the actor and for the spectator as well: so some wish to emphasize them as insoluble constants and some barely accept them as objective connotations to be hidden or masked perhaps. However if, even in the current situation of fragmentation and proliferation of theatre and para-theatre activity, Theatre remains the singular noun for an indefinable and unpredictable plurality, it is because someone has taken the opportunity to carry out practical experimentation on these 'essences/differences' that gives all 'those who make theatre' across the board a conviction of impregnable autonomy and the vision of a common, inalienable territory.

For the observer and student of theatre, what is important is to acknowledge how far these differences and essences of theatre have been revealed and demonstrated through the practice of dramatic art, because that gives them a different strength compared with

the many investigations and studies that in contrast are part of the 'discourse on theatre'. In other words, the three qualities Grotowski's journey allows us to enunciate do not *define* theatre but on the contrary are *defined* by and in theatre; and, whereas they may appear to the outside observer like the margins of contemporary theatre culture, they are in fact – at least for some 'natives' – the centre of an area of free but concrete self-definition of *their* theatre.

It remains, then, for anthropology to promote dialogue with this insider's viewpoint, which is comprehensible but untranslatable: as a result of it, all these materials and all these phenomena (texts, productions, masques, etc.) that were previously piled high in a beautiful arrangement, and put on show like objects to be interpreted and catalogued by scientific research, now come together more clearly on a theatre territory that aspires to create its own science.

It is now possible to recognize and exploit somehow the input of that science. But how?

It is not yet feasible to transfer it directly and still less to translate it across into the logic and aims of a different discipline that is nevertheless still external. The most appropriate method of using the latest demonstrations and studies carried out by theatre research is that which involves respecting and valuing the cognitive and operational autonomy of theatre and art; in other words the one that keeps separate the theoretical and practical processes and results achieved by theatre culture, in order to exploit them subsequently as the premises and guarantees that make anthropological research *on* theatre viable.

In the meantime, the insider route of anthropological exploration and study *by* theatre has already achieved valuable objectives for itself – and for our benefit – and it has mapped out the territory. On that territory, by confronting and interrogating the theatre's practices and repertoires of deep alterity, the anthropologist too can now, with due care, venture to take the first steps on a new 'journey'.

Piergiorgio Giacchè

University of Perugia

(translated from the French by Jean Burrell)

Notes

1. Even since the development of what has been defined as 'the anthropology of complex societies', contemporary theatre and art have remained fields that have been virtually unexplored by an anthropological discipline that, without exception, prefers to carry on defining itself through confirmation of its traditional object rather than in terms of the issues raised by its methods.
2. Jean Duvignaud (1965), *Sociologie du théâtre. Essai sur les ombres collectives* (Paris, PUF).
3. In research and theories on theatre, and especially but not solely contemporary research and theories, it is not hard to find claims that theatre is *extra-social* or proof that it is *outside the day-to-day*; more particularly today, a trend is detectable towards the creation of a kind of '*non-sociological anthropology*' as a factor uniting diverse and even contrasting anthropologico-dramatic theories. See P. Giacchè (1988), *Antropologia e cultura teatrale. Nota per un aggiornamento dell'approccio socio-antropologico al teatro*, *Teatro e Storia*, 4, no 1, April, pp. 23–50.
4. This alludes in particular to Richard Schechner's (1977) '*theory of performance*' (*Essays on Performance Theory*, New York, Drama Book Specialist) and hence to Victor Turner's many contributions, designed to extend and apply this theory; within the limits of this brief paper we cannot detail the basic research directions of these two representatives of the *anthropology of theatre*.

5. E. Barba (1993), *La canoa di carta, Trattato di antropologia teatrale* (Bologna, Il Mulino), p. 153; E. Barba (1993), *Le canoë de papier. Traité d'anthropologie théâtrale, Bouffonneries*, no 28–29.
6. From the studies that have emphasized how Artaud's dramatic theory started an 'anthropological route', we mention among others the book by M. Borie (1989), *Antonin Artaud. Le théâtre et le retour aux sources. Une approche anthropologique* (Paris, Gallimard).
7. There is a strand of contemporary theatre culture that has drawn on the terms, material and methods of cultural anthropology; the use of the expression 'anthropological theatre' is an attempt to bring together and hold in the same field the multiplicity and variety of experiments and research (carried out by great 'masters' but also small groups) that have shown the value of, or the need for, an explicit relationship with anthropology. See P. Giacchè (1991), *Lo spettatore partecipante; Contributi per un'antropologia del teatro* (Milan, Guerini), pp. 20–22.
8. Lately several works have been published on Eugenio Barba's *theatre anthropology* and the term has frequently been explained in detail. In the present context it is sufficient to recall the primary and most general definition as 'the study of human beings in the act of representation' (cf. E. Barba (1981), *La corsa dei contrari. Antropologia teatrale* (Milan, Feltrinelli). See also the most recent publications from this strand of original and basic research: E. Barba (1993), *op. cit.*; E. Barba, N. Savarese (1995), *Un dictionnaire d'anthropologie théâtrale. L'énergie qui danse. L'art secret de l'acteur, Bouffonneries*, no 32–33.
9. See Marc Augé (1992), *Non-lieux. Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité* (Paris, Seuil), pp. 28–29.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 29–30.
11. Among Turner's many publications reviewing the paradigms of 'social drama' and the 'process of ritual', and the concepts *liminal* and *liminoid* that link theatre and ritual, we must mention the most recent (1986), republished in *The Anthropology of Performance* (New York, PAJ Publications). See also by the same author (1982): *From Ritual to Theatre – The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York, PAJ Publications).
12. According to Turner it is precisely this freedom of invention that is the characteristic the *liminoid* inherits from the *liminal*, or theatre inherits from ritual: it is now the last space of the 'subjunctive mood' in culture, the space 'in which suppositions, desires, hypotheses . . . are all legitimated'. See V. Turner (1969), *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (London, Routledge).
13. According to Grotowski, an awareness of the existence of the 'creation of a vision' as a distinct but not isolated phase of the process of 'staging' a play is essential in a theatre director. See J. Grotowski (1986), *Il regista come spettatore di professione, Teatro festival*, no 3, April, pp. 28–36.
14. Jerzy Grotowski, the first 'theatre practitioner' to become a member of the College de France, where a chair of theatre anthropology was created for him, died on 14 January 1999; his research continues, in accordance with the directions, objectives and methods he developed, at the Jerzy Grotowski and Thomas Richards Study Centre he founded in Pontedera (Italy) in 1986.
15. The most comprehensive book on Grotowski's research and theatre theory is in our view by Jennifer Kumiega (1985, *The Theatre of Jerzy Grotowski*, London, Methuen), even though it ends in 1984 and so does not illustrate or comment on the last stage of his work. There are few works that illustrate and document this stage and they are less well known; among others we can mention: J. Grotowski (1986), *Tu sei figlio di qualcuno, Linea d'ombra*, anno IV, no 17, December (French translation 1986: *Tu es fils de quelqu'un, Europa*, 726, October); J. Grotowski (1988), *Il Performer, Teatro e storia* 4, anno III, no 1, April, pp. 165–169; T. Richards (1995), *Travailler avec Grotowski sur les actions physiques* (preface and essay by J. Grotowski, Actes Sud/Académie Expérimentale des Théâtres).
16. The 'poverty of theatre' and what can be defined most comprehensively as 'Grotowski's paradox of theatre's authenticity' are justified and explained in J. Grotowski's most well known and widely read work (*Towards a Poor Theatre*; in French *Vers un théâtre pauvre*, Paris, La Cité 1971), which has been translated into many languages; on the other hand, the phrase 'art as vehicle', relating to Grotowski's latest research on the *Performer*, was coined by Peter Brook who used it as the title of a short article. See P. Brook (1988), *Grotowski, l'arte come veicolo, Teatro e storia* 5, anno III, no 2, October, pp. 255–258.