



Reinhardt's Modern Concept of Eclecticism in Theatre at Variance to the Production Philosophies of Grotowski and Brook, A Critical Review

Damian P. Enyaosah

Ph. D. Scholar

Harry W. Bass Jr. School of Arts, Humanities, and Technology

The University of Texas at Dallas

U.S.A

ABSTRACT

Eclecticism in twenty-first-century theatre is fast becoming an influential directorial ideology due to the effects of globalization and digitalization. However, some theatre critics will argue in favor of a wide variety of non-traditional styles of performance that emerged during the avant-garde theatre of the 1900s. The main objective of this paper is to apply a comparative approach to assess Max Reinhardt's directorial concept of 'eclecticism' and its numerous benefits to traditional theatre, while juxtaposing it with the production philosophies of Jerzy Grotowski and Peter Brook. This article invites the reader to an exposition of the directorial styles of three great theatre exponents as case studies of the Modern stage. The research addresses the aesthetic features of Reinhardt, Grotowski, and Brook's theatre that have encouraged and stimulated a greater exploration of a variety of diverse and inclusive approaches to directing performances for the ever-evolving contemporary audience. The summary and findings are deduced from the critical examination of the three case studies.

Key Words: Contemporary Performance, Directorial Styles and Approaches, Eclecticism and Digital Theatre, Global Theatre and Performance Aesthetics, Performance Study, Theatre Design and Criticism, Theatre and Wellness, Theatre Spaces and Audience Study, Western Performance and Modernism.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT OF ECLECTICISM

Eclecticism is a very broad term with different scholars offering diverse positions in perspectives. However, the origin of the concept has been traced to a school of ancient Greco-Roman philosophers who detached from the real but selected from existing philosophical beliefs those principles that seemed most reasonable to them.

Eclecticism always tends to spring up after a period of vigorous constructive speculation, especially in the later stages of a controversy between thinkers of pre-eminent ability. Their respective followers, and more especially cultured laymen, lacking the capacity for original work, seeking for a solution in some kind of compromise, take refuge in a combination of those elements in the opposing systems which seem to afford a sound practical theory. (cited by Dillon and Long 3)

The term eclecticism comes from the Greek word "eklektikos" which means "choosing the best", or from "eklektos", which equally means "picked out, select" (George and Scott 4). In other words, eclecticism is an intellectual principle that often transmits its ideological doctrines upon existing concepts as an end product or the anticlimax of a known convention (Hatzimichali 1). Famed Eclectics in ancient Greek gospel were the Stoics, Panaetius, and Posidonius, and the New Academics Carneades and Philo of Larissa. Among the Romans, Cicero was completely miscellaneous, as he united the perambulatory, Stoic, and New Academic doctrines. Other eclectics included Varro and Seneca. (Zeller, 2001).

In theatre, eclecticism has to do with the particular style of a play that demands a distinctive stage treatment. This idea came to life around 1890. Each period before this time would treat all productions the same way. In 1850 a Greek play from 400 BC would be staged in the same way as a Shakespearean play or a melodrama. In 1890 there was

much deliberation about the merits of realism and anti-realism, but each director still tended to adopt a single approach for all plays. Some believed that each production should be styled according to the conventions of the time it was written. The eclectic approach eventually triumphed in the twentieth century and became a distinguishing mark of the directing style during this time.

However, in the late 1890s and early 1900s, the Swiss theorist Adolphe Appia and the English man Gordon Craig independently began formulating a theory of theatrical practice involving the harmonious blend of acting, scenery, costumes, lighting, and text, welded together by a master artist, the director. Edward Henry Gordon Craig propounded the principle of eclecticism in the theatre as a 'Director's Theatre'. In his manifesto 'The Art of the Theatre', believed that the director should control the shape of the modern theatre both from his writing desk and in the rehearsal hall and not the playwright. According to Craig, dramatic art is comprised of "action which is the very spirit of acting; words, which are the body of the play; line and color, which are the very heart of the scene; rhythm, which is the very essence of dance" (13). Craig stunned many by insisting that no one part of the theatrical art should dominate, though he did concede that action was the most valuable component. He still acknowledges Aristotle as he restored plot action to the structural dominance over character.

Craig's visualized the actors playing with the screens and moving them manually. The screens became to the actors, almost another player, while also establishing an aesthetical discourse. More than that, I argue that it is a kind of historical revision of Western theatre modernism and that Craig's solution for the relationship between actors and screens was a forerunner of the actors' and performers' contemporary perspective. Craig himself as a self-publicist became the evangelist of the new movement in 1905 with the publication of his manifesto, *The Art of the Theatre*. Where he rejected the lavish realism of the Victorian tradition, they espoused simple, permanent, or semi-permanent settings and subtle lighting effects that symbolically suggest the essence of the play production. His provocative ideas and drawings proved increasingly influential through the decade and beyond, affecting the works of the younger generation of avant-garde artists endeavoring toward a 'new' theatre.

Foremost among these younger artists was the innovative German director Max Reinhardt, who in 1905 took over the *Deutsches Theatre* in Berlin. Reinhardt was noted to be the first important director to achieve success applying Craig's principles and tended to produce plays realistically. Reinhardt is regarded as the director who popularized Eclecticism in the theatre hence, became the father of the Eclectic Theatre (Morrison 16). As a broad term, the concept of eclecticism is said to have attracted different perspectives from ancient to modern times. Since the nature of the eclectic concept is in contrast with a variety of avant-garde theatrical styles, this study evaluates the perspectives of Max Reinhardt and the infusion of eclecticism in modern theatre amidst the popular theatre philosophies of Jerzy Grotowski and Peter Brook.

2. WHAT IS ECLECTICISM IN MODERN THEATRE?

Eclectic theatre essentially brings material from a variety of sources. At the period when eclectic theatre began to reemerge in modern theatre, many dramatists were rejecting some concepts of naturalism and realism. They were looking for something more modern and experimental. Reinhardt suited the style, form, and methodology of his productions to the particular style and form of the plays he directed. Reinhardt's eclecticism borrowed from Eastern and Western historical styles and periods. Teams of assistants followed the meticulous plans Reinhardt outlined in his prompt book for each production. Reinhardt stated that "there is no one style of theatre which is more artistic than the others. All the old forms are equally valuable if illuminated by the genius of a director." (Kuritz 376) The subsequent histories of the evolution of contemporary theatre validated Reinhardt's claim.

There came to be a greater focus on movement to tell a story, rather than dialogue. Theatre pieces began to emphasize dance, sound, and light as 'the primary expressions of language' (Crawford, Hurst, Lugerling, Wimmer, 238). Movement on stage was made to be highly stylized and dramatists incorporated Laban's theory of spatial movement, gymnastics, acrobatics, and mime. The guiding rule is a theatre favored by a strong stage director to ensure unity in the production. Eclectic theatre in the late 20th Century has been particularly focused on using movement as a means of storytelling.

2.1 Reinhardt Eclectic Theatre

True eclecticism could be attributed to Maximilian Goldmann Reinhardt (1873 – 1943). Reinhardt produced plays from different periods in a variety of styles. He realized that some plays are better suited to bigger theatres while others would require a smaller and more intimate space. He would remodel a specific space to suit the requirements of a specific play. For a medieval pageant drama, he changed the theatre into a cathedral. He would experiment with different types of theatrical devices to create the correct atmosphere for a production. Reinhardt believed the director was the supreme artist of the theatre. He recorded every detail, such as movements, lighting, scenery, sound, and costume in a prompt book.

Reinhardt believed a script was only an outline and that it was the job of the director to complete it into a workable piece that could be performed on stage. Many contemporary influences, such as theatre-in-the-round and open stages can be traced back to the influence of Reinhardt. Even though Reinhardt was the director who essentially popularized the concept of eclecticism, there were others, such as Harley Granville Barker, who aided Reinhardt in this quest. Baker is known for his work at the Royal Court Theatre, in England, between 1904 and 1907. Eclecticism is very much part of modern theatre, where directors produce plays based on their choice of interpretations rather than a specific set of conventions. Reinhardt's principal aim was to immerse the spectator into the action of the drama to experience the actor's part in the tiny world formed by the theatre, as his part in the greater social world. An interrogation of Reinhardt's directorial styles provides an understanding of the eclectic nature of his theatre production philosophy, and these include the conception of stage design, the conception of the player, and the conception/system of theatre organization.

The conception of stage design is the idea of intimacy that affected Reinhardt's conception of the stage, which altered the representation of characters in two ways: Formation and Working. Thus, we see Reinhardt's stage altering in form, and passing from one tradition to another. As the intimacy idea grows stronger, the stage walks out of the enormous box with three sides in which the Italians placed it and enters the arena in which the Greeks bequeathed us. In this way, it is seen encroaching upon the auditorium, first modestly, as the apron stage begins to project, and the earlier and simpler methods of Shakespearean staging become apparent, and then more boldly, as it plunges across and occupies the whole floor of the theatre. The working of the stage is also affected by the same idea in three ways that encompass the scenery, lighting, and the changes in the scenery.

As the scene steps out of the frame in response to the intimacy idea, the character and materials change, and pass from the age of extravagant and complicated acting and scenery to that of broad and simple effects with painted canvas yielding solid doors, walls, and roofs. As the stage takes on spacious and ample proportions, the "architecture" of the scene becomes more or less a substantial embodiment of these proportions, possessing architectonic elements in its structure that suggest a return to the pre-Italian period of stage scenery. These proportions are attained (1) by the use of the entire stage built out to the level of the first tier of boxes, and (2) by the use of the arena. In the latter case, the main aim is to build in the audience, as at Olympia, that conveys to each spectator the sensation of being a part of a great whole.

The new system of stage lighting was intimate, and largely based on emotional effects for the main aim of stage lighting is to contribute as far as possible to the emotions of the drama. Lighting has become an embodiment of emotion. (Warden, 2012) Lights play an emotional part in the drama, focusing and accentuating the performers' emotions as they make their entrance, mostly employing colored rays. In short, the modern problem of costume, scenery, and light is being treated with special care by reformers like Max Reinhardt. To preserve the mood of the drama in the spectator, there should be as little friction in the representation of a play as possible.

This principle has led to the modern problem of the reduction of the act-interval, which Max Reinhardt has attempted to solve in various ways, but mostly by the employment of ingenious mechanisms. The two principal devices employed by him are the revolving stage in use at the Deutsches Theatre, Berlin, and the sinking stage used in *The Miracle*. Beyond these movable stages, a further solution has been sought in the Elizabethan alternate stages and the Greek device of intervals filled in by the chorus. The said devices are also used in an attempt to solve the modern problem of unity in a variety of stage settings. Reinhardt's conception of the player deals with a type that is intimately

alive, a player in whom the intellectual rather than the artistic faculty has become sensitive and awakened. This awakened faculty is considered to, declare itself in a psychological conception of acting and a modernized idea connected with the drama, its significance, and interpretation. The idea is that the actor should be subordinate to the spirit or mood of the drama and aim before all things to convey that mood to the audience. That is, the performer should first assert the individuality of the play, and thereafter their individuality. This ensemble idea also demands that all players concerned in a production shall submit to the direction of a producer-director.

Reinhardt's system of theatre organization falls broadly into two divisions (a) the physique of the theatre, and (b) the mind of the theatre. (Carter, 17) This makes use of an intellectual ordering of the theatre and a comprehension of the parts of the circle of intellect necessary to its working. The circle is, as will be seen, composed, comparatively speaking, of a new form, a body of co-directors animated by a full intellectual conception of the function of the theatre. (Carter, 17) We see them united to exert the Will of the Theatre, as an instrument for restoring a shapeless mass to something resembling uniformity and coherence. Some of Reinhardt's eclectic theatre ideologies influenced leading directors of the twentieth century including notable directors like Grotowski and Brook which will be examined in the later sections.

2.2 Interrogating Jerzy Grotowski's Production Philosophy

According to the Grotowski Institute Encyclopedia, Jerzy Marian Grotowski was born on the 11th of August 1933 in Rzeszów, Poland, and died on the 14 January 1999 in Pontedera, Italy. He was a theatre director, a researcher investigating the art of acting and, broadly speaking, performance, a lecturer in theatre anthropology, a reformer of the performing arts, and a cultural visionary. (Kolankiewicz, 2012) Influenced by the ideals of counterculture, he outlined his vision of active culture as a field in which its participants find satisfaction without pursuing the goal of creating works but instead work towards co-creating encounters characterized by collective effervescence. The Polish theatre director Jerzy Grotowski described his mission as the creation of 'a secular sacrum in the theatre...' (Grotowski, 1)

In Peter Brook's preface to Grotowski's *Towards a Poor Theatre*, Brook describes Grotowski's work with the Laboratory Theatre as the search for 'a new Mass', noting that Grotowski's 'tradition is Catholic – or anti-Catholic; in this case, the two extremes meet'. (Grotowski qt in Matson, 2013) Grotowski's definition of the theatre is "what takes place between spectator and actor". (Grotowski, 15) He writes that theatre 'cannot exist without the actor-spectator relationship of perceptual, direct, "live" communion'. (Grotowski, 15) To focus on this horizontal relationship between the actor and the spectator, Grotowski calls for a 'Poor Theatre', a theatre stripped of all superfluous elements, such as set, costumes, props, and make-up. He calls his way of proceeding a 'via negativa – not a collection of skills but an eradication of blocks' to the full expression of the spirit through the body, leading to a "trans-lumination" in performance in which 'the body vanishes, burns, and the spectator sees only a series of visible impulses'. (Grotowski qt in Matson, 2013)

The pinnacle of performance is the 'total act', a moment in which the actor's performance 'score' is completely revealed to the spectator. Grotowski writes, 'In the most important moment in your role, reveal your most personal and closely guarded experience'. (Grotowski, 17) The total act is 'the act of laying oneself bare, of tearing off the mask of daily life, of exteriorizing oneself... It is a serious act of revelation.' (Grotowski, 19 and Matson, 51) 'If the actor performs in such a way, he becomes a kind of provocation for the spectator.' (Grotowski, 20) 'The spectator understands, consciously or unconsciously, that such an act is an invitation to him to do the same thing'. (Grotowski, 20) As Grotowski continues, 'This act could be compared to an act of the most deeply rooted, genuine love between two human beings'. (Grotowski, 22) 'It is all a question of giving oneself. One must give oneself, in one's deepest intimacy, with confidence, as when one gives oneself in love.' (Grotowski, 23) 'This is both a biological and a spiritual act.' (Grotowski, 24) This 'self-sacrifice' (Grotowski, 25) of the actor's entire being through the medium of his body in performance is, Grotowski writes, 'the essence of the actor's vocation.' (Grotowski, 25)

The poor theatre: using the smallest amount of fixed elements to obtain maximum results by means of the magical transformation of objects, through the props' multifunctional 'acting' to create complete worlds using

only the things to hand. [...] This is theatre in an embryonic form, in the process of being born, when the awakened instinct of acting spontaneously selects appropriate tools for magical transformation. The driving force behind it is certainly a living being, the actor. (Flaschen, *Grotowski et al*, 93)

According to Terry Hodgson, the term Poor Theatre is associated with Jerzy Grotowski and the influential Laboratory Theatre. Grotowski called his theatre poor because it dispensed with theatrical trappings and the technological resources of 'rich' theatre. Grotowski made the actor's voice and body central to the performance. (Humaira, 2014) Only stationary light sources were used; the only masks were the actors' faces; costumes were nondescript; vocal effects replaced instrumental music and sound 'off'; the auditorium became a sensorial space divided in varying ways to allow the utmost contact and exchange between performers and audience. Grotowski sought something beyond drama. He worked to develop physical and emotional responses so that 'impulse and reaction are concurrent'. (Humaira, 2014)

Grotowski moved beyond the early influence of Stanislavsky towards a ritualized intensity. At moments of shock or terror, he argued, mortal beings use 'rhythmically articulated signs' and begin to dance and sing. 'A sign, not a common gesture, is the abecedarian integer of expression for us.' (Hodgson, 12) Grotowski sought to explore moments of extreme pressure and moved naturally towards 'archaic situations' expressed in myth and frequently involving taboo. In a world where myths are myths and not trueness, we must essay to assume myth's 'ill-befitting skin' he placarded. When the theatre confronts us with brutal situations where 'the life mask cracks and falls' it can expose an 'intimate subcaste' which returns us to common mortal trueness. The points of poor theatre are evocative of the propositions of Artaud. still, Artaud aimed to synthesize the work of the actor with 'rich' technology of noise, light, and costume.

The jottings of Nietzsche, Durkheim, and Jung are also constantly invoked as influences on Grotowski, but the practical work seems of further direct significance. As a director, Grotowski preferred to stage his performances in non-conventional spaces likened to structures and apartments, rather than popular theatre houses with traditional stages. Generally, the spectators were placed on numerous sides of the action or in and amongst the action, itself. Acting in the style of Poor Theatre emphasizes the physical skill of the pantomime and uses props for metamorphosis into other objects, occasionally of great significance. (Grotowski, 15) In the description presented by Grotowski in the textbook 'Towards a Poor Theatre,' this form of theatre emerges as a result of a process of reduction, with the theatre performance sanctified of all gratuitous rudiments.

Eventually, the only necessary factors of the theatre appear to be living people – the actor and the onlooker together with that which takes place between them. In effect, theatre work is shown to be overall work with and on the actor, which results in, among other effects, all means of expression (the design, music, lighting, space) again getting naturally connected to the actor's deeds. At the same time, the core of the poor theatre is shown to be the hunt for the deepest verity of the actor's deeds and working towards the consummation of the total act. The conception itself was most generally understood as an expression describing the rejection of complex means of carrying apparently in the 'rich theatre' with which it was varied – this was a theatre of ostentatious and luxurious staging which (in Grotowski's view ineffectually and vainly) attempts to keep up with film and TV in producing spectacular visions and stories.

The conception was also subject to multitudinous reinterpretations and deportations (for illustration, the poor theatre as a theatre of the poor, i.e. those subject to profitable and political oppression). To this day it remains the most recognizable term associated with Grotowski's theatre. No matter how important theatre expands and exploits its mechanical coffers, it'll remain technologically inferior to retake and TV. Accordingly, I propose poverty in theatre. (Grotowski, 19) utmost of Grotowski's work concentrated on actor training. He'd presumably be the most expansive actor training program developed since Stanislavski. The conception of Poor Theatre strips down all of the theatre's surpluses and its especially non-commercial theatre; the antipode of ultramodern-day blockbusters.

Grotowski argued theatre could noway contend with film and TV, so it should have no way essay to, and many of his Poor Theatre works reached performance. Those that did were frequently performed only formerly before

a small number of observers. The term ‘ Paratheatre ’ is frequently associated with Grotowski(‘ para ’ meaning ‘ beyond ’) and Para-theatre saw Grotowski trial with actors in training programs and other non-performed workshops. In the area of script, Grotowski occasionally experimented with classic workshops, changing their setting for contemporary applicability. Physical movement was a crucial element of Poor Theatre performances. (Grotowski, 19) Grotowski’s conception of the Space and Actor-spectators relationship excluded whatever proved redundant, where theatre can live without make-up, without autonomic costume and scenography, without a separate performance area(stage), without lighting and sound goods, etc.(Grotowski, 19).

Grotowski ignored traditional theatre spaces in preference for apartments and structures. Grotowski saw little need for a traditional stage devoted to acting or a purpose-erected theatre for performances. Grotowski’s work involved a violent disquisition of the relationship between the party and onlooker. The end was to exclude the division between actors and spectators, creating a fellowship between the two. Actors generally performed with the observers on numerous sides. Actors also performed in and around the observers strategically placed amongst them in the space. In 1961, Eugenio Barba joined Grotowski’s company as an adjunct and archivist who helped to vulgarize Grotowski’s workshop in Western Europe. Some of them worked with Marceau, the influence of mimic in the work of the Living Theatre and Grotowski's work.

Grotowski’s amusement area and scenic design were generally bare, with many props and no set as object metamorphosis was a crucial aspect of Poor Theatre. After metamorphosis, objects were frequently emblematic and of great significance. Lighting generally swamped the acting area with no use of limelights or concentrate areas. ‘ Costumes ’ if used at each, would be anonymous, not relating character (as with literalism). “ one must ask oneself what's necessary to the theatre. Can the theatre live without costumes and sets? Yes, it can. Can it live without music to accompany the plot? Yes. Can it live without lighting goods? of course. And without a textbook? Yes. ”(Grotowski, 32) The performance act can not live if the players are more concerned with payment, charm, particular success, and applause than with the story creation understood in its loftiest form.

According to Grotowski, a successful act can not live if the actor conditions it according to the size of his part, his place in the performance, the day, or the kind of spectators. (262) The players ’ skills were at the core of all poor theatre performances. On occasions, performers’ training was intensive as no ‘ real ’ props were used for performances, but employed actors as props. Actors with self-esteem had no place in Grotowski’s theatre because the end was for acting to be authentic, akin to Stanislavski’s system (but further physical). Grotowski used a variation of Stanislavski’s emotional memory fashion with his players.

2.3 Interrogating Peter Brook Production Philosophy

What differentiates Brook's jotting from so numerous other theatrical exponents is its extraordinary clarity. His gentle illumination of the four types of theater is conversational, indeed chatty, and though passionately felt, it's entirely lacking in the kind of moralistic bombast that excrescencies numerous analogous textbooks. (John Longenbaugh) Peter Stephen Paul Brook was born on 21 March 1925 and he's a largely influential British theatrical patron and director. During the 1950s he worked on numerous products in Britain, Europe, and the USA, and in 1962 returned to Stratford-upon-Avon to join the recently established Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC). Peter Brook's career, beginning in the 1940s with radical products of Shakespeare with an ultramodern experimental sensibility and continuing to his recent work in the worlds of pieces and grand theater, makes him maybe the most influential director from the 20th to the 21st century.

Cofounder of the Royal Shakespeare Company and director of the International Center for Theater Research in Paris, maybe Brook's topmost heritage will be The Empty Space. His 1968 book divides the theatrical geography, as Brook saw it, into four different types the Deadly Theater (the conventional theater, epigonic and unsatisfying), the Holy Theater (which seeks to rediscover ritual and drama's spiritual dimension, stylish expressed by the jottings of Artaud and the work of director Jerzy Grotowski), the Rough Theater (a theater of the people, against pretension and full of noise and action, stylishly illustrated by the Elizabethan theater), and the Immediate Theater, which Brook

identifies his career with, an attempt to discover a fluid and ever-changing style that emphasizes the joy of the theatrical experience.

The Empty Space divides theatre performances into four types, examining four modes or points of view on theatre: Deadly; Holy; Rough, and Immediate. At first, Brook examines in depth the nature of what he defines as “The Deadly Theatre” or theatre that’s dull and un-engaging. This kind of theatre, he suggests, is defined by passivity — of generators, practitioners(actors, directors), and spectators. Nothing happens on stage to completely and challengingly engage spectators; thus, a spectator is not engaged at all. Deadliness always brings us back to reiteration the deadly director uses old formulae, old styles, old jokes, old goods, stock onsets to scenes, and stock ends; and this applies inversely to his mates, the contrivers, and melodists if they don't start each time a fresh from the void, the desert and the true question why clothes at each, why music, what for? (Brook, 44)

The second was "The Holy Theatre", or theatre which, in Brook’s perspective, is more concerned with spiritual, advanced values that eventually are removed from a spectator's day-to-day experience, and are thus unengaging. The third, "The Rough Theatre", explores ways that the author suggests could be employed by both "The Deadly Theatre" and "The Holy Theatre" to awaken spectators to theater's implicit power and sapience. These ways, he suggests, are grounded on naturalness, impulse, and raw emotional expression. There's a peril, he suggests, in counting too much on "the rough theatre", with too important emphasis on its values leading to a lack of depth, shallow meaning, and theatre of sensation rather than sapience. For sapience to be gained, he writes, the stylish aspects of "the rough theatre" must be combined with the stylish of "the holy theatre", with such a combination offering the possibility of enlightenment through an examination of incidents of sensation predicated in occurrences from diurnal life.

This combination, he maintains, was and is most immaculately expressed in the workshop of William Shakespeare. He offers several exemplifications of how Shakespeare achieved this witchcraft and of how that witchcraft has proved transcendently effective over the centuries since the plays were first written. This witchcraft, or rather what Brook sees as witchcraft, is further defined in the final phase of the book, "The Immediate Theatre". This, in Brook’s perspective, is theatre that combines the rough and the holy in an experience that brings illumination of mortal verity and experience to spectators in an immediate, visceral, occasionally subconscious but always pregnant way. This explores several ways potentially exploitable by theatre interpreters of all disciplines (generators, actors, directors, and critics) to make theatre both tête-à-tête and societally applicable. Operation of the latter techniques serves both theatre and society in terms of keeping theatre evolving for as life changes, so does the experience of, and the eventuality for connecting with, deeper mortal verity as portrayed by practitioners and endured by participants/spectators.

Brook concluded by stating that there's a theatre that exists for the sole purpose of performance and not minding if there are spectators or not. The theatre he called “The Living Theatre.” In the Living Theatre, three requirements become one; it exists for the sake of performing, it earns its living through performing and its performances contain the most violent and intimate moments of its collaborative life. They are a community, but they are only a community because they have a special function that gives their collaborative actuality its meaning. This function is acting. Without acting the group would run dry they perform because the act and fact of performing corresponds to a great participation need. They are on the hunt for meaning in their lives, and a sense indeed if there were no participants, they would still have to perform because the theatrical event is the climax and center of their hunt. Yet without spectators, their performances would lose their substance. The spectators are always the challenge without which a performance would be a sham. Additionally, it is a practical community that makes performances for a living and offers them for trade.

In a Living theatre, we'd each day approach the trial putting history's discoveries to the test, ready to believe that the true play has formerly again escaped us. (Brook, 76) The Living Theatre is exemplary in numerous ways but has still not yet come to grips with its essential dilemma. Searching for godliness without tradition, without source, it's impelled to turn to numerous traditions, numerous sources; yoga, Zen, psychoanalysis, books, reports, discovery, alleviation, a rich but dangerous eclecticism. The system that leads to what they are seeking can not be a cumulative

one. To abate, to strip down can only be effected in the light of some constant. They are still in the hunt for this constant. (Brook, 76)

3. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS: ECLECTIC THEATRE VS GROTOWSKI AND BROOK'S THEATRE

Based on the above discussions and critical review of works of literature, it is pertinent to state that Reinhardt produced plays from different periods in a variety of styles. He realized that some plays are better suited to bigger theatres while others would require a smaller and more intimate space. He would remodel a specific space to suit the requirements of a specific play. For a medieval pageant drama, he changed the theatre into a cathedral. He would experiment with different types of theatrical devices to create the correct atmosphere for a production. Reinhardt believed the director was the supreme artist of the theatre. He recorded every detail, such as movements, lighting, scenery, sound, and costume in a prompt book.

Meanwhile, Grotowski emphasized the actor being the factor and even made use of human props and less consideration to the design elements, and his counterpart Peter Brook also shares similar ideologies as Brook always makes mention of Grotowski's Poor Theatre as being True. "Grotowski's actors offer their performance as a ceremony for those who wish to assist: the actor invokes, lays bare what lies in every man — and what daily life covers up. The theatre becomes holy because its purpose is holy; it has an easily defined place in the community and it responds to a need the churches can no longer fill." (Brook, 71) Brook implied in *The Empty Space* that the theatre becomes deadly and rough when there is an influx of design rudiments that leads to an unengaging or bad theatre.

This makes Brook propose a living theatre that can be staged anywhere at any time as he maintains that any empty space could be called a bare stage. An actor walks in front of the space left with minimal props, costumes, and make-up in the presence of another individual(s), that is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged. Additionally, Brook was greatly motivated while observing Grotowski's theatre; he asserts that Grotowski plays only for thirty observer-like participants— as a deliberate choice. Grotowski is assured that the problems facing himself and the performer are so great that considering a larger audience/participants could only lead to a dilution of the work. Brook and Grotowski's approaches to directing are essentially grounded on the director and the actor relationship.

"You predicate yours on the director, actor, and spectators. I accept that this is possible, but for me, it is too indirect. Is he right? Are these the only possible theatres to touch ' reality '? They are true to themselves, they clearly face the introductory question, 'Why theatre at all?' "(Brook 1968 qt in Owen Daly) From here, it can be derived that both Grotowski and Brook have a slightly analogous focus on the director and actor relationship with a lower emphasis on spectators and scenic design goals. For Brook, the world has been a space formerly empty and overwhelmingly crowded with life. From every corner come stories eager to be told. The actors are always themselves, and they are always the characters they play. They are everyone, and they are nobody in particular. (Lan, 1)

Brook argues that "I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across the space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged."(Brook, 11) Some theatre advocates of Brook's philosophy consider the statement as a holy text. In contrast, eclectic theatre on the other hand, ultimately focuses on the director, actor, design elements, design effects, and audience paying attention to details of the playtext towards the utilization of a variety of styles to attain a distinctive intimate production. Eclecticism still plays a part in Grotowki and Brook's philosophies for the very reason that they produce and direct their plays based on their choice of interpretations rather than a specific set of conventions which is fundamental to Reinhardt eclectic style. However, Grotowki and Brook could be considered as auteur directors whose production philosophies do not serve the purposes of a playtext; rather, they demand that the text serve their purposes. The reverse is the case for Reinhardt's eclectic theatre whose style serves the purposes of the playtext.

4. CONCLUSION

Even though the three theatrical approaches discussed in this paper are relatively different in their production philosophy, they all have one thing in common which unifies them. Their varied concepts are all still being realized on a playing platform known as a “Stage or Space”. The stage unifies them all and their conceptualization of intimate spaces be it traditional or non-traditional. Without a space or a playing platform, no act of theatre can be achieved. Aesthetically, the researcher was able to conclude that the Eclectic theatre design effects aid performances in creating direct intimacy between the players and the audience giving them the required mood, color, and rhythm which enhances the quality of the production while adhering to the drama/text. Nevertheless, Grotowski and Brook’s production philosophy will disagree with my proposition because they might believe the sublimity of performance relies solely on the given director, actor, and participants with less consideration of traditional theatre spaces, text, and audience intimacy. The audience in Grotowski and Brook’s theatre becomes equal sensorial participants/players in the performance other than mere intimate observers. Grotowski and Brook encourage audience participation rather than the audience intimacy created by the aesthetic distance of Reinhardt’s eclecticism.

REFERENCES

- Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space*. Touchstone, 1996. -. *The Empty Space*. 1968. London Penguin Books, 2008.
- Carter, Huntly. *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt*. the University of Michigan, M. Kennerley, 1914.
- Carter, Huntly. *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt*. New York. M. Kennerley, 1914.
- Daly, Owen. “Holy Theatre from Peter Brook’s Book The Empty Space.” *Owendaly.com*, owendaly.com/jeff/grotowsm.htm.
- Daly, Owen. “About This Grotowski Archive.” *Owendaly.com*, 11 Mar. 2012, owendaly.com/jeff/owen1.htm. Accessed 15 Mar. 2024.
- Dillon, J., Long, A. *The Question of "Eclecticism". Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*. Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1988.
- Hatzimichali, Myrto. *Potamo of Alexandria and the Emergence of Eclecticism in Late Hellenistic Philosophy*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. 2011.
- Hodgson, Terry in Chambers, Colin. *Continuum Companion to Twentieth Century Theatre*. A&C Black, 2006.
- Humaira, Rupsha, Anjni And. “Jerzy Grotowski.” *Jerzy Grotowski*, 26 Jan. 2014, grotowskiproject.blogspot.com/. Accessed 15 Mar. 2024.
- Innes, Christopher. *Edward Gordon Craig: A Vision of Theatre*. Routledge, 2013. 177.
- Jerzy Grotowski. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. Routledge, 2012.
- Kolankiewicz, Leszek. “Grotowski Jerzy.” *Grotowski.net*, 7 Dec. 2020, *grotowski.net/en/encyclopedia/grotowski-jerzy*.
- Kuritz, Paul. *The Making of Theatre History*. Prentice-Hall, 1988.
- Lan, David. “The Suit: The Show That Sums up Peter Brook’s Theatrical Odyssey.” *The Guardian*, 25 May 2012, *www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2012/may/25/the-suit-fits-peter-brook*.
- Ludwik Flaszen, ‘Dziady, Kordian, Akropolis in the Teatr 13 Rzędów’, in Ludwik Flaszen, Grotowski & Company, translated by Andrzej Wojtasik with Paul Allain, edited with an introduction by Paul Allain with the editorial assistance of Monika Blige and with a tribute by Eugenio Barba, Holstebro – Malta – Wrocław – London, New York: Icarus Publishing Enterprise, 2010, p. 78–94.
- Matson, Cole C. E. *Towards a Eucharistic Theatre : The Theatrical Theologies of the Reduta, the Rhapsodic Theatre, and Grotowski’s Lab*. Feb. 2016, pp. 1–258, *www.academia.edu/76667714/Towards_a_eucharistic_theatre_the_theatrical_theologies_of_the_Reduta_the_Rhapsodic_Theatre_and_Grotowskis_Lab?uc-sb-sw=11206341*. Accessed 15 Mar. 2024.
- Matson, Cole. “Grotowski’s Poor Theatre: A Theatre of the Body» Transpositions.” *Transpositions*, 1 Nov. 2013, *www.transpositions.co.uk/grotowskis-poor-theatre-a-theatre-of-the-body/*.
- Morrison, Michael A. *John Barrymore, Shakespearean Actor*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Osiński, Zbigniew. “Returning to the Subject: The Heritage of Reduta in Grotowski’s Laboratory Theatre.” *TDR/The Drama Review*, vol. 52, no. 2, June 2008, pp. 52–74, <https://doi.org/10.1162/dram.2008.52.2.52>. Accessed 28 Nov. 2022.
- “Poor Theatre.” *Grotowski.net*, 15 Mar. 2012, *grotowski.net/en/encyclopedia/poor-theatre*.

Warden, C. *British Avant-Garde Theatre*. Springer, 2012.

Warden, C. Introduction: *A British Theatrical Avant-Garde*. In: *British Avant-Garde Theatre*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. 2012. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137020697_1

Zeller, Eduard. *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, 13th edition. Oxon: Routledge. 2001. p. 253. ISBN 9781315822976.

Zeller, Eduard. *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*. Burns & Oates, 1997.