

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<i>Introduction and Preface to the Third Edition</i>	xi

PART 1 Who? Major Practitioners of Improvisation

Introduction	1
1 Improvisation in Training, Rehearsal Practice and Writing (Europe and the UK)	3
The principle of improvisation	3
Precursors: Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Chekhov	6
Renovation and the development of drama training: Jacques Copeau and Suzanne Bing	14
Improvisation and ‘traditional’ theatre training	23
Improvisation and playwrighting: Mike Leigh	27
2 The Improv Scene (US)	38
New York giants	38
Lee Strasberg	40
Chicago Bears	43
Audience-led impro	55
Improvising musical theatre	59
3 Improvisation in the Creation of New Modes of Performance	62
Roddy Maude-Roxby/Theatre Machine	62
Jacques Lecoq and the semiotics of clowning	68
Le Théâtre du Soleil	76
Dario Fo and Franca Rame	78
4 Improvisation for Change: ‘Paratheatre’, Participation and Performance Work beyond the Stage	86
Jerzy Grotowski	86
Jacob Moreno: Stegreiftheater and psychodrama	93
Jonathan Fox and Jo Salas: Playback Theatre	97
Augusto Boal	99

Doing it with you: participatory, immersive and movement-based work	103
Freeform as kinetic being: contact improvisation, Butoh, Movement Medicine	109
Theatre Sports	113
'Theatre of the Ordinary'	113
Improvisation in poetry	115
Jazz	119
Jazz research: the improvising brain	120
Stand-up and encounters with impro	120
5 Improvisation in Non-Western Performance	124
Japan, China and Indonesia	124
Proto-drama: the Gimi of Papua New Guinea	129
<i>Orta oyunu</i> and <i>ru-howzi</i> : improvisation in the context of Islam	131
West African 'concert party' and South African theatre	137
PART 2 What? The Practice of Improvisation: Improvisation Exercises	
Introduction	143
6 Preparation	145
Relaxation	145
Games	146
Balance and 'body/think'	148
Space and movement	151
Concentration and attention	153
Impulses and directions	155
The fixed and the free	159
7 Working Together	163
Working in pairs	163
Trust and respect	163
Making a machine	164
Showing and telling	168
Entrances and exits	169
Meetings and greetings	170
Blocking	172
8 Moving Towards Performance	174
Senses	174

Tenses	176
Status	179
Masks	182
Structures, rhythms and atmospheres	195
9 Improvisation for Scene-Building	197
Who/where/what?	197
Objectives and resistances	198
Point of concentration (focus)	200
Memory	202
Set	203
Character	204
Narrative as generative structure	206
Sample sequences	209
PART 3 Why? The Meaning(s) of Improvisation: Towards a Poetics	
Introduction	215
10 Enriching the Communication of Meaning	217
Implications of psychodramatic and paratheatrical approaches	217
The censor's nightmare	219
Transformation and the plural self	224
Site and meaning	229
11 Meaning and Performance	230
Meaning as performance (or vice versa): the place of the improvisatory	230
Texts, signs and meaning	232
Improvisation and writing	234
Co-creativity	240
The aesthetics of risk	242
The wager of the Other: an ecology of improvisation?	243
New combinations; saying Yes, hearing No	244
<i>Notes</i>	247
<i>Bibliography</i>	260
<i>Index of Selected Games and Exercises</i>	277
<i>General Index</i>	279

I Improvisation in Training, Rehearsal Practice and Writing (Europe and the UK)

The principle of improvisation

Improvisation is not just a style or an acting technique; it is a dynamic *principle* operating in many different spheres, an independent and transformative way of being, knowing and doing. The twentieth century witnessed an explosion of experiments which have embraced the principle of 'improvisation'. Music, for example, was transformed by the various forms of jazz: technical proficiency allied to improvisation to create a practically inexhaustible synthesis. In modern dance, Isadora Duncan and Martha Graham, in different ways, opened up a wealth of new plastic possibilities for the expressive body. The former immediately and spontaneously danced the truth of what she felt. The latter broke down the rigid formulae of classical ballet and replaced them with a language that responded to the world around as well as within the dancer. The 1960s political philosophy of situationism in Europe and happenings in the United States celebrated the spontaneous and site-specific, most importantly perhaps the conjunction of site, moment, performer and spectator, that is, the place, time and bodies of new event-structures. Many of these forms have been reconfigured in the performance work of the early twenty-first century, so it is worth dwelling on this a little. The examples given above (jazz and twentieth-century modern dance) involve the negotiation of form and freedom, and writing about this often tends to polarise them. In fact, as noted in the discussion of *commedia* in the Introduction, both are involved throughout, in preparation/rehearsal and, sometimes, in performance – arguably more often in site-specific or immersive work of recent times. It has been suggested that most of what passes for 'improvisation' in jazz is anything but that: 'breaks' tend to be repetitive and/or predictable, and they remain strictly within the frame of rhythm and key-signature or depart from it only in 'agreed' ways. So quite a lot of jazz falls back on habit – the habit of the player and the expectation of the listener. But this immersion in pattern is not solely restrictive: as with much Asian performance – and a key criterion adopted by Barba for his own company's work – knowing the 'score' (which may have been developed from a long sequence of experiment, trial and error)

is a basis for liberation. Using the term 'improvisation' is a bit sloppy here, because it refers equally to the development process and to potentially unexpected 'leaps' in performance, moments when 'the flower blooms', as *Noh* theatre would have it. But what both time-dimensions trace is a point of change, a happening of something new.

As Martha Graham writes, 'There is a necessity for movement when words are not adequate. The basis of all dancing is something deep within you' (in Roose-Evans 1970: 112). Is improvisation here the honing of a technique or acuity for identifying the moment when things 'change', when something really does 'happen' to the relationship between 'self' (located in the machine of the body-as-agent) and the 'environment' (space, place, time, other performers, audience, score, text, context and so on)?

However, it is true that all theatrical performance ideally strives for a rigorous authenticity: what Stanislavsky called 'artistic truth', perhaps? The lines of development we discuss in this section lead in three principal directions, but each ultimately demands the same degree of commitment and is concerned – though from different angles – with an exploration of 'self' and 'reality' for performers and/or audience.

Improvisation is used in three major contexts. It feeds first into what we might call traditional theatre training, as a preparation for performance and a way of tuning up the performers. We can place this in the (Stanislavskian) tradition of 'character' preparation, or, to put it another way, as a method of schooling the actor to project the 'reality' of the character. It is a process which involves the development of imaginative skills so that the body can experience and express appropriate emotional states: discovering in oneself the self or being of 'another' and presenting it.

We discuss the use of improvisation in actor training below; this line of work initially tends – though not exclusively or rigidly – towards the naturalistic, the documentary and the sociopolitical, with a relatively clearly defined concept of 'character' as the focus of deterministic forces: what D. H. Lawrence called the 'old stable ego of personality' clings to this and inhabits the structure and content of the 'well-made play'. Perhaps the most extreme development occurs in the improvisation-for-performance work of Mike Leigh, where a scripted text arises from improvisation fleshed out by 'sociological' research.

The second tradition (or perhaps anti-tradition) rests on a more radical acknowledgement of the fragmentation of nineteenth-century notions of a consistent personality. The comic and satiric vein, often allied to improvisation, challenges assumptions about stable social personality and 'bourgeois' respectability; taken to extremes, it undercuts political, religious and philosophical myths about the coherence of individual identity and its consonance

within a system of stratified order and significance. The work of Jarry, Artaud and Beckett, for instance, extends and foregrounds this destabilisation; it also requires a more radically physical and improvisatory approach to acting, and it is not surprising that alongside this eventually scripted and accepted form of theatre, work on and with improvisation should have continued to develop almost as a form in and for itself. Improvisation of this kind both serves as an exploratory form of theatre and – here we move into the third tradition, ‘para-theatrical’ context – also locates the issue of self and reality in spheres other than the narrowly theatrical.

The more radical modes of improvisation both accept the consequences of the disintegration of the existential self and attempt to use them positively. Grotowski’s actors learn to ‘disarm’, that is, to arrive at a condition without the protective masks of the familiar or the comfortable escapes of dramatic cliché. The work focuses not on the reality of the character but on that of the *performer*; where it emerges as public theatre, it is the inventiveness and authenticity of the performers in their relationship with the spectators which is foregrounded, as opposed to the presentation of a narrative. Here improvisation and performance are seen as part of a developmental process which can thus extend beyond theatre into, for example, psychotherapy, education and politics.

It is only a step from here, and indeed a step which had already been taken by work like that of Grotowski’s para-theatrical period, to the spectrum of concern with location and audience in which they become participants in the event. Yet in another way it is also a step back, towards the *communitas* Victor Turner identified as the dynamic of ritual. In the ongoing exploration of new forms of being, the shaman bites back.

John Martin (2004) notes that improvisation is used in pre-rehearsal, rehearsal and performance, and offers four ways of working with it: solo, in pairs, variations and for groups. He indicates that in addition to Western actor training, improvisation is found in Boalian Forum Theatre (responding to spectator interventions), Japanese *Noh* (gauging the state of the audience), South Indian *Kathakali* (play with audience by popular characters) and West African performance, where dances are ‘never the same’ (Martin 2004: 102–3). Exercises are organised according to the kinds of energy level they seek to generate and the ways in which they change the nature of the performer’s relationship to space. Martin trained at the Lecoq school and has worked extensively with performers from many traditions.¹

Martin’s proposed divisions can be seen to relate both to what we discuss in Part 1 about training and trainers and to the way Part 2 (the ‘how’ section) is organised. The use of improvisation as a strategy of training is a way of developing the performer’s resources, which as it is formalised or

repeated develops into a methodology; improvisation as a way of creating or amending performance alters its nature and effect, inflecting its status and meaning. Pre-rehearsal involves the preparation of bodies and groups for *disponibilité* and play, and the exploration of the relationship between the body of the performer and the space of performance. Improvisation in and as rehearsal continues these moves with reference to the performance-text (the ensemble of signs and codes which constitute the performance); it develops the contexts and 'back-stories' of characters and situations through exercises like 'hot-seating' or affective memory work; and it works on strategies to energise relationships and intentions, by attempting to find ways to 'raise the stakes' and intensify the degree of attention to what is happening between performers and in the space. Improvisation in and as performance can be the most risky venture possible – for a clown courting failure, for a participant in a scenario whose parameters are known but whose detail, order and meaning is liable to be changed by any performer; or a subtle variation registering the receptive condition of the audience or the specific dynamics of the moment by a highly skilled performer; or uncensored or deliberately invoked interventions from spectator-participants to which performers respond supportively. In what follows we discuss both forms of training (process) and uses in performance (application or product), which often feature in parallel in the work of trainers and theatre-makers, or follow directly on from each other.

Precursors: Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Chekhov

Improvisatory methods slowly began to percolate through mainstream Russian theatre. In St Petersburg in 1908, the idealising theorist Vyacheslav Ivanov (1866–1949) proposed a renovation of the theatre in which the actors would descend among the audience, distribute masks and costumes 'to everyone who wanted them ... involving those present in a communal creative improvisation' (Rudnitsky 1988: 10). He sought to replace theatre's classical reliance on *mimesis* with a dionysian group *praxis*. His Symbolist poetic contemporaries were cautious, and they regarded Ivanov's proposals for a renewed liturgical theatre that would take the place of traditional religious ritual as utopian and unworkable.

Following Meyerhold's use of *commedia* techniques in *Columbine's Scarf* (1910), Alexander Tairov's production of *The Seamy Side of Life* by Jacinto Benavente opened in 1912 at the Reineke Theatre. This too sought to explore the improvisatory essence of masked *commedia* and mime, though the young, inexperienced actors struggled to realise Tairov's vision.

After the October Revolution of 1917, perhaps the first person to think of improvisations as more than idealist experiments, historical reconstructions or as training and rehearsal exercises was Meyerhold's protégé Sergei Radlov (1892–1958). Radlov founded the 'Popular Comedy' (*Teatr Narodnoy Komedii*, or People's Comedy Theatre, St Petersburg) in 1920. He argued that 'a genuine contemporary art form could be achieved only in one way – by means of "the actor's verbal improvisation"' (Rudnitsky 1988: 57). Where Meyerhold had stressed physical improvisation and mime, Radlov placed emphasis on the spontaneous creation of verbal text. Feeling that melodrama and tragedy depended for their power on a fixed, stable text, Radlov chose to work exclusively in comedy, often with circus performers and clowns such as Georges Delvari, creating half-plays/half-scenarios in which every one of the players

was allowed, and in fact obliged, to say everything that came to mind. The main criterion for success lay in the audience response: the more often and the more loudly they burst out laughing, the better. Topical jokes about current events, remarks unexpectedly directed at the audience and informal, familiar banter with spectators were encouraged. (1988: 57)

For Radlov, indeed, the playwright was seen as 'pernicious', and his aim was to free the actor from the writer's tyranny. He felt that the actor's enslavement to the words of others 'completely atrophies the actor's initiative, transforming an independent artist into an obedient and passive performer, practically a marionette, controlled by the writer's will' (57). He did, however, collaborate with Maxim Gorki, who found the idea of improvisation attractive, on a piece called *The Hardworking Slovoetkov*, a satire on bureaucracy. The piece was considered a failure: the theatre's designer Valentina Khodasevich described Delvari's improvisations as 'crude and vulgar' (Rudnitsky 1988: 59) and recorded Gorki's displeasure at the way the actors turned sharp satire into broad farce and slapstick. Discouraged, Radlov began to direct more classical, less improvised comic pieces, and the circus performers decamped back to St Petersburg's Cisinelli big top. In 1922, the Popular Comedy closed.

Yevgeny Vakhtangov's last production, Carlo Gozzi's *Princess Turandot*, which opened at the Moscow Art Theatre's Third Studio (later renamed the State Vakhtangov Studio) in February 1922, saw his actors given freedom to improvise in performance. They were asked to imagine that they were playing Italian actors playing the Chinese roles of the play: they were encouraged to get into role, and to get out of role, and to show the transitions.

They were instructed ‘to conduct complex, capricious and merry play with the character, simultaneously demonstrating the technique of transformation, the joy of metamorphosis and the ability to look at one’s hero with irony “from the side”’ (Rudnitsky 1988: 54). Vakhtangov’s ‘fantastical realism’ style of performance anticipated Brecht, quoted from *commedia* as well as from Chinese theatre and remained in the theatre’s repertory for a thousand performances. Revived in 1971, it remains popular to the present day.

We might assume that Constantin Stanislavsky (1863–1938) was the originator of the modern use of improvisation, at least as a rehearsal and training device. Many of the scenes described in his books, *An Actor Prepares*, *Building a Character* and *Creating a Role*, in which the director ‘Tortsov’ guides his young protégés through the processes of self-discovery, are improvisatory in nature. But these books are the product of Stanislavsky’s later years, after a heart attack had forced him to give up acting. They do not necessarily relate to his own theatrical practice, particularly in the early days of the Moscow Art Theatre (MAT).

Stanislavsky did use a form of ‘proto-improvisation’, a kind of imaginative projection of oneself into a role, and began to suggest to his actors (a) that they might do this together, as a group, away from the pressures of actual rehearsals; and (b) that they do it continually, *outside the theatre*, while practising simple physical activities. The concentration required led them towards group outings, boating or mushroom picking, away from the bustle of ‘normal’ town life, so that the actors could slowly become immersed in their characters.

Although knowledge of Stanislavsky’s practice has until recently been limited by lack of access to his writings in the original Russian, he seems in fact to have made use more consistently than hitherto recognised of exercises aimed at physical, emotional and intellectual integration in order to produce a multilayered spontaneous ‘truth’. Some of these exercises resemble the kinds of energy work used extensively by Michael Chekhov (Carnicke 2000: 22); improvisation was particularly important in working on structure, rhythm, atmosphere and social context in Stanislavsky’s last (posthumously performed) production, *Tartuffe* (1939).

It took a long time for Stanislavsky to come to the central conclusions of his early work: that a director should be interested in the actor’s process rather than trying to dictate a result; that an actor should blend himself with the character he plays; that when playing a villain one should look for his good side; that it was not important that one played ‘well’ or ‘ill’ – what mattered was to play truthfully. But Stanislavsky was also, at this time, overimpressed by the externals of naturalism, by a scenic naturalism

that gave the illusion that genuine emotions were being played out within it and also by the autocratic example of Ludwig Chronegk's practice with the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen's company. Only later in his work, after the famous vacation in Finland in 1906, would he consciously transfer the emphasis to the inner life of the character: in effect, the creation of the Stanislavsky 'System'.

It was not until 1911, when Stanislavsky founded the First Studio of the MAT, that improvisation became in any way central to the practical work (and even later before it became part of the theory). According to Paul Gray, improvisation was first introduced by Stanislavsky's trusted friend and associate Leopold Antonovich Sulerzhitsky, whom Stanislavsky had put in charge of the Studio's developmental work (Gray 1964: 25). Improvisation immediately became the rage among the younger generation of actors and actresses who made up the First Studio but was equally powerfully resisted by the older generation. For Olga Knipper and Ivan Moskvin – and even for Nemirovich-Danchenko himself – there seemed nothing practically useful in the Studio's work at first. But for Yevgeny Vakhtangov,² Mikhail Chekhov, Maria Ouspenskaya and Richard Boleslavsky, Sulerzhitsky's technique was a liberation.

It was really only in the last phase of his work, when he had ceased to act and when the translator Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood had prevailed upon him to write down his way of working, that Stanislavsky himself began to consider seriously the techniques of improvisation, making the students work on scenes entirely without a text.

As David Magarshack points out, Stanislavsky had never really applied this purely theoretical idea to prove its efficacy in practice. It would be his successors who would elevate this experimental way of working into a central tenet of the 'Method'. Stanislavsky's work has led directly to that of modern America (both the 'Method' and the 'New York School' of improvisation discussed below) and to the plays of Mike Leigh, in which the *sine qua non* of performance is the truthful depiction of naturalistic character. His influence on the theatre of the twentieth century is still immense, but the naturalistic theatre's development of applied improvisation is due to his successors and emulators rather than to Stanislavsky directly.

Bella Merlin's books *Beyond Stanislavsky* and *Konstantin Stanislavsky* contain a full and more detailed discussion of, for example, the 'The Method of Physical Actions and Active Analysis' (Merlin 2001) and a short and very accessible account of Stanislavsky's life and work, with detailed discussions of *An Actor Prepares* (Merlin 2003). The latter also focuses discussion on three Stanislavskian methods: early 'round-the-table' analysis ('table work', which she stresses is active and fun rather than dry and scholastic) and

the 'System' (117–25); an introduction to the 'Method of Physical Actions' (126–42); and an introduction to 'Active Analysis' (143–54). There's a useful glossary (157–62) that discusses key terms such as 'grasp' and 'communion' as well as the more obvious System terminology and relates them directly to the main text, and to Stanislavsky's own writings (see also Part 2).³

Techniques which emanate from Stanislavsky, such as 'affective memory', substitution, use of 'hot-seating' or improvised 'back-story' scenarios, proceed in stages from individual imaginative activity to mutually improvised dialogue. They aim for an internal sense or feeling of 'this is how it is'. In the 'finding the needle' exercise directed by 'Tortsov', the actress starts by demonstrating 'looking for a needle in a bewildered way'. It's an act. Stanislavsky raises the stakes, as subsequent practitioners would say, by telling her that there really is a needle and if she doesn't find it she'll be out of a job. She changes her behaviour completely and the dynamic shifts radically. In other words this is a nutshell version of getting inside, of solving a real problem in real time.

Meisner's second-level exercises build on repetition of banal mutual observations by introducing a task for one of the participants ('You have to fry an egg for your gran'; 'there's a bomb under the TV') to operate a similar process. Here then is another kind of sequence – increasing intensification, upping the ante, ramping up the stakes. So this kind of trajectory (simple basic version: 'your energy level when you did that scene was 5; now do it at 9 or 10') is a key procedural feature of this strand of improvisation as rehearsal and training; it signals that method is being employed to arrive at a point – I really have to find an actual needle, I have to fry an egg and keep throwing the dialogue ball back – where the actor is 'free' because he or she is experiencing diverse parameters of a situation and operating at a level of organic complexity where a different order of mental and physical coherence starts to kick in. (See discussion of Drinko on improvisation and consciousness in Chapter 2.)

If it can be argued that both Lee Strasberg and Stella Adler, though in different ways, pursue Stanislavsky's aim to enrich the actor's inhabiting of the present through their work on emotion, Sanford Meisner is particularly concerned to centre all exchange between performers in a developed sensitivity and openness to what is happening to them in the moment. Exercises which appear to consist of the banal repetition of surface observations are guided in such a way as to lead to acknowledgement and articulation of subtle shifts of attitude, and they also aim to engender a spirit of play between actors. (Nick Moseley's book (discussed in the Introduction, pp. xxii) frames Meisner's work well and presents a good selection of his exercises.) So this work is about taking from each other

(Keith Johnstone's 'yes-saying' as spontaneous verbal response initially) and playing; passing the ball back and forth, offering and accepting; developing a 'dialogue' between players as in, for example, jazz or Indian classical music, or between musicians and dancers in Indian work. Here the rhythmic patterns (*Tal* or *Tala*) used to structure the interaction between performers – dancer/musician, musician/musician and so on – are known as *jugalbandi* – there is a stipulation that this word is used when the artists are of equal standing, not one leading the other. The rhythmic 'subvocalisation' which goes on here – a kind of *grammelot* (see Chapter 3 on Dario Fo) – seems to incite spontaneous physical response, even within relatively 'closed' forms like *Kathakali* or *Kathak*.

What is improvisatory here – and has links with aspects of Copeau's, Johnstone's and Grotowski's work – is the way in which 'text' becomes a porous field of interplay and revelation, where actors begin to develop the kind of antennae which can pick up their own 'pre-expressive' shifts which are so essential, for instance, to the red-nosed clown, but also to sensitive acting in all kinds of performance. And this kind of subliminal or subtextual sensitivity seems to imply a psychophysical functioning of a somewhat extended kind.

The modern 'alternative' examination of improvisation 'begins' with Vsevolod Meyerhold (1874–1940), one of the MAT's leading actors during the early autocratic stage, who left Moscow in 1902. Stanislavsky invited him back to join the MAT Studio Theatre project in 1905. Meyerhold's disagreement with the MAT's 'realistic' concept of theatre soon became apparent. A conflict between him and Stanislavsky ensued; the Studio Theatre was closed before it had opened. For Stanislavsky, especially as his work developed, the actor was the focus of theatre. For Meyerhold, the focus was the director's art. The division between them was a formal one and should not obscure the great respect each had for the other.

In 1910 Meyerhold opened the 'Interlude House' at the former Skazka Theatre at 33 Galernaya Street, St Petersburg, to explore aspects of popular and street theatre and, especially, *commedia dell'arte*. Because he was working at the conservative Imperial Alexandrinsky Theatre at the time, he was asked by the management to conduct his experimental work under a pseudonym. At the suggestion of the composer and poet Mikhail Kuzmin, he took the name of 'Doctor Dappertutto', a character from E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Adventure on New Year's Eve*. Doctor Dappertutto was a real-life manifestation of the mask, a ubiquitous *doppelgänger* who assumed responsibility for all Meyerhold's experiments in the eccentric and the supernatural for the rest of his time at the Imperial theatres (Braun 1969: 115, 119–28).⁴

Although the Interlude House was short-lived, the Dappertutto experiments continued for many years. Meyerhold's fascination with *commedia dell'arte* had a number of levels. Where Stanislavsky's theatre explored the 'inner truth' of character, Meyerhold glimpsed the equally profound 'exterior truth' of the mask. He was also fascinated by the figure of the *cabotin* (which he regarded in a very much more positive light than Copeau later did). The figure of the itinerant, poor, professional actor, descended from the classical *mimus*, via the Russian *skomorokhi* (Russian equivalent of the *jongleur*) and *balaganschik* ('fairground booth-player') no less than the Italian *comici dell'arte*, attracted him powerfully.

His awareness of *commedia dell'arte* was conditioned by his acquaintance with a number of European sources: the drawings of Callot, with their grotesque and malicious, sexual and scatological figures; the *fiabe* of Carlo Gozzi, with their deliberate room for actors' improvisations, their poetic, magical delicacy; the plays of Goldoni, with their developing interest in psychological realism and their literary grace; the works of the Romantic Hoffmann, with their masked and transformed mysticism, their fascination with reality and its double; and, finally, his close association with the writer and director Vladimir Soloviev, whose knowledge of *commedia* stimulated his own (Risum 1996: 75).

Beyond his initial intellectual, literary and aesthetic interest, Meyerhold was engaged with the actor's physical skills: the extraordinary plasticity of the street entertainer would ultimately become the basis of the scientific bio-mechanics with which his name is associated, and which led to an investment in the *actor's* independent creativity. He returned to the idea of the *commedia dell'arte* scenario, set in advance by the *concertatore* or laid out by a master dramatist like Goldoni or Gozzi.

Michael (Mikhail) Chekhov (1891–1955) was the nephew of the playwright Anton Chekhov. He worked at MAT from 1912 to 1918, and later in Berlin, Paris, Dartington, New York, Connecticut and Los Angeles. Franc Chamberlain describes Chekhov as 'an outstanding actor and author of one of the best actor training manuals ever published in the European tradition' (Chamberlain 2000a: 79). His approach is now incorporated into the curriculum of many training establishments.

Over 100 of Chekhov's exercises have been published. Much of Chekhov's focus is on developing inner resources, and the exercises aim to:

- link inner and outer, psychological and material (via work on energy and focus)
- create and inhabit imaginative space
- locate and inhabit imaginary bodies and centres

- explore psychological gesture, archetype
- develop imagination and concentration
- activate higher ego
- explore atmospheres and qualities
- develop a sense of form, beauty and wholeness.

The general context of his work is towards the evocation of ‘atmosphere, actors’ creativity, physicalisation of inner experience’ (Chamberlain 2000a: 80). It is important for the actor to ‘become an active participant in the process of imagination’ (86).

Rudolf Steiner’s Theosophy and associated practices were useful to Chekhov in overcoming a personal crisis and leading to ‘liberation from his self-indulgent and self-destructive tendencies’; from this Chekhov acquired a distance from the everyday self which he was able to incorporate into acting strategies, moving away from the Stanislavskian emphasis on personal emotion towards activation of a Steineresque ‘higher ego’ (the ‘artist in us’) (Chamberlain 2000a: 81), which has attributes such as detachment, compassion and humour. Chekhov also stressed the importance of the condition of ‘two consciousnesses’ – ‘real acting was when we could act and be filled with feelings, and yet be able to make jokes with our partners’ (Chekhov 1985: 102). This suggests parallels with Copeau’s and Lecoq’s work on ‘neutrality’, discussed below, and also with non-Western actor training rooted in particular understandings of mind/body integration and models of consciousness. Chekhov himself also used aspects of eurythmy (Steiner/Dalcroze) and worked with Vakhtangov to synthesise the approaches of Stanislavsky and Meyerhold.

According to Franc Chamberlain, ‘the basic principles of his technique will allow as many variations and creations as there are creative individualities’ (2000a: 113ff.). So exercises can be adapted; they should also be explored at length in order to allow new outcomes to emerge. Chekhov requires this openness and ‘wanted an attitude of warmth, friendliness, freedom and ease in the workspace. Giving and receiving, underpinned by a sense of joy, is at the heart of the work’ (115). Chekhov’s ‘Four Brothers’ is a set of exercises designed to stimulate these kinds of experience. These criteria exemplify important improvisatory principles and form a link between the psychological and inner-directed end of the Stanislavsky spectrum and the kinds of spatial and element work partly derived from dance and *mime blanche*, also figuring extensively in Lecoq’s sport-derived methodology.

The first person, however, to investigate improvisation as *the* means to explore the nature of acting, and the first man to grasp the full significance of this way of working, was Jacques Copeau. In Limon, in 1916, he wrote:

It is an art which I don't know, and I am going to look into its history. But I see, I feel, I understand that this art must be restored, re-born, revised; that it alone will bring a living theatre – the theatre of players. (Kirkland 1975: 58)

Renovation and the development of drama training: Jacques Copeau and Suzanne Bing

Albert Camus said, 'In the history of the French theatre there are two periods: before and after Copeau' (cited in Saint-Denis 1982: 32). This judgement might be extended to the history of improvisation: Copeau (1879–1949) truly began the modern tradition. John Rudlin enumerates the many debts which the modern theatre owes to Copeau's teaching and practice:

In no particular order: drama games; improvisation; animal mimicry; ensemble playing; writers-in-residence; *commedia dell'arte* revival; mime; mask-work; repertoire rather than repertory; community theatre; theatre as communion. (Rudlin 1986: xiv)

And not to Copeau alone. His assistant (lover, mother of Copeau's son, the writer Bernard Bing, partner in all but name) the actress Suzanne Bing (1885–1967) has been unfairly neglected, due largely perhaps to her own diffidence and deference to Copeau's memory. Much of the credit for discovery and invention in this new mode should rightly be hers.⁵

Copeau was not the first to use improvisation as a rehearsal and training technique: Stanislavsky, we have seen, used it at the Moscow Art Theatre Studio; Tairov had employed it at the Kamerny, too. But Copeau, at Le Vieux-Colombier and in his teaching, was the first really to base a system of exploratory work upon it, and the impact of his decision is still reverberating.

Jacques Copeau was a drama critic before he became a full-time practitioner. He was part of the reaction against the realism of Antoine's Théâtre Libre (though he knew and admired Antoine and regarded Stanislavsky as a source of creative inspiration), against the false rhetorical style of the Comédie Française and against the crassness of boulevard theatre. He read and in many ways admired Craig and Appia, but disagreed with their proposed alternatives. Instead, in 1913, he published his own 'manifesto' – his *Essai de Rénovation Dramatique* – and founded his own theatre in the rue du Vieux-Colombier in Paris. Bing was a young actress, recently divorced from

the avant-garde composer Edgard Varèse, by whom she had a daughter. She took Copeau's call for renovation of the stage literally and joined his new company that year.

She (like Copeau) became interested in the ideas of Émile Jaques-Dalcroze, which included music improvisation and its expression through the body, and had experimented with them teaching children with Copeau in Geneva before rediscovering them again via Margaret Naumburg in New York, where the Vieux-Colombier spent two important seasons during the First World War as part of the propaganda war effort.

Margaret Naumburg (1890–1983), then the wife of the novelist Waldo Frank, had been quietly instrumental in introducing the ideas of Dalcroze and Alexander technique to America. She was a passionate and devoted educationist, trained with Maria Montessori, whose ideas she refined. She wrote an article popularising Dalcroze's ideas in America and (when the Great War put his business at risk) personally invited Alexander to New York, where she introduced him to her former teacher, the Pragmatist philosopher and progressive education advocate John Dewey. Waldo Frank had written an account of the Vieux-Colombier (Frank 1918), and he and Margaret entertained the actors during their stay. Bing (then nursing a baby) was offered a teaching job at Margaret's Walden Infant School. Here she observed and practised Margaret's use of games.

Bing's resultant physical theatre training exercises – masks and animal games in particular, which derived in part from Naumburg's work – would be crucial to Copeau's project to eliminate *cabotinage* (the actor's reliance on a repertoire of stale tricks; 'ham' acting). She taught them first to the French actors at Morristown. They would contribute directly to the formation of *les Copiaus* – Copeau's experimental troupe in Burgundy – and, later, la Compagnie des Quinze under Michel Saint-Denis. It was Bing's personal tuition which directly led to the developmental mime of Etienne Decroux and through him to the extraordinarily influential teaching of Jacques Lecoq. If Copeau is the father of physical theatre, then Suzanne Bing is its mother.⁶

In the beginning, Copeau did not so much have a vision of a future theatre, as a certainty that such a theatre would be possible – if only the right conditions were fulfilled. His manifesto ended with the now famous plea '*Pour l'oeuvre nouvelle qu'on nous laisse un tréteau nu!*' (For the new work, just leave us bare boards!) (Copeau 1913: 72), and almost his first act, practical and symbolic, was to empty the stage of the old music-hall building. He ended the 'tyranny of the technician', leaving the stage open and free for the actor to perform and (just as importantly) to rehearse on. By 1921, he had stripped away the proscenium arch and replaced it with an

open, multi-levelled end-stage.⁷ Yet, with a minimum of technical means, Copeau's actors achieved a remarkable degree of realism when they wanted to – even astounding Antoine with Charles Vildrac's *Le Pacquebot S.S. Tenacity* (1920), in which a few tables, chairs and bottles were enough to create the ambience of a seamen's café in a harbour.

As a director, Copeau was renowned both for his fidelity to text and for his ability to train and develop actors. He employed an 'organic' approach, aiming to discern what the written text demanded of the actor. He came to improvisation in an interesting way. Copeau believed in ensemble acting. He believed deeply in truth on the stage. But he also believed in liberating the physical and vocal creativity of the actor. Acting in Paris in 1920 was still dominated by two highly contrasted schools: broadly, the classical (exemplified by the Comédie Française) and the naturalistic (Antoine's Théâtre Libre). The 'classicists' over-elaborated the text, using it as a vehicle for displays of virtuosity. The 'naturalists' stripped away the beauty of the text, 'deflating' it (in Saint-Denis's terms) and losing touch with the actor's essential theatricality.

So this great lover of the text resolved, for a time, to take away the text from his actors – to withhold it from them – in order to force them to rediscover the essentials of the craft of acting. He had no real idea, at first, of how to achieve his aims. It is possible that he was as 'thrown' by the withdrawal of the script as his students. But he had intuition and remarkable teaching skills (complemented by those of Suzanne Bing, his best actress), and he was a great risk-taker. He knew where the work should start; that was enough:

Therefore in his teaching Copeau temporarily withdrew the use of texts and made the study of the expressiveness of the body – Improvisation – his point of departure. He led all the work in an empiric fashion, guided by experience, observation and experiment. With the support of his collaborators in various fields, he invented exercises with many progressions and developments. (Saint-Denis 1982: 32)

Copeau and Bing developed a hierarchy running from immobility and silence through movement to sound and finally to words and text (Felner 1985: 38). This underpinned much of his work, particularly with mask, which Copeau regarded as of great importance:

The departure point of expressivity: the state of rest, of calm, of relaxation, of silence, or of simplicity ... this affects spoken interpretation as well as playing an action ... An actor must know how to be silent,

to listen, to respond, to stay still, to begin an action, to develop it, and to return to silence and immobility. (Copeau 1955: 47–53)

This is the first expression of the central concept of *neutrality*, to which we shall return in Parts 2 and 3. This work on neutrality included what Bing called ‘pre-formation of the expressive idea’, a phrase which suggests strong parallels with the later work of Eugenio Barba on ‘pre-expressivity’.

The scenic innovations represent one aspect of Copeau’s genius. The other was his ability to teach actors. Many of his early collaborators later went on to become teachers of drama in their own right, especially Suzanne Bing, Charles Dullin, Louis Jouvet and, of course, Michel Saint-Denis. Their influence upon drama, in France and beyond, is incalculable. Suzanne Bing taught drama games, animal mimicry, mask work and mime. (She taught Etienne Decroux, who later taught Marcel Marceau.) Dullin founded L’Atelier, where Decroux also taught. Among their pupils were Jean-Louis Barrault and, briefly, Antonin Artaud. Both Jean Dasté and Barrault contributed to the teaching of Jacques Lecoq. Jouvet, Copeau’s greatest actor in the early days, founded a company at the Théâtre des Champs-Élysées and later became a professor at the Paris Conservatoire, as well as a resident director of the Comédie Française. Michel Saint-Denis was responsible for founding no fewer than five major drama schools, two in London, the others in Strasbourg, New York and Montreal: Jerzy Grotowski referred to Saint-Denis as his ‘spiritual father’.

Already in 1913, Copeau had dreamed of a new type of theatre school alongside the Vieux-Colombier theatre. He felt that actors were ‘the enemy of the theatre’. More precisely, the enemy was *cabotinage* – we might translate it as ‘ham’ but it also implies a kind of clinging to habits of thought and action. The *cabotin* is fundamentally uncomfortable on the stage: he looks for things to do, for ‘business’ to hide behind (Rudlin 1986: 45).⁸

Jacques Lecoq – a spiritual descendant of Copeau – taught clowning at his Paris school. The centre of this work is learning how to be at home on the stage – even when the clown has nothing to fall back on except himself, his audience and what can be created between them in the moment of performance. Sending the clown out to amuse an audience, armed with absolutely nothing (no ‘gags’, no jokes, no script, perhaps not even speech) is a way of ‘de-cabotinising’ the student actor.

By 1916, Copeau had sketched out the prospectus of his ideal training establishment, and the school itself opened its doors in 1921. The prospectus is worth describing.

1. *Rhythmic gymnastics*. Based on the eurhythmics of Jaques-Dalcroze. (Later Copeau revised his opinion of this type of work.)
2. *Gymnastic technique*. Breathing exercises, sport, fencing, athletics. The aim was total possession by the actor of his physical resources. Copeau based much of this work on Georges Hébert's *L'Education Physique de l'entraînement complet par la méthode naturelle* – a series of books that revolutionised the French system of physical education. Copeau used Hébert's methods as ways of developing the *play instinct* through physical ability and instinctive action (see also, on Lecoq, Chapter 3, pp. 68–76 below).
3. *Acrobatics and feats of dexterity*. To give the actor suppleness as well as strength. Ideally taught by a clown, and of great use in comedy and farce work. (Copeau was impressed by circus clowns; he invited the Fratellini Brothers to teach at the school.)
4. *Dance*.
5. *Singing*.
6. *Musical training*. The actors were to be taught at least the basic skills of playing various instruments.
7. *General instruction*. For two hours a day, the children of the school (for Copeau believed that the future would lie with those brought up under this method rather than those retrained in it) would have academic studies. The adults would develop their cultural awareness through seminars and by conversation with artists and writers.
8. *Games*. Copeau and Suzanne Bing were perhaps the first drama teachers to recognise the value of *games* work (discussed further in Part 2). They recognised that children learn through play, and that the responses of play are natural and authentic. Copeau speaks here not of a system but of an 'experiential education'. He writes, 'Somewhere along the line of improvised play, playful improvisation, improvised drama, real drama, new and fresh, will appear before us. And these children, whose teachers we think we are, will, without doubt, be ours one day.'
9. *Reading out loud*. Copeau was a brilliant reader. He felt it was vital to inculcate in his students the ability to respond to a text immediately and fully; to be able to vocalise a text at sight required quickness and flexibility of mind as well as voice.
10. *Recital of poetry*.
11. *Study of the repertoire* (which, of course, meant mainly the French classical repertoire).
12. *Improvisation* (see below).

To this list Copeau added mask and mime work and (after a discussion with Craig) study of the technical crafts of the theatre. The Vieux-Colombier School operated from 1921 to 1924. Much of what is envisaged in this prospectus could not immediately be realised, but there was enough success eventually to move Copeau to close the theatre in order to concentrate on the laboratory work of training.

The prospectus of the second year, as taught by Copeau and Bing (and with movement directed by one Lt Georges Hébert himself), lays out the whole programme – not just for the Vieux-Colombier actors but in embryo the entirety of subsequent improvisation and impro-based training.

Dramatic training ... cultivation of spontaneity and invention in the adolescent. Storytelling, games to sharpen the mind, improvisation, impromptu dialogue, mimicry, mask work. ... (Rudlin and Paul 1990: 43)

On improvisation, Copeau wrote in the same 1916 prospectus:

Improvisation is an art that has to be learned ... The art of improvising is not just a gift. It is acquired and perfected by study ... And that is why, not just content to have recourse to improvisation as an exercise towards the renovation of classical comedy, we will push the experiment further and try to give re-birth to a genre: the New Improvised Comedy, with modern characters and modern subjects. (Rudlin 1986: 44)

What Copeau envisaged in *la comédie nouvelle* was a twentieth-century revitalisation of the energy of *commedia dell'arte*. He understood that simply to re-create *commedia* was of no use: the masks, situations, *lazzi* of the Italian comedy belonged inextricably to their own time. Academic reconstruction was of use only as an aid to the generation of a New Improvised Comedy (as Rudlin translates it) – a new form for the present.

Copeau conceived of a company entirely devoted to such work. Each actor would develop and play one specific role, just as the performers of *commedia* had. At first, Copeau himself would be the wellspring of the work, providing scenarios and training. But, gradually, the new characters – the new masks – would become independent of him:

Choose from the company the six or eight actors most appropriate to such an enterprise, the ones with the most go in them, the most self-confident, and the best assorted ensemble – who would henceforth

dedicate themselves almost entirely to improvisation. A genuine brotherhood: the *farceurs* of the Vieux-Colombier. Each actor would light upon a single character from this new *commedia*. He would make it his own property. He would feed it. Fatten it from the substance of his own being, identify with it, think of it at all times, live with it, giving things to it, not only from his own personality, external mannerisms and physical peculiarities, but also from his own ways of feeling, of thinking, his temperament, his outlook, his experience, letting it profit from his reading, as well as growing and changing with him. (cited in Rudlin 1986: 96)⁹

The attempts to put this dream of a twentieth-century *commedia* into practice were, unfortunately, beset by apparently insuperable difficulties.¹⁰ Where could he find such a troupe, willing to make the act of dedication he envisaged? What sort of character types would so vividly encapsulate the preoccupations of the twentieth century as Arlecchino, Pantalone and Pulcinella had those of the sixteenth? What should the scenarios be about? Copeau didn't know – but he was willing to find out.

There were willing actors, too, among them Jean Dasté, Aman Maistre, Suzanne Bing, Jean Villard, Léon Chancerel, Auguste Boverio, Copeau's children Pascal and Marie-Hélène and his nephew Michel Saint-Denis. In 1924 Copeau relinquished the Vieux-Colombier and withdrew with a dedicated group of actors (affectionately nicknamed *les Copiaus*, or 'Little Copeaus', by the locals) to Pernand-Vergelesses, a village near Beaune in Burgundy. There, for the next five years, he based his work in an old *cuvierie*, or store for wine vats.

The work was developmental, ranging from the austere discipline of *Noh* drama, singing, dance, mime and acrobatics to comic improvisation, *commedia* work and, later, character improvisations with and without masks. Shows were devised for the region (e.g., a play based on the labour of the vineyard worker, performed before 2,000 such workers in the village of Nuits Saint-Georges after the wine harvest).

Our comic improvisations were instantly accepted by this audience. Because there was never any barrier between players and audiences, the spectators sensed how much they influenced the actors, how they could affect their performances, indeed, how at times they could lift the actors to a rare degree of exhilaration. (Rudlin 1986: 26)

Throughout his work, from 1916 onwards, Copeau had been making notes towards the creation of *la comédie nouvelle*. Now it was possible to

attempt it with the *Copiaux*. They worked in 1925 on classical *commedia*: Jean Dasté (Copeau's son-in-law) played Arlequin; Copeau himself played Pantalón; Jean Villard worked on Pedrolino; and Léon Chancerel worked on the Doctor. The group did evolve new, personalised characters, too. Chancerel developed the Mask of 'Sebastien Congr ' ('archivist, timid paleographer, molly-coddled and ridiculous'). Jean Dast  created 'C sar' ('an old "quacker" with a keen nose for business'). Suzanne Bing created 'C lestine'. Boverio invented 'Lord Quick' (a 'thoughtless, fat old man, who delighted in recalling his entire past life, both literary and worldly'). Michel Saint-Denis created the Masks of 'Jean Bourgignon' and 'Oscar Knie': he made the latter mask himself, by hand, and found it to be 'a violent character who made great demands on him and became a parasite on his own personality' and who both hated and was inseparable from 'C sar' (Rudlin 1986: 102–3; Rudlin and Paul 1990: 232).

The Burgundy period with *les Copiaux* came to an end in 1929. The ensemble had reached a point where, in Copeau's opinion, it needed to return to the mainstream of French theatre – though without him.

We could act, dance, sing, improvise in all kinds of ways, and, when necessary, write our own dialogue ... [We had] become an ensemble with a fertile imagination and the technical means to represent in our work many aspects and facets of the world. What we were lacking was, no doubt, a few more actors and, above all, a writer. (Saint-Denis 1982: 26–7)

Copeau's closure of the Vieux-Colombier was itself a kind of 'instinctive' rather than rational act, in order to 'start ... over again, [to] learn what we did not know, experiment with what we vaguely felt' (Rudlin and Paul 1990: 168–70).¹¹ The work at Pernand-Vergelesses served to bring the actors 'back to a na ve state ... their natural position before a world of possibilities where nothing is corrupted by habits of imitation, nor perverted by an acquired virtuosity' (*ibid.*).

Copeau encouraged the group to return to Paris. Michel Saint-Denis reformed *les Copiaux* into the Compagnie des Quinze and the work moved on to a different level. Devoted to physical expression still, the Compagnie des Quinze nonetheless wanted to work with a writer. Basing themselves again at the rebuilt Vieux-Colombier, they continued to improvise,¹² but now in collaboration with the young Andr  Obey. Together, they continued to evolve theatrical languages (including *grummelotage*, a mixture of real words, mime and silent improvisation derived from the study of *commedia* and popular theatre¹³). It was a creative tension between text and

improvisation, with the constant danger that one would overwhelm the other. Plays such as *Noah*, *Le Viol de Lucrèce* and *Don Juan*, however, showed that the collaboration could succeed brilliantly.

From 1931 to 1934 the Compagnie des Quinze took Europe by storm. In Paris, though, the Vieux-Colombier was still regarded as an ‘art house’, distrusted by the traditionalists and (perhaps) not radical enough for the modernists. The company tried to repeat Copeau’s experiments by retreating again to the country – this time to Aix-en-Provence. Within six months the company had disbanded, defeated by financial pressures and the strain of communal living.

But Copeau’s vision of *le tréteau nu* had been realised. The experiments of the years 1920–34 had demonstrated that a way back to the simple power of the medieval trestle-stage was possible and that community drama based on improvisation could succeed where the sophisticated classics had failed, and had proved beyond doubt that improvisation itself could form the basis of a system of training that could reinvigorate and revitalise the whole craft of acting.

Some of the principal elements of Copeau’s theory and practice can be summarised as follows:

1. Much of Copeau’s work was directed not immediately towards performance, but towards *readiness for performance*, as an underlying educational and developmental goal for himself and his actors.
2. The company learned (with lots of ups and downs) about working for each other, functioning – even living – as a group (with, ideally, no emphasis on ‘stars’). Copeau himself learned as he went along; his directing included large elements of responsiveness, intuition and adaptation. The principles of change and involvement in a process were more important than the need to conclude or arrive at a finished product.
3. Improvisation operated within the context of games, mime and mask work, *commedia* and so on, and could develop along with any of these towards new forms of theatre. Copeau started by using text-related improvisations but later developed a freer and more eclectic use of text in the search for *comédie nouvelle*.
4. Copeau’s subsequent concern with theatre-as-communion can be seen retrospectively to illuminate much of his career, from sincere and passionate critic of sterility, via the function of *patron* of a group enterprise culminating in community-rooted performance, to identification of theatre as a shared creative act with para-theatrical significance for individual and society.

It is no exaggeration to say that practically every major initiative in modern theatre can trace its lineage back to Copeau in some degree. His influence is subtle and often very tenuous, but it persists. He worked at some time with virtually every major figure in the French theatre of his day, and his students and collaborators have spread that influence to succeeding generations. The Theatre Guild and the Group Theatre in America acknowledged his influence. Most of the major British actors of the late 1930s onwards worked with Saint-Denis. And, most important, Copeau and Bing's initiatives still permeate (often without conscious realisation) drama training at all levels (see 'Genealogy of Modern French Mime', in Felner 1985: 49).

Improvisation and 'traditional' theatre training

The decision of the Compagnie des Quinze to work with a writer seems in retrospect an almost symbolic act, representing a shift of emphasis – a movement from improvised back towards scripted drama. The collaboration of Saint-Denis's troupe with André Obey seems to symbolise a particular reaccommodation of the script-based play.

Of course, neither Copeau nor Saint-Denis had any desire to abandon the written play permanently. What was important about Copeau's experimentation was the creation of a new type of *performer*, out of which a new type of drama might one day emerge. It was a way of renovating the classical drama from within, rather than an abandonment of it. As Rudlin puts it, 'Actors of *parts* are sustained by a dramatic illusion of which they are part; performers of *plays* by a nothing-to-hide, open contact with the spectator' (Rudlin 1986: 60).

The relationship with Obey was a step towards that new openness, a true collaboration of creative performers with a sensitive and gifted playwright rather than a resubmission of the actors to the text. The collaboration showed that there was, indeed, a new way to create plays.

But the return to the Vieux-Colombier with Obey marks the reincorporation of improvisation into traditional forms of play-making. Improvisation becomes just one of the many means of theatre, valuable certainly as a process which develops the actor, and which the actor and writer may use explicitly to develop the final play, but no longer the primary method of creativity.

And that is what, basically, improvisation has remained for 'mainstream' theatre, under the pressures of time, the constraints of economic resources and the fear of failure. In the UK, neither the National Theatre (which has offered workshops on improvisation) nor the Royal Shakespeare Company,

nor any of the major subsidised repertory theatres has ever mounted a fully improvised show. (Plays created by improvisatory means are a different matter.)¹⁴

One cause may lie in the *training* of actors and directors, who have been taught to regard improvisation only for its developmental value in actor training and for its occasional usefulness in the rehearsal situation. Virtually all modern drama schools, in varying degrees, use improvisation (just as they might use games, mask work, mime and so on) in the training of actors. In this they follow, consciously or unconsciously, the precepts of Michel Saint-Denis. After the collapse of the Compagnie des Quinze, he was responsible for the development of no fewer than five major drama schools. He set up the London Theatre Studio in Islington (1935–9), his experiences at the LTS and later in teaching or planning for the Old Vic Theatre School (1947–52), L'École Supérieure d'Art Dramatique, Strasbourg (1952–7), the National Theatre School of Canada (1960) and the Julliard School Drama Division, New York (from 1968) all laid down what we might call the 'invisible curriculum' of most drama schools in Europe and America with regard to improvisation.

Saint-Denis's principle for training was to 'stimulate the initiative and invention of the future interpreter by making him pass through the experiences of the actor-creator' (Saint-Denis 1982: 81–2). The search would be for the performer who could more successfully interpret a text than evolve one; and many of the students were, indeed, professional actors, already fixed in their habits of work and thought.

Accordingly, the training programme was primarily based on improvisation work. But now Saint-Denis added 'a carefully selected group of Stanislavsky's exercises: those which would not lead our actors to an excessively subjective concentration which might prove detrimental in acting a classical role' (1982: 48).

His own *ideal* four-year curriculum – which he describes in *Training for the Theatre* (88–99) – is very clear on the relationship of improvised work to formal rehearsal of plays. The first year is largely improvisatory, with no public performances. This is the 'Discovery Year'. Mask work, observation, transformation and solo and group non-verbal improvisation are stressed. But in the last term of the second year (called 'Transformation Year') we find that the Improvisation work is to cease to give more time to the Interpretational work – specifically a Chekhov play. In the third ('Interpretation') year, Improvisation work is suspended altogether (except for two weeks in the middle term on preparatory exercises in the Restoration style). He splits his curriculum throughout into two groupings: 'Technique' and 'Imagination'. Both Improvisation and Interpretation

come under 'Imagination'. By the middle of the course, then, the imagination is entirely given over to interpretative rather than purely creative work. Improvisation has become the servant of interpretation. In the final ('Performing') year there is 'no improvisation work, unless something special is needed for the rehearsal projects for the repertory season or unless there is opportunity to offer a unique master class' (98).

The drama school curriculum is clearly designed to 'produce' actors and, in their final year, present them to potential employers in a series of public 'coming out ceremonies' (the 'showcase'). Improvisation in this context is one of the tools by which 'an actor prepares' for the job.

The two main uses of improvisation in traditional drama (including drama training), then, are (a) to do with the exploration of a character's inner nature and the accommodation of that nature to the actor's own, and (b) the further exploration of character within situations which extend beyond those contained within the play.

The director may set up an improvised situation in order to let the actors discover what they themselves, as human beings, might do or feel in such circumstances. The actors gain insight into the circumstances with which the characters in the play have to contend, and their responses become more authentic as a result. The actors can draw upon their own vicarious experiences at difficult moments in the performance.

Or it may be that an actor will use 'improvs' to explore his assumed character in situations outside those explored in the play. An actor may ask, 'What is my character like when he is alone? when he is with his friends? his boss?' Out of this kind of work the actor may build up a wealth of small, circumstantial details – how his or her character walks, talks, drinks and handles props. In rehearsal this work is developed and crystallized through the use of the well-known 'hot-seating' technique, where a character is interrogated by other cast members and has to stay in role while replying. In performance these details will inform his or her playing and lend it credibility. It will be nearer the truth since it depends upon experiential discovery via the body of the actor rather than upon imposed externals.

In developing the 'reality of character', Stanislavsky was concerned with 'inner truth': the performer needs to develop emotional and physical resources which clearly are his or her own, even though they are used to invite empathy with (or in Brecht's view, to signal) some specific or typical behaviour patterns which constitute a fictitious character to be 'read' by the spectators. Saint-Denis paraphrases it thus: 'It is only from within himself [i.e. the actor], and through physical actions inspired by or drawn from his own inner resources, that the character can be realised' (1982: 82).

This realisation has to be coherent, not a matter of bits and pieces stuck on (a collage of a style of walking, a tone of voice, an accent); even Brecht, who was not concerned with all-round characterisation, demanded a complete *Gestus*. Saint-Denis sees it emerging from an alternation between this 'subjective' work on oneself and a more 'objective' understanding, via the text, of the role. Balance between 'reality of self' and 'reality of role' is an important basis *either* for mainstream acting or for more exploratory and ultimately extra-theatrical work. The essentials of improvisation can underpin both strands, and it is only the difference of focus which separates them. Ultimately, theatre is a way of 'knowing ourselves' better, and improvisation energises that process, whatever channel it may take.

Many Conservatoires and Drama Schools now include on their staff a Meisner expert and very possibly a Lecoq expert, in addition to those who teach movement (Laban method, t'ai chi ch'uan) or work on psychokinetic preparation (Feldenkrais, Alexander technique). And audiences – and thus also potential trainees – have become accustomed to performance styles which work more overtly from the body, from rapid and daring interconnectivities and from the (apparently) more visceral and/or spontaneous – though of course these are in most instances the fruit of long rehearsal. These same trainees are likely (in the UK) to have at least some encounter with the work of companies like Frantic Assembly, Théâtre de Complicité, Propeller, Cheek By Jowl and others; they may well have participated in workshops given by members of these ensembles, since all professional theatre now almost inevitably includes – and requires to meet its financial needs – an extensive schools and/or community outreach mission. They are also more likely than in the previous century to have heard of or been able to participate in a site-specific or immersive theatre event like those created by Punchdrunk, offering more direct kinds of personalised experience to audience members. Rather than what we have described above (improvisation as a rehearsal tool for the still largely 'naturalistic' requirements of most paid acting work on stage, film and TV), the flavour of the improvisatory permeates much of this spectrum; it will inevitably continue to shape developments in training too.

In the USA, the main line of development of character work passes through Lee Strasberg, whose work we shall examine in detail below. In the UK, there is, however, one area in which improvisation and what we are here calling the 'traditional' theatre have formed a liaison in the field of play-creation. It brings together the concern for detailed and truthful characterisation as the basis of acting, the idea of the actor as part-creator of the work, the methods of improvisation and the traditional crafts of the playwright. The focus of this synthesis is the playwright and director Mike Leigh.

Improvisation and playwrighting: Mike Leigh

The son of a doctor, Mike Leigh was born in Salford in 1943 (Clements 1983: 7) and grew up ‘as a middle-class kid in a working-class area’, which gave him an ambivalent but deeply perceptive view of class relationships. He was also, as his play *Two Thousand Years* (2005) makes clear, born into a Jewish family, which stimulated questioning about identity. ‘All my films and plays have in one way or another dealt with identity ... Who is the real you, and who the persona defined by other people’s expectations or preconceptions?’ (Leigh 2006: v–vii). The negotiation of identity and role within ethnic, religious, national, historical, linguistic or regional contexts is thus fundamental to his interrogation of what makes up a ‘character’.

Leigh’s training at RADA included virtually no improvisation work. Improvisation was simply not a part of actor training at that time, even though innovative theatre directors such as Joan Littlewood and film directors such as John Cassavetes were using it quite commonly.

Two aspects of [Leigh’s RADA] training did make an impression ... He became fascinated by some exercises with the director James Roose-Evans, who employed a method derived from a visit to Lee Strasberg’s Actors Studio in New York. This was to do with expressing the inexpressible through the movement, and touching, of hands (Leigh has subsequently used this technique to allow actors to progress beyond the parameters of naturalistic improvisations). And he was touched, too, by one particular improvisation conducted by Peter Barkworth in which two talented students – Sheila Gish and Ian McShane – were separately briefed with incompatible information and then thrown together. (Coveney 1996: 61)

With hindsight, one can see the indirect influence of Strasberg and, even more importantly, the principle of separation: the isolating of the actors before allowing their fully developed *characters* to meet on stage or screen.

Leaving RADA in 1962, Leigh worked as an assistant stage manager and bit-part actor in films before enrolling in the pre-diploma course at Camberwell Art School. Sitting one day in the life-drawing class:

I suddenly realised what it had been that we hadn’t experienced as actors. In the life drawing class there were a dozen or fifteen kids and everyone was making a serious and original investigation into a

real experience. Nobody was doing a second-hand rendering of something. I began to think that acting could be creative in the same way that any artist is. (Clements 1983: 10)

Leigh was impressed by Beckett's ability to make his audience share his characters' time, to concentrate on the moment of performance itself, and by Peter Hall's work at the Royal Shakespeare Company, which allowed Brechtian values to creep into the English theatre. Hall also brought Saint-Denis and Peter Brook into the RSC, and Leigh saw much of the work being produced by them. Most interesting for us is Leigh's response to Peter Brook's 1964 RSC production of Weiss's *Marat-Sade*, in which the actors were asked to base their characterisations upon actual case histories of mental patients. When some of the rehearsals were broadcast on BBC Television's *Omnibus* arts programme, Leigh thought, 'If they can do all that, why don't they take it a stage further and make up a play?' (Clements 1983: 11).

So Leigh himself began to make up plays with young amateurs. The first of these, *The Box Play*, taught him a number of valuable lessons. Although the play was highly successful – it was fun to see and to perform, and its subject matter (a family of six living in a cage-like box in the middle of the stage) worked well as 'cartoon' – Leigh wasn't satisfied with it. He regarded it as 'force-bred' – the inexperienced actors had to be coached throughout the improvisations. He created parts for everyone who came to the rehearsals, and he describes the methods as being fairly arbitrary ('you're the dog; you're the dad; you're the mum – improvise'). Leigh felt that the work in this play and in subsequent workshops was too shallow.

His second play, *My Parents have Gone to Carlisle* (1966), established some of the basic principles which have guided his work ever since. The improvisations were kept private (to avoid the actors trying to 'perform' before they were ready). The play started from an event (a teenage party) to which the players could relate personally. The actors were encouraged to build up biographical details about their characters, and improvisation extended beyond the immediate situation of the play to look at those characters in other contexts. He drew the final play out of the 'real events' of the improvisations.

There remained the problem of the play's final organisation. The improvisations were realistic and truthful, but not very communicative. The natural tendency of such sensitive exploratory work without an audience is to be 'introspective and inaudible'. There is nothing wrong in this: the work is for the *actors'* benefit. But the transition from private to public had to be made, and Leigh felt the need to impose his own sense of order.

He shaped the final play out of the actors' work, but in order to do so he often had to work against the 'naturalism' of the rehearsals.

In 1967, Leigh joined the RSC as an assistant director. This allowed him to work with professional actors on *NENAA*. Here he realised that

if an improvised play was really to be a totally organic entity, genuinely evolved from characters and relationships, then I had been wrong in starting rehearsals ... by stating plot or theme and then 'filling it in' ... I saw that we must start off with a collection of totally unrelated characters (each one the specific creation of its actor) and then go through a process in which I must cause them to meet each other and build a network of real relationships; the play would have to be drawn from the results. (cited in Clements 1983: 15)

In some ways this type of work can be related to Copeau's experiments in the 1920s (though it merely echoes them unconsciously). The idea of a play evolving out of characters created by the actors is not so far from the ideals of *la comédie nouvelle*; though instead of *masks*, which the actors would develop throughout their lives, we have naturalistic *characters* evolved for the duration of a play's work period.

Leigh began rehearsals for *NENAA* by providing a series of receptacles, objects such as 'boxes, suitcases, egg-cups, a bucket, a coffin', and getting the actors to build characters suggested by one of the objects. This is analogous to mask work, responding to an object which gives the actor a starting point for improvisation. But, in Leigh's 'pre-rehearsals', where the actors work singly (and privately) with the director, the object (as in Stanislavsky's work) is to create the 'inner lives' as well as the external physical mannerisms of the characters. The job was then to structure situations in which the characters thus created could meet and interact. Finally, an overall situation had to evolve which would contain the action that developed between the characters. Between 1965 and 1969 Leigh created nine plays based on improvisational work. Until then (says Paul Clements in his book on Leigh, *The Improvised Play*) he still believed he would become a solitary playwright. It took him a long time fully to understand that working via improvisation was a way of being a dramatist.

Mike Leigh *is* a playwright; all the more so, perhaps, in that his plays are wrought rather than written. He is a writer of plays in the other sense too; though his plays are written *on* and *with* his actors. The early choices are all his. He asks his actors to make lists of potential characters, but they may never know what has attracted him, what possibilities he has glimpsed for future developments or why he has chosen one character for them to

work on rather than another. The process of keeping the actors apart from one another until the characters have been formed is directly analogous to the mental compartmentalisation of the more traditional writer of scripts. One level of the play is very privately developed and, while the actors are never puppets, they never really have access to that level of the composition. When they are brought together and begin to interact, many of the fundamental choices will already have been made. The possibilities will have been narrowed down. The future pattern will not be predictable but its shapes will have been conditioned by Leigh.

The plays themselves are 'traditional' in two senses: first, in that Leigh has said he is not interested in 'happenings' and they are therefore not improvised in performance (although one knows that the depth of characterisation is such that, if anything accidental were to happen during performance, the actors would be able to accept and incorporate it *in character*); second, in that the result is always a tightly crafted and (usually, apparently) naturalistic drama.

In Leigh's best-known early works (the play and film *Bleak Moments* (1970–1), the film *High Hopes* (1989), and his published plays *Abigail's Party* (1977) and *Goose Pimples* (1981)) this is quite obvious – as the 'finished' and 'published' versions of the original performances make clear. The publication of the playscripts of these works, which were 'evolved from scratch entirely by rehearsal through improvisation' (Leigh 1983: 7), reaffirms Leigh's status as a 'traditional' playwright. The plays can be (and are) performed by actors other than their original creators without recourse to further improvisation.

At the time of Leigh's breakthrough success with *Abigail's Party* at Hampstead, the critic Sheridan Morley discussed Leigh's early career in more detail. By the time of *Abigail*, he points out, Leigh had already been responsible for over thirty plays in the previous ten years, many of them devised and improvised. The method had been established carefully, and by working with many actors in many types of theatre. Leigh himself was keen to stress that *Abigail's Party* had a socially critical *raison d'être*, and his conception of improvisation in the making of these works is rigorous and demanding in the extreme:

[A]s soon as you start talking about improvisation people expect anarchy: in fact our objectives ... the things we wanted to say about these people and their social habits and surroundings, remained rock solid from the very first: only the surface text is flexible. (Morley 1977)

Mike Leigh's influence has spread: actors and actresses he has worked with have gone on to direct in their own right (Les Blair was in *The Box Play*

right at the beginning; Mike Bradwell, the founder of Hull Truck, played Norman in *Bleak Moments*; Sheila Kelley was in *Babies Grow Old*, *Nuts in May*, *Ecstasy* and *Home Sweet Home*). Sara Pia Anderson and Phil Young are other deviser-directors who have essayed play creation in the improvised style after Leigh.

Paul Clements, however, makes the very telling point that it was not until after Phil Young's *Crystal Clear* in 1982 (televised by the BBC in 1988) that any major drama critic explicitly acknowledged that

improvised plays are just as much plays as any other kind ... Indeed the tendency with improvised plays appears to be towards a much higher degree of accuracy in characterisation than with the average pre-conceived authorial script. (Clements 1983: 57)

And the general critical tendency is still to regard the improvised play as somehow too 'loose', too 'unfinished', perhaps as not 'a real play' at all. Leigh's works are certainly 'real plays'. They are created experientially. They are based upon observation. They are authentic, carefully crafted and detailed examinations of character and social environment. They are drawn from life – 'serious and original investigations into real experiences', the crucial discovery of the Camberwell art classes applied to the theatre – but they are also shaped and purposive events, poetic and symbolic statements about the ways in which human beings live and relate and fail. Leigh and those who have collaborated with or learned from him have shown that improvisation need no longer be just a rehearsal device of the drama schools. With Leigh's plays (and equally his films, which are created by the same rigorous methods), improvisation has become the source and means of dramatic creation itself.

It was clear, even as we prepared the first edition of this book in 1990, that Mike Leigh had virtually ceased to work in the theatre. He had gradually been drawn into the ambit first of the television drama and then the pure film, although he continued to use his remarkable improvisatory techniques in much the same way in the new media.¹⁵

Improvisation in cinema is a study beyond our present scope (perhaps needing a companion volume!), but brief reference should be made here to those genres and pioneers whose influence can be detected in Leigh's cinematic work. Chief among these are the 1950s British 'Free Cinema' experiments – with hand-held cameras, improvisatory acting and documentary social-realist subject matter – of directors such as Lindsay Anderson, Karel Reisz, Tony Richardson and Lorenza Mazzetti,¹⁶ which prefigured the British 'New Wave' films of the 1960s; and the American

movies of John Cassavetes, perhaps problematically described as ‘improvised’ films.

Cassavetes (1929–89), a New York Method-trained actor, screenwriter and director, working chiefly with his wife Gena Rowlands, Peter Falk and Ben Gazzara, made and appeared in many films, over some of which he had full artistic control. These films are legendary for being made ‘outside the system’, often on 16 mm stock and on minimal budgets. In fact, as Ray Carney’s detailed critical studies of Cassavetes’s work have shown (Carney 1994, *passim*, 2001, *passim*) the improvised elements in them are quite circumscribed. It can be quite hard for a low-budget film to allow much improvisation, because it wastes film stock and costs time, and time is always money. The claim blazoned across the screen at the end of *Shadows* (1959) – that ‘the film you have just seen was an improvisation’ – should perhaps be taken under advisement.

In 1960, the film played to sell-out audiences in New York, Venice and London, where the Beat generation hailed it as a major breakthrough in film technique, and where its press material certainly fostered the idea that it was entirely improvised, and ‘grabbed’ from the New York streets rather than shot on a sound stage. Carney suggests that a largely improvised film (now known to scholars as the *Ur-Shadows*) was first made in 1957–8, previewed, largely rewritten (by Cassavetes and uncredited screenwriter Robert Alan Aurthur (1922–78)) and then re-shot: only about a third of the original film remained. Carney discovered a worn 16 mm print of the *Ur-Shadows* (and remains in dispute with Gena Rowlands over its authenticity and validity). In later films like *Faces* (1968), *Minnie and Moskowitz* (1971), *A Woman under the Influence* (1974, which Cassavetes originally wrote as a play, only filming it when Gena Rowlands persuaded him it would be too emotionally harrowing a central role to play night after night), *The Killing of a Chinese Bookie* (1976) and especially *Opening Night* (1977), the actors certainly improvised in rehearsal; but Cassavetes then scripted the films very tightly before shooting. In reality, Cassavetes himself – as screenwriter – was the principal improviser (which in no way detracts from his films’ impact or importance). The result is an always very coherent and carefully plotted piece of work.

Cassavetes’s own understanding of improvisation is filtered through the ideas of jazz. His various takes are riffs on the scene he is performing. This is wholly consistent with the Beat ethos: Allan Ginsberg claims that ‘the entire Beat literary movement was based ... on Kerouac’s estimate of be-bop as an improvised, spontaneous form’ (cit. Sargeant 2008: 10).

All film actors improvise to some extent. Takes can never be identical. Directors often encourage stars to explore the role on camera; some film

actors seem incapable of doing anything else. Directors like Martin Scorsese (who championed Cassavetes's work) and Mike Nichols (who began as an improviser himself, with Elaine May and Compass) are very likely to create improvisatory moments in shooting: stories like Nichols having Alan Arkin surreptitiously 'goosed' below the camera in order to film a shocked reaction on the actor's face in *Catch 22* abound. This is not the same as improvising a whole movie in the way that Leigh does. For this reason, critics like Amy Taubin rightly regard Leigh's 'lengthy, improvisory rehearsal methods' as 'more radical' than John Cassavetes's or Scorsese's. (Taubin 1993: 70; cit Watson 2004: 29).

Leigh's work in cinema, then, has a prehistory, of which he is fully aware. *Shadows* was one of the first films he saw on coming to London (Coveney 1996: 60); Anderson and Reisz were still major figures in the theatrical and cinematic scene during his formative years (and took an interest in his work). And Leigh, in turn, has an influence on successive generations of film-makers. His approach, forged in the theatre, has transferred fairly directly to the screen. Improvisation is still the main method used, and it is thoroughgoing. The films are worked out with, and 'written' through, the collaboration of a company of dedicated actors, who undergo a lengthy series of isolated exercises with Leigh before meeting and colliding for the camera. David Thewlis (who created 'Johnny' in Leigh's *Naked* 1993) explains that:

When you work with Mike, you take a source character, who is someone you know and you build the character on top of a real person. It's not an impersonation but it's inspired by a real person. Of course, for any character you draw on all sorts of people. In Johnny's behavior there's bits of my friends, my brother, my wife, an old girlfriend. At the same time Mike is tweaking the character, pushing me in certain directions and pulling me back, influenced, presumably, by people he knows. And that's how Mike directs in terms of creating a character who is neither me nor the original person but someone entirely new. (quoted in Watson 2004: 29)

Surprisingly 'one of Leigh's biggest worries is that audiences think the actors aren't acting at all' (Interview with Peter Brunette 1991, in Movshovitz 2000: 31). Leigh (speaking at the time of the film *Life is Sweet*) responded to this concern very carefully and with great determination to be understood:

These people aren't playing themselves, they're creating characterizations. I cast in a very empirical, instinctive way, partly because I work

with people who are known to be highly versatile character actors. Gradually we begin to bring into existence, really, the whole world of the characters . . . I really don't know where it's going. My job is to be inventing it, and as I do so, I begin to discover, to create the premise for the film.

But all of this is only preparatory, and the real meat and bones of the thing is what happens when the shoot starts. I write a structure that is very brief, like three pages. . . . And each scene is built and rehearsed on location and built up through lots of discussion and very thorough rehearsal until it's ready and then it gets shot. (*ibid.*)

So how, he was asked, if there is no pre-existing script (as there certainly was with Cassavetes) is the piece given shape? Does he at least know where the story is heading?

Yes and no – this is really the most elusive thing of all. Yes, certainly, a substantial part of it, but I also keep my options open, and, invariably, I really don't know how it's going to end. This is normal in dramatic writing: Anybody can do the end; it's getting the beginning and the middle set up that's the problem. If you've got everything else going in the right direction, then the end is there like a harvest to be plundered. (*ibid.*, 31–2)

But the fact of the actors' atomisation remains crucial to the process. The actors

don't actually know what I'm up to. In fact, the actors never know anything more about the whole thing than their characters do. . . . That's important, because it means that you really preserve those tensions and get the reality of the thing. (*ibid.*, 32)

Reality, as Peter Brunette points out, is central to Leigh's film work (and Watson, too, subtitles his book on Leigh, 'A Sense of the Real'). That three-dimensionality, the sense that the surface of the play or film is penetrable, and that we have somehow slipped through it into a world even more real than this one, underpins the work. Garry Watson follows Henry Krips's and Hal Foster's ideas that this penetration marks for an audience – especially those disturbed or made uncomfortable by the traumatic nature of the events relived and experienced – the irruption of the 'Lacanian Real'. That is to say, it creates 'a site of anxiety where the symbolic order [as defined by the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan – the linguistic, socially

created mediation of experience, as opposed to the “imaginary,” which is its prior non-linguistic aspect] breaks down’ (Watson 2004: 12, and cf. Krips 1999: 37; Foster 1996: 29). This rent in the fabric of the symbolic represents the ‘traumatic real’ and makes the immediate reception of the work highly problematic. Almost by definition (he argues, following Foster), avant-garde work requires to be viewed more than once: the symbolic order is not prepared for it, and the mind requires time to accommodate to it.

Leigh would perhaps find this too abstract – too ‘film studies’. Instead of Lacan’s inexpressible ‘Real’, he proposes a simpler notion of reality: that which surrounds us.

[W]e should aspire to the condition of documentary. By which I mean that when you shoot documentary, you do not question that the world you’re pointing a camera at actually exists in three dimensions and that it would exist whether you filmed it or not. And if we can aspire to that condition with what the actors are doing, so that it really is in three dimensions, and really does go around corners, then the bit that we actually see, the tip of the iceberg, is going to have that solidity to it. (Interview with Brunette, in Movshovitz 2000: 32)

The arrest of ‘Vera’ (played by Imelda Staunton) in the 2004 film *Vera Drake* came as a huge shock to the actors playing her family. They knew nothing at that stage of shooting about Vera’s occupation as a back-street abortionist, and their shock is registered on camera in precisely that documentary manner. Compare Thomas Vinterberg’s application of a similar technique in *Festen* (1998), the first successful Dogme film. Vinterberg had the company improvise on site (not on set, this being Dogme) for some weeks. The guests at Helge’s sixtieth birthday had genuinely grown to like their genial host. Once the (single, hand-held) camera was running, though, at the height of the festivities Helge’s estranged son, Christian, rose to make a formal speech of congratulation to his father. Instead, he spilled the beans about the incestuous rape that shattered his childhood and caused his sister’s suicide. The assembled actors (no less than their characters) greeted the revelation with stunned disbelief, even to the point of trying to carry on eating as if nothing had happened! In both of these scenes, what is revealed beneath the surface of the apparently real is a traumatic deeper reality, and does profoundly disturb. Our identification via the very banality of the representation – its ordinariness and its verisimilitude – leaves us unprepared for the incursion of a real against which we have no prepared defences and with which we, as receivers, now need to improvise.

There is an aspect of Leigh's work we have not discussed. This intense obtrusion of reality into the business of acting may be disturbing or destabilising for the performer as well as the viewer. Once the actors' scenes have been shot (remembering that, unlike plays, films are often performed out of sequence), there may be a necessity to complete the imaginary and often very emotional journey they have been asked to undertake: Leigh understands this need for what Schechner calls 'cool down' and allows for it. David Thewlis describes him spending a day after finishing *Naked* simply doing improvisations with the actress Lesley Sharp so that her character could come to terms with the rejection she had endured in the film (cit. Watson 2004: 29).

It is, therefore, possible to see Leigh's late work (from *Naked* onwards) as a clash of two 'reals': the observable, verifiable reality of the world around us, and the inexpressible Real that it conceals from us, apprehended by asking his actors to undergo a guided, self-revelatory process no less rigorous than Grotowski's.

Leigh has revisited the theatre on a number of occasions in recent years, and to popular and critical acclaim. Two new theatre pieces, *Two Thousand Years* (2005) and *Grief* (2011), were accompanied by a directorial foray which saw him revive *Ecstasy* at Hampstead (also 2011), where it had premiered in 1979, and later at the Duchess Theatre. The plays are now interspersed with the films (*Happy Go Lucky* 2008, *Another Year* 2010, *A Running Jump* 2012 short and *Mr Turner* 2014).

Two Thousand Years, self-described as his 'Jewish play', applies the original method of improvised creativity to the theme of the 'Jewish family' in its broadest sense. It encompasses the familial and domestic world of secular North London Jewry, and also explores the generational and political differences within the broader family – issues of religious fundamentalism, the struggles for Israeli independence from British rule and the current divisions over settlers' rights and the treatment of Israel's neighbours are all woven into the play's dense fabric.

All my films and plays have dealt in one way or another with identity. Who are you? What are you? Who is the real you, and who the persona defined by other people's expectations or preconceptions? *Secrets and Lies* was about a woman seeking the truth of her identity; *Vera Drake* told the story of the heroine's hidden life; *Abigail's Party* explored received notions of social behaviour; *Topsy-Turvy* was about reality and artifice; and *Naked* and *High Hopes* were each concerned, in quite different ways, with the conflict between what we are and how we live, with what we believe in. (Leigh 2006: v)

What better interrogation of identity could there be than the improvisational process, where everything is, and everything remains, provisional until it's ready to encounter the Other? Where every tentative statement about character is open to exploration, revision and confrontation until a credible persona emerges.

Index of Games and Exercises

Chapter 1

The Pattern Game 51

Chapter 3

Red Nose 72

Chapter 6

Draining exercise 146
 Opening the pelvis 147
 Warm-up games 147
 1-6 148
 Cat and Mouse 148
 Continuous stamping sequence 149
 Fight in the Dark (Pauper and Eunuch) 150
 What are you doing? 151
 Basic movement exercises 152
 Basic Laban parameters 152
 Cube 152
 Kinesphere 152
 Circles of Attention 153
 Grasp (Empty Space) 154
 Current of energy 154
 Starfish 155
 Backward roll 155
 Écllosion 155
 Undulation 156
 Walk, Clap, Freeze 156
 One-word improvisation 157
 Song and Dance 157
 Observe-evaluate-react 160

Chapter 7

Telling a story by turns 163
 Body shapes 163
 Sculptor and Clay 163
 Trust circle 164
 Glass Cobra 164
 Making a Machine 164
 Laughing Snake 165
 Rhythmic weave 165
 Sun and Moon 166
 Group clap 166
 Concert 166
 Jets and Sharks 166

Making Contact 167
 Ball in the air 167
 Chair game 167
 Mime-stick 168
 Door-way 169
 Wrong room 169
 Meetings and greetings 170
 Meeting the object 171
 Columbian Hypnosis 171
 Blind leading 171
 Yes / Yes, but 173
 Gibberish talk 173

Chapter 8

Mime journey 174
 Passage through the elements 174
 Moulding, flowing, flying, radiating 175
 Moving and freezing 176
 Mirroring 176
 Pair work 176
 Vary the tense 177
 Vary the person 177
 Affective memory 179
 Hot-seating 179
 Status transactions 180
 Great Game of Power 180
 Status relationships 181
 Status for creative writers 181
 Master-Servant 181
 Neutral mask 183
 Waking up 183
 Farewell to the Boat 183
 Neutral Body 184
 Expressive mask 185
 Countermask 186
 Nested masks 186
 Commedia 187
 Bird of paradise 188
 Larval mask 190
 Coathangers 191
 Clown (red nose) 191, 72
 Learning objectives (Eldridge) 194
 Ground rules for mask improvisation (Eldridge) 194

- Relationship of parts 195
 Dimensions 195
 Vectors 196
 Rhythms 196
 Change direction with punctuation 196
 Atmospheres 196
- Chapter 9**
- Who/Where/What 197
 Resistance 199
 Imaginary physical circumstances 199
 Interrupted routine 199
 Frozen image 200
 Dynamisation 200
- Point of Concentration (POC) / Focus 200
 Theme-Scene 201
 Memory games 202
 Magic If 204
 Previous circumstances 204
 Invisible others 206
 Free association 206
 Reincorporation / Callback 207
 Trampoline words 208
 The Bears Are Coming! 209
 Slowmo Race 209
 Complete the image 209
- Sample sequences (Table 9.1) 210–12

General Index

- 1789 76
 Abbott, John xxv
Abigail's Party 30, 36, 249 (n.15)
abhinaya 125
 Abhinaya Theatre Company 139
Absinthe 220
 accident xvi, xx, 30, 84, 87, 240, 253 (n.14)
Accidental Death of An Anarchist 78–9
 active meanings xvii, 10, 71, 84, 144, 200, 212, 228, 232–3, 258 (n.3)
 Actors Studio 27, 40–2, 44
 Adler, Stella 10, 40
Adventure on New Year's Eve 11
Aesthetic Letters 71
Aesthetics of the Oppressed 102, 146
 affective memory (*and see* emotional recall) 6, 10, 70, 179, 196
 Africa xiv, 1, 5, 55, 111, 113, 115, 129, 133, 137, 139–40, 229, 238, 241, 243, 255 (n.7)
Age d'or, L' 76
 Agop, Güllü 134
Akropolis 87, 254 (n.3)
 Albahaca, Elizabeth 86
 Alda, Alan 47
 Alderman, Naomi 251 (n. 8)
 Alexander, Andrew 48, 54
 Alexander, F.M. 15, 26, 110, 145–6, 225, 255 (n.1)
 Alexandrinsky Theatre 11
 Alfreds, Mike 208, 245–6
 Alk, Howard 46
 Allain, Paul 129, 149
 Altered States of Consciousness (ASCs) xiv, 51–2, 92
 alternative drama 1, 11, 121
 Althusser, Louis 221
 American Laboratory Theatre 39
An Actor Prepares 8–9, 153
 And, Metin 132, 134
 Andersen, Dana 53, 250 (n. 6)
Andersen's Dream 239
 Anderson, Lindsay 31, 33, 249 (n. 16)
 Anderson, Sara Pia 31
 Animo 232
 Annoyance, The 54
Another Year 36, 249 (n.15)
 Antoine, André 14, 16
apartheid 140, 238, 241, 243, 255 (n. 10)
 Apidan Theatre 141
Apocalypsis cum Figuris 87
apophasis 244
 Appia, Adolphe 14, 255 (n.1)
 applied improvisation 9, 38, 42, 141, 204–5, 210, 241
 Arab world 115–7, 131–2, 134
Arabian Nights 62, 208
 Arcola Theatre 249 (n. 14)
 Aristotle xviii
 Arkin, Alan 33, 47
 Arlecchino xx, 20, 187, 189
 Artaud, Antonin xvii, 5, 17, 72, 87, 89, 96, 225, 253 (n. 14)
 Asner, Edward 45
 Association Travail et Culture 68
 Atatürk, Kemal 134, 255 (n. 6)
 attention xix, xxiii, 6, 50, 126, 143, 148, 150, 153–4, 169–70, 176, 189, 197, 200, 202, 211, 224
Audience Participation in Theatre: Aesthetics of the Invitation 104
 audience participation/suggestion 44, 46, 59–60, 67, 79, 90–1, 101, 106–7, 121, 126, 130, 132, 138, 207, 229, 231, 239–41, 251 (n. 1), 254 (n. 3)
 audience-led improvisation xii, 40, 44, 46–8, 50–1, 55–7, 61, 103, 113, 233
 Aurthur, Robert Alan 32
auto-cours 68–9, 252 (n. 5)
autokabdaloj xviii
 Auxiliary Egos, in Psychodrama 95, 97
 Avner the Eccentric (Avner Rosenberg) 74
 Awareness Through Movement 146
 Aykroyd, Dan 47
 Azama, Michel 237
 Azerbaijan 135
 Babbage, Frances x, 101, 195, 209, 240
 BABEL 106

- Babies Grow Old* 31
 Badiou, Alain 103, 225
 Bailey, Brett 140, 229
 Baker, Bobby 66
 Bakhtin, Mikhail xix, 93, 136, 232, 247
 (n. 5)
balaganschik 12, 77
 balance xvii, 92, 109, 129–30, 143, 145,
 148–51, 155, 174, 184, 203, 210, 212,
 222–3
 Bali xvii, 126–7, 148, 178, 193
 Balkans 115
 Barba, Eugenio xii, xx–xxi, 3, 17, 62, 70,
 87, 92, 124–5, 129–30, 148–9, 158,
 161, 176, 203, 221, 239–40, 244–5
 Barber, Karen 137–9, 255 (n. 9)
 Barbican, the 249 (n. 14)
 Bardhan, Gul 221
 Barker, Clive x, xiv, xxii–xxiii, 44, 100,
 146–7, 149, 159, 170, 176–7, 182,
 195, 205, 257 (n. 11)
 Barkworth, Peter 27
 Barrault, Jean-Louis 17
 Barthes, Roland 258 (n. 1)
 Basque 115–6,
 Bateson, Gregory 51
 Battersea Arts Centre 249 (n. 14)
battute xx
 Beacon Hill 94–5, 97
 Beck, Julian 221, 253 (n. 1)
 Beckett, Samuel xxii, 5, 28, 65–6,
 73–4, 179, 225, 244
 Beijing Opera 125
 Bel, Jérôme 66
 belly dancing 114–5
 Belushi, John 47, 50
 Benavente, Jacinto 6
 Benda, Władysław Teodor 185–6, 256
 (n. 4)
 Bengaluru (Bangalore) 118
 Benin 137
 Benison, Ben 62
 Beresford, Steve 121
 Bergman, John 257 (n. 11)
 Bergner, Elizabeth 93–4, 254
 (nn. 6, 7, 8)
 Berkoff, Steven 74
 Berlusconi, Silvio 82
 Berman, Shelley 47
 Berry, Cicely 196
bertso, bertsolaris, bertsolaritza 115–6,
 266
 Bhabha, Homi 141
bhagavata 138, 173
 Billington, Michael 247 (n. 6)
 Bing, Suzanne 14–21, 23, 43, 86, 146,
 184, 247 (n. 5), 255 (n. 1)
 bio-mechanics 12
bios 124, 158
 Black Rainbow 118
 Blair, Les 30
Bleak Moments 30–1,
 blocking 144, 172–3, 197, 211–2, 215,
 228, 236
 Boal, Augusto x, xii, xiv, xxi, xxiii, 5, 45,
 51, 95–7, 99–103, 108, 110, 146, 157,
 159, 163–4, 171, 180, 195, 200, 205,
 209, 218, 221, 240–1, 243, 254 (n.
 11), 256 (n. 2)
 body/think 143, 148–9, 152, 210, 230
 Bogart, Anne 112
 Boleslavsky, Richard 9, 39–40
 Bond, Edward 235
 Boston Toy Theatre 43
Bouffon, bouffonerie 75, 82, 247 (n. 5),
 253 (n. 13)
 Bourdieu, Pierre 103
 Bourriaud, Christian 66, 106
 Boverio, Auguste 20–1
Box Play, The 28, 30
 Boyd, Neva L. 43–4, 48, 50–2, 103, 146,
 195, 249 (n. 1)
 Bradwell, Mike 31
 Braun, Allan R. 120
 Bread and Puppet Theater 253 (n. 1), 256
 (n. 4)
 breathing 18, 84, 153–4, 175, 187, 227
 Brecht, Bertolt 8, 25–6, 45, 48, 68, 74,
 89, 95, 99, 102, 176–7, 187, 189, 245,
 258 (n. 4)
 Brechtian 28, 45, 84, 89, 121–2, 159,
 226, 256 (n. 7)
 Brighella xx
 Brith Gof 104
 British Council 249 (n. 14)
Brixham Regatta 62
 Brook, Peter 28, 74, 76, 102, 131, 135–6,
 146
 Brookes, Sally 257 (n. 11)
 Browne, Maurice 43
 Brubeck, Dave 119
 Bruce, Lenny 47, 250 (n. 3)
 Brunette, Peter 33–5
 Buber, Martin 83
 Buckland, Andrew 140
 Buddhist 125, 176, 231, 258 (n. 4)
 Buenaventura, Enrique 102, 195, 200
Building a Character 8
 Burgundy 15, 20–1
 Butoh 104, 109, 111

- cabaret 45, 241
cabotin, cabotinage 12, 15, 17, 77, 81, 248
 (n. 8)
 Cage, John 110, 121
 callback *see also* reincorporation 52
 Callery, Dymphna xiv, xxiii–xxiv, 146,
 159, 166, 191–2, 195, 197–8, 239–40,
 256 (n. 2), 257 (n. 11)
 ‘calling it on stage’ 55
 calypso 115–7
 Campbell, Ken 52–3, 89, 224
Can't Pay? Won't Pay! 78
 Canada 24, 48–9, 53, 63, 110
Canadian Improv Games 250 (n. 6)
canovaccio, canovacci xx, 82
canto a braccio 115
 Cantor, Eddie 249 (n. 1)
 Cape Town 140
 Cardinal Sins of Impro 169, 172
 Caribbean 115
 Carney, Ray 32
 Carnicke, Sharon 8, 247 (n. 3)
 carnival xix, 59, 82, 95, 106, 242
carpa 141
 Carreri, Roberta xx
 Cartoucherie, La 76
 Cassavetes, John 27, 32–4
Castell of Perseverance, The 247 (n. 4)
catharsis 95, 102
 Catra, I Nyoman 126
 ‘Célestine’ 21
 censor xviii, xxiv, 6, 47, 63, 115, 120,
 134, 136, 140, 173, 198, 206, 219–21,
 235, 257 (n. 2)
 ‘César’ 21
 Chamberlain, Franc 154, 166–7, 175–6,
 219, 259 (n. 7)
 Chancerel, Léon 20–1, 248 (n. 12)
chantwell, chantuelle 115
 character xv, xx, 4–6, 8–9, 11–12, 19–21,
 25–7, 27–37, 39–42, 47, 52, 56–7,
 59, 63, 67, 81–2, 88–9, 98, 100–101,
 113–4, 121, 126–8, 132–4, 136–8, 144,
 158–9, 166, 169–72, 177, 181–2, 184,
 186–7, 189, 191, 193, 195–9, 204–6,
 211, 213–4, 226, 234–7, 239, 248
 (n. 9), 255 (n. 3, n. 7, n. 8), 256
 (n. 3, n. 7)
 Charles, David Alfred 49, 94, 99, 141,
 153, 176, 224, 232, 241
 Cheek By Jowl 26
 Chekhov, Michael xii, xxii, 8–9, 12–3,
 39, 154, 166–7, 175–6, 189, 211, 226,
 234–5
 Chen, Tania 121
 Chicago xii, xxi, 38, 40, 42–50, 52, 54–5,
 59–60, 104, 113, 122, 128, 146, 207,
 249 (n. 1), 250 (n. 2, n. 6)
 Chicago Little Theatre 43
 Chichester Festival 249 (n. 14)
 China 8, 58, 124, 128, 150, 176
 Choudhury, Amit 139
 Christodora House 249 (n. 1)
 Chronegk, Ludwig 9
 Churchill, Caryl 237–8
 Cieślak, Ryszard 86, 91
 circus xxi, 7, 18, 73–4, 76, 239–40
 Cirque du Soleil xxi, 247 (n. 6), 252
 (n. 10)
 cirquish 252 n. 10
 Cixous, Hélène 238
 Clements, Paul 27–9, 31, 249 (n. 15)
 Close, Del 49–52, 54, 113, 198–9, 208,
 236, 244, 250 (n. 5, n. 6), 258 (n. 6)
 clowns, clowning xvi, xviii, xix–xxii,
 6–7, 11, 17–18, 64, 68, 72–5, 81, 83,
 121, 126–8, 131–2, 136, 191, 224,
 226, 242, 252 (n. 7)
Clowning 62–3, 220
Clowns, Les 76
 Clurman, Harold 38, 40
 co-creation, co-creativity 38, 61, 64,
 111–2, 121, 139, 194, 212, 240, 244
 Coetzee, Greg 140
 Coldiron, Margaret 129, 193, 254 (n. 2)
 Coltrane, John 119
 Comédie Française 14, 16–17, 248 (n. 6,
 n. 11)
comédie nouvelle 19–20, 22, 29, 76
 ComedySportz 49
Comedy Vehicle 21
 comic *see also* stand-up xvii–xviii, xx, 4,
 7, 20, 47, 81, 121, 123, 125, 131–4,
 136–7, 203, 208, 248 (n. 10, n. 13),
 250 (n. 13), 255 (n. 3), 258 (n. 6)
comici dell'arte xix, 12, 80, 83, 119
commedia all'improvviso xx
commedia a soggetto xx
commedia dell'arte xix, 3, 6, 8, 11–12,
 14, 19–22, 45–7, 63, 68, 71, 74, 76–7,
 80–2, 91, 96, 132–3, 170, 186–7, 191,
 193, 198, 209, 213, 252 (n. 10), 252–3
 (n. 12), 253 (n. 14), 256 (n. 8)
commedia erudita xix
commedia sostenuta xix
 Committee, The 47, 50, 250 (n. 2, n. 5,
 n. 6)
 communication xxiii, 43, 48, 87, 104,
 120, 145, 168, 189, 217, 221, 230, 251
 (n. 7), 254 (n. 1)

- communion 10, 14, 22, 154
 community theatre 14, 46, 77
 Compagnie des Quinze 15, 21–4
 Compass 33, 45–7, 50, 250 (n. 2, n. 6)
 Complicité *see* Théâtre de Complicité
 complicité 83, 224
 concentration 8, 13, 24, 50, 143–4,
 153–4, 156, 166, 173 187, 200–3, 205,
 210–11
 Concert Party 137–9, 255 (n. 9)
concertatore xxii, 12
conchetti xx, 119
 Conductor, in Playback 97–8
 Coney 104, 108, 248 (n. 249)
 Conrad, Troy 122
Constant Prince, The 87, 91, 245, 254
 (n. 3)
 Contact Improvisation xii, 52, 104,
 109–10, 171
contre-masque see countermask
 Cook, Sally 191
 Cop in the Head 96, 103, 218, 221, 235
 Copeau, Jacques xxi–xxii, 11–23, 29, 38,
 43, 68, 76–7, 86, 90, 92, 107, 111,
 129, 146, 153, 159, 171, 182, 184–5,
 190, 226, 228, 237, 247 (n. 5), 248 (n.
 6, n. 8, n. 11), 253 (n. 1), 255 (n. 1),
 256 (n. 4), 257 (n. 10)
Copias, les 15, 20–1, 38, 185, 237, 248
 (n. 9, n. 12)
 countermask 186–7, 194
 Craig, Edward Gordon 14, 19,
 185
creación colectiva 102, 243
Creating a Role 8
 creativity xiv, xxii, 12–13, 16, 23, 36, 42,
 50–1, 69, 71 101, 119, 124, 136, 145,
 175, 190, 193, 197–8, 212, 215, 219,
 222–4, 228, 233, 236, 238, 242–3
 Crouch, Julian 192, 257 (n. 11)
Crystal Clear 31
 Csíkszentmihályi, Mihály 50–1, 129, 254
 (n. 2)
 Cunningham, Merce 110
 Cynkutis, Zbigniew 86

dalang 127
 Dalcroze *see* Jaques–Dalcroze
damas improvisadoras 116
 ‘Dappertutto, Doctor’ 11–12, 247
 (n. 4)
 Darby, Kris 251 (n. 8)
 Darden, Severn 47
 Darling Khan, Ya’Acov xviii, 111
 Darling Khan, Susannah 111

 Dasté, Jean 17, 20–1, 68, 248 (n. 12)
 Dasté, Marie–Hélène (‘Maiene’) 20, 256
 (n. 5)
 David, Ranji 118
*David Shepherd: A Lifetime of
 Improvisational Theater* 250 (n. 6)
 Davis, Miles 119
 Davison, Jon xx–xxii, 247 (n. 6)
Dead Class 248 (n. 9)
 Decroux, Etienne 15, 17, 76, 86, 256
 (n. 4)
 Deleuze, Guy 103, 109, 141, 225
Dell’ arte rappresentiva xx
 Delsarte, François 145, 255 (n. 1)
 Delvari, Georges 7
 De Maat, Martin 54
 De Niro, Robert 41
 Desperate Optimists 66
 Devine, George 53, 63, 235
 devising, devised work xiv, xxiii, 20,
 30–1, 44, 46, 58, 159, 161, 191–2,
 198, 234–5, 237–8, 248 (n. 14), 258
 (n. 5), 258–9 (n. 7)
 Dewey, John 15, 43, 146,
 255 (n. 1)
 Dickens, Charles 60–1, 108, 228
 Diderot, Denis 203
dilated body 148
 director xxii, 8, 11–12, 16–17, 24–7, 29,
 31–3, 36, 38–9, 42, 48, 50, 53, 58,
 60, 62–3, 77–9, 86–7, 114, 121, 124,
 134, 140, 143, 154, 158, 160, 164, 173,
 177, 179, 192, 204, 232, 234, 238,
 245, 248 (n. 9, n. 14), 250 (n. 6), 253
 (n. 1, n. 2), 256 (n. 8)
 Director, in Psychodrama 95, 97,
 101
 disarmament 89, 228
discorsi 82
 discourse 67, 101, 181, 228
 Disorder 137, 245
disponibilità 6, 71–2, 127, 129, 172, 212,
 222–4
Dogme 35
dohar 118
Don Juan 22
Doors of Perception, The 51
 Dorian Mime xviii
 drama schools xxii, 1, 17, 24–6, 27, 31,
 38, 53, 159, 225, 255 (n. 1)
 Drinko, Clayton xiv, xxv, 10, 50–3, 120,
 149, 224
 Duffy, Margaret 53–4
 Dullin, Charles 17, 68, 86, 253 (n. 1)
 Duncan, Andrew 45

- Duncan, Isadora 3
 Dylan, Bob 125
Dziady 87
- éclosion* 155–6, 211
 École Internationale de Mime et de Théâtre 68
 École Jacques Lecoq 75, 81, 252 (n. 3)
 École Philippe Gaulier 75
 École Supérieure d'Art Dramatique 24
 ecology xii–xiii, 85, 92, 108, 242–4
Ecstasy 31, 36, 249 (n. 15)
 Edinburgh, Edinburgh Festival 59, 120, 207, 248–9 (n. 14)
 education xxiv, 5, 15, 18, 22, 43–4, 46, 55, 59, 62, 68, 81, 93, 99, 103, 110, 116, 126, 228, 237
Edwin Drood 60–1
 Eldredge, Sears xii, 72, 111, 182–4, 186–7, 194, 256 (n. 4, n. 5, n. 7)
 elements 13, 70, 174–5, 179, 184, 199, 213, 252 (n. 6)
 Ellenbogen, Nicholas 140
 Emigh, John 192–3, 256 (n. 5)
 emotional recall *and see* affective memory 10, 69, 174
 encounter 1, 37, 51, 73, 88–9, 109, 131, 164, 170–2, 193, 212, 225, 245
 ensemble xxv, 14, 16, 19, 21, 26, 39, 64, 86, 138–9, 205, 209, 235, 239
 entrances 73, 133, 144, 150, 153, 169, 211, 255 (n. 6)
 epic 82, 84, 106, 115, 126–7, 136, 138
 Ernst Busch Hochschule für Schauspielkunst (HfSK) 159–61
Escape Room, Escape Room Games 58, 251 (n. 8)
Essai de Rénovation Dramatique 14
 EtcHELLS, Tim 161–2
étude 40, 70
 Europe xiii, xix–xx, 1, 3, 12, 22, 24, 38, 55–6, 58, 62, 74, 78, 80, 82, 110, 115, 117, 123–4, 132, 134, 137, 140, 185, 192, 253 (n. 13), 255 (n. 1) 256 (n. 5)
 eurhythmics 18, 39
eutony 145
Every Day Except Christmas 249 (n. 16)
 exercises *see* Index of Games and Exercises
 Existentialism 223
 exits 144, 150, 153, 169–70, 211
 Expressive Mask 171, 183, 185–6, 190
extempo 115
 Extempore Theatre 53
extra-daily 92, 129–30, 148
- fabulatori* 80–1
Faces 32
 fairground booth 12
 Falk, Peter 32
 fantasy 42, 57, 67, 173, 258 (n. 4)
 farce xviii, 7, 18, 20, 65, 78, 81–2, 129, 132, 134, 204, 240
Fastnachtspiel 190
Faustus 254 (n. 3)
 Federal Theatre Project 46, 134, 249 (n. 1)
 Feldenkrais, Moshé 26, 76, 102, 110, 145–6, 210
 Felner, Mira 16, 23, 72, 183, 187, 191
Female Parts 78
 Ferguson, Marilyn 224
 Fergusson, Francis 40
Festen 35
fiaba, fiabe 12
 Fight in the Dark 150, 174, 210
 finding the scene 258 (n. 6)
Finger in the Eye, A 80–1
First Arabian Night, The 208
 First Studio 5, 9, 14, 39, 253 (n. 1)
 Five Rhythms Dance 110–1
 fixated set *see* set
 Flanagan, Hallie 46, 249 (n. 1)
 Flaszen, Ludwik 86–7
 Fleishman, Mark 140–1
 Flicker, Ted 47, 51, 250 (n. 2)
 'flow' 50–1, 127, 129, 194, 210, 254 (n. 2)
flyting 117
 fMRI scanner, fMRI suite 120
 Fo, Dario xii, xviii, xx, 11, 64, 68, 74, 78–85, 161, 189, 242, 252 (n. 9, n. 10)
 'focus' xxiii, 12, 50, 52, 91, 105–6, 109–10, 113, 125, 128, 144, 147, 153, 158, 167–8, 170, 173, 176, 183–4, 189–90, 195–7, 200, 202, 208–9, 212–3, 217–8, 226, 229, 246, 257 (n. 9), 258 (n. 3)
 Footsarn Theatre Company 74
 Forced Entertainment 66, 104, 161
Forefather's Eve 87
 Forum Theatre xxi, 5, 51, 56, 99–101, 109, 118, 121, 163, 221, 237, 240, 243
 Forsberg, Eric 53
 Forsberg, Jo 53–4, 250 (n. 6)
 Forsberg, Linnea 54
 Forsberg, Rolf 53
 Foster, Hal 34–5
 Fotis, Matt 250 (n. 5)

- Four Brothers 13
 Fox, Jonathan 97–9, 218
 France/French xii, xix, 14–15, 17–18, 21, 23, 38, 75–6, 81, 86, 91, 103–4, 108, 115–6, 185, 252 (n. 11), 253 (n. 14)
 Frank, Waldo 15, 38
 Frantic Assembly 26, 234
 Fratellini Brothers 18
 Free Associates, The 54, 60
 free association 206–7, 211
 freestyle rap 115, 117, 120, 196, 251 (n. 1)
 Freire, Paolo 254 (n. 11)
 Freud, Sigmund 93, 95–6, 241
 fringe 63, 207
 Fritz, Birgit x, 51, 102, 159, 164, 166, 195
 Fugard, Athol 139, 238, 241, 255 (n. 10)
 Functional Integration 146
- Gaan Bhangra* 117
 Gale, Derek 93–5, 254 (n. 5, n. 9)
gambuh 126
Game of Hurt, The 46
Games for Actors and Non-Actors 100–2
 Game Theatre 48
gamelan 126
 games *and see* Index of Games and Exercises xi, xxii–xxiii, 1, 14–15, 17–19, 22, 24, 43–5, 48–50, 53, 56–8, 100–3, 110, 112–3, 143–4, 146–9, 151, 159, 163–4, 171, 179, 181, 195, 202, 205, 209–10, 218, 222, 235, 250 (n. 6), 251 (n. 1), 257 (n. 11), 257 (n. 1)
 gamesercises 100
 Ganguly, Sanjoy x, 51, 102, 109, 117, 195, 200, 221, 243
 gap 84, 107, 141, 192, 226, 231
 Gardner, Lyn 58
 Gaulier, Philippe 75–6, 106, 112–3, 146, 163, 240, 244, 247 (n. 5), 252 (n. 7), 253 (n. 13)
 Gay Sweatshop 237
 Gazarra, Ben 32
 Geertz, Clifford 127
 Geese Theatre Company 191–2, 257 (n. 11)
 George, David E.R. xxi, 125, 224, 233, 258 (n. 4)
gestus 26, 189
ghana 115–7
 Ghana 137–8, 255 (n. 9)
ghazal 115, 118
 gibberish 173, 211
 Gide, André 223
 Gillison, Gillian 129–31
 Gimi 129–31
 Ginsberg, Allen 32, 257 (n. 3)
 GITIS 86
giullare, giullari xix, 80–3
 ‘given circumstances’ 39–40, 42, 180
 gleeman, gleemaiden xix
 Goat Island 66
 Gob Squad 66
 Goffman, Erving 51
 Goldoni, Carlo xx, 12
 Gombrowicz, Witold 253
Good Person of Szechwan, The 74
Goose Pimples 30
 ‘Gorilla’ 113
 Gorki, Maxim 7
 Gozzi, Carlo xx, 7, 12
 Graham, Martha 3–4
grammelot *see also grummelotage* 11, 80–2, 140, 173, 205, 248 (n. 13), 252 (n. 10)
 Grand Union 110
 Grauert, Ruth 114
 Gray, Paul 9
 Greek chorus 185
 Green, Alissa 49
 greetings 132, 144, 170, 211
 Gregory, R.G. 55
griot 115
 Grillo, Beppe 85
 ‘Grock’ (Karl Adrien Wettach) xx
 Grotowski, Jerzy xiii, 5, 11, 17, 36, 48, 73, 86–92, 100, 139, 155, 173, 183, 218, 220–8, 244–5, 252 (n. 2), 253 (n. 1, n. 2), 254 (n. 3, n. 4), 256 (n. 2)
 group creation xiv, 50, 76, 205, 212
 group improvisation xiv, 39, 161, 199, 209
 Group Theatre, the 23, 40, 253 (n. 1)
 groupmind 50
grummelotage (see also grammelot) 21, 74, 248 (n. 13), 252 (n. 10)
 Guattari, Félix 106, 225
guslari 115
- ‘Hadjeivat’ 136, 255 (n. 8)
haikai no renku 115
 ‘Hajji, the’ 136
 half-mask 187, 189
 Hall, Peter 28
 Halpern, Charna 49, 53–4, 198–9, 207–8, 236, 250 (n. 5, n. 6), 258 (n. 6)
 Halprin, Anna 110
Hamlet 87, 197, 241, 250 (n. 4)
hana 111, 124, 129, 224, 254 (n. 2)
 Handspring Puppet Company 255 (n. 10)

- Happy Go Lucky* 36, 249 (n. 15)
Hardworking Slovotekov, The 7
 Harlequin 77, 156,
 Harold, the xxv, 50–1, 54, 89, 105, 118,
 120, 250 (n. 4, n. 5)
 Harris, Barbara 47
harukaru 129
 Hashmi, Safdar 221
 Hatley, Barbara 127
 Hauck, Ben xxv
 Heathcote, Dorothy 55, 103, 195
 Hébert, Georges 18–19, 70, 145, 255
 (n. 1)
 Henry Street Settlement 249–50 (n. 1)
 Heritage, Paul 100
High Hopes 30, 36
 higher ego 13, 175, 235
hijā 132
 Hijikata, Tatsumi 111
 Hilton, Julian x, 230–1, 246
 Hippe, Eva and Lorenz 56
 Hirst, David x, 81
 Hoban, Russell 66
 Hoffman, E.T.A. 11–2
 Holdsworth, Samantha 106
 Höllering, Anna 94
 Holmes, Rupert 60–1, 251 (n. 10)
 Homann, Greg 141
Home Sweet Home 31
Homo Ludens 71
 Honner, Seth 58
 Hood, Stuart 79, 252 (n. 12)
 Hopkins, Harry 249 (n. 1)
 hot-seating 6, 10, 25, 101, 179, 195
 Houben, Jos 146
 Huizinga, Johan 71, 146
 Hull House 43, 249 (n. 1)
 Hull, Lorrie 41–2, 44, 157–8, 173, 247
 (n. 2)
 Hull Truck 31
hűng xvii
 Hungary 58
 Hunt, Albert 44
 Huxley, Aldous 51

I and Thou (Ich und Du) 83
 I Gelati Theatre Company x, 74, 226,
 256 (n. 8)
I Survived a Zombie Apocalypse 251
 (n. 8)
iemoto 124
If so, then yes 65
iibongi 115
 image theatre 100–2, 157, 163, 195, 200,
 209, 221

 imagination xv, xxiii, 13, 21, 24–5, 39,
 42, 57, 67, 70–1, 122, 147, 159, 166,
 168, 171, 177, 182, 194–8, 203–4,
 206, 212, 215, 217, 222–3, 228, 236,
 256 (n. 1)
 immersive theatre 3, 26, 55, 57, 59,
 103–9, 112, 172, 179, 229, 241, 248–9
 (n. 14)
Immersive Theatres 104–5
 impersonation xvii, 33, 138, 203,
Impro 62, 179–82, 187, 192, 197, 199,
 207
 Improbable Theatre Company xii, 46, 63,
 98, 192, 205, 232, 234, 248 (n. 14),
 257 (n. 11)
Impro for Storytellers 234
 Impromptu Theatre 94
 Impro-Olympics 63, 252 (n. 1)
Improvathon 53
 ImprovBoston 60
 improv consciousness 50, 224
 improvisation *passim* (see **Contents**);
 and:
 Africa, in 137–42
 Bali, in xvii, 126–7, 128–9, 193
 China, in 58, 125–6
 France, in 14–22, 68–77
 Indonesia, in 127–8
 Islam, in 131–6
 Japan, in 124–5, 128–9, 149–50, 224
 Papua New Guinea, in 129–31
 Russia, in 6–13
 UK, in 23–37, 55, 62–7, 97, 103–9,
 120–3
 USA, in 38–55, 59–61, 113–5
Improvisation for the Theatre 44
 ‘Improvises’ 122
 ImprovOlympic (iO Chicago) 49, 52, 54,
 250 (n. 6)
 improves 25, 47, 50–1, 204
improvvisazione 115
improvvisatrice 116
 impulses xvii, xix, 67, 69–70, 114, 120,
 143, 149, 155, 157, 160, 165, 172,
 176, 211, 226
Indeterminacy 121
 India, Indian xiv, xvii–xviii, xxii, 5, 11,
 60, 102–3, 111, 115, 118–9, 125, 127,
 129–30, 133, 138–9, 148, 173, 193,
 198, 221, 231, 243, 255 (n. 3), 258
 (n. 3)
 Indonesia xvii, 124, 126–8, 148, 178, 193
 Instant Theatre 55–6
 Interlude House 11–12
 intertextuality 88, 139, 233

- introception 111
 Invisible Theatre 100, 131
 Iran, Iranian *see* Persia, *ru-howzi*
 Ireland 254 (n. 10)
 Iser, Wolfgang 107
 Islamic drama 116, 131–2, 134
 ISTA 124–5
 Italy/Italian xix–xx, 12, 19, 68, 78, 82–3,
 85, 115–7, 124, 128, 252 (n. 12), 253
 (n. 14), 254 (n. 4)
 Ivanov, Vyacheslav 6
izibongo 115
 Izzard, Eddie 122
- Jaguar Jokers, the 255 (n. 9)
 Jahořkowski, Antoni 86
 Jakarta 127–8
 Jamal, Ashraf 141
 James, Greg 251 (n. 8)
 Jana Sanskriti x, 102, 163
 Janiszewski, Tadeusz 220
 Japan xvii, xxii, 5, 58, 111, 115, 124,
 129, 141, 149–50, 224
 Jaques-Dalcroze, Émile 13, 15, 18, 145
 Jarry, Alfred 5, 95
 Java, Javanese 127, 148
 jazz xii, xiv, 3, 11, 32, 51, 119–20,
 137–40, 160, 241, 257 (n. 3)
 Jazzart 140
 ‘Jean Bourignon’ 21
 Jellicoe, Ann 235
 Jenkins, Ron 80–1, 83–4, 126, 252
 (n. 10), 252–3 (n. 12), 253 (n. 14)
Jerry Springer: The Opera 121
 jester 80, 82–4
 Jigalov, Andrei xxii
Jo-Ha-Kyu 239
 Johnson, ‘Bob’, Ishmael 137
 Johnston, Chris xiv, xxiii–xxiv, 55–6,
 98, 147, 156, 159, 172–3, 195, 209,
 236–7, 256 (n. 2)
 Johnstone, Keith xiv, xxii–xxiv, 1, 11,
 49, 53, 62–3, 65, 92, 96, 98–100, 103,
 106, 112–3, 159, 172, 179–82, 187,
 192, 195, 197–9, 202, 206–7, 218,
 222, 226, 234–6, 242, 244, 254 (n. 10)
 Joint Stock 237
 Joker 100–1
 jokes xix, 7, 13, 17, 47, 72–3, 81, 122,
 127, 136, 198
jongleur xix, 12
 Joseph, Steven 55
 Jouvett, Louis 17, 248 (n. 7)
jugalbandi 11, 243
 juggling xv, xix
 Julliard School 24, 38
- Jung, Carl Gustav 91, 93, 218, 225
 Jupitus, Phill 123
- kabigan, Kabi gan, kavigan, Kabir*
Larai 117–8, 243
kabiyal 118
Kabuki 124
kagura xvii
 Kaleider 57–8
 Kamerny Theatre 14
 Kamiřiřthũ Cultural Center 141
 Kani, John 140, 238, 241, 255 (n. 10)
 Kantor, Tadeusz 91, 248 (n. 9), 253
 (n. 2)
 Kaprow, Allan 104
Karagöz 136, 255 (n. 8)
Kathak 11
Kathakali 5, 11, 125, 128–9, 148, 168,
 245
 ‘Kavuklu’ 133, 136
 Kearns, John 120–1
 Kelley, Sheila 31
 Kente, Gibson 140
 Kenya 141
ketoprak 1273
khayal 118
 Khlebnikov, Velimir 248 (n. 13)
Killing of a Chinese Bookie, The 32
 kinaesthesia 99, 112, 149
Kind of Blue 119
 kinesphere 152, 156
 King, Eleanor xvii
 ‘Kitchen Rules’ 51
 Knipper, Olga 9
 Koestler, Arthur 233
Königsroman, Der 96
Kordian 87, 254 (n. 3)
 Korea, North xvii
 Korea, South xvii, 141
 Krautzbeg, Harald 111
 Krips, Henry 34–5
 Kruchenykh, Aleksei 248 (n. 13)
 Kruskall, Megan 113
Kudiyattam xvii
 Kumiega, Jennifer 87, 91, 252 (n. 2)
- Laban, Rudolf 26, 69, 110, 145–6, 149,
 152, 156, 182, 196, 211, 252 (n. 4),
 255 (n. 1)
Laboratoire d’Études du Mouvement
 (*LEM*) 70
 Lacan, Jacques 34–5
Laiv see LARP
 Lamden, Gill 191–2, 258 (n. 5)
 Landau, Tina 112
 Langer, Susanne 67

- language learning 55, 70, 87, 93, 125,
139, 222–3, 228, 248 (n. 13), 252
(n. 10), 115
- LARP, LARPing xii, 56–8, 251 (n. 7)
- larval mask 71, 74, 182, 190–2
- lateral being 225
- lateral thinking 225
- Lawrence, D.H. 4
- Lawrence, Josie 46, 251 (10)
- Lavery, Carl 66
- Lazio 115
- lazzo, lazzi* xx, 19, 63, 76, 82, 119
- Leabhart, Thomas 256 (n. 4)
- Lecoq, Fay 237
- Lecoq, Jacques x, xii, xiv, xix–xxii, 15, 13,
15, 17–18, 26, 50, 62, 64, 67–78, 81,
83, 91–2, 100, 106–7, 111, 113, 125,
127, 129, 146, 152–3, 155–6, 159, 168,
170, 174–5, 182–7, 190–2, 196, 199,
209, 211, 213, 218, 221–2, 224, 226,
228, 230, 234, 237, 242, 244, 246, 247
(n. 5), 248 (n. 12), 252 (n. 3, n. 4, n. 5,
n. 6, n. 7, n. 11), 253 (n. 13), 254 (n. 1),
255 (n. 1), 256 (n. 4, n. 8), 257 (n. 10),
258–9 (n. 6, n. 7)
- Lecture From a Skip* 65
- Lee, Stewart 121–2
- Leep, Jeanne xxv, 51
- legislative theatre 100
- Leigh, Mike xiii, 4, 9, 26–31, 33–6, 205,
234, 249 (n. 15)
- lenong* 127
- Lifegame* 98–9, 257 (n. 11)
- Life Is Sweet* 33
- life-mask 89
- Life-Play* 250 (n. 6)
- lila* 231
- Limb, Charles J. 120
- lingkungan* 126
- Littlewood, Joan 27, 149, 219, 255 (n. 1)
- Live-Action Role Play *see* LARP
- Living History* 59
- Living Newspaper 46, 94, 134, 179
- Living Theatre 221, 253 (n. 1)
- ‘lizard brain’ 53, 89, 224
- London Theatre Studio 24
- Lone Twin 66, 104
- Longform, long-form improvisation xxv,
50–1, 53, 60, 97–8, 207, 250 (n. 5),
254 (n. 10)
- Long Form Improvisation and American
Comedy: The Harold* 250 (n. 5)
- Loose Moose 99
- Lord, Albert Bates 115
- Lord Chamberlain 63, 219
- ‘Lord Quick’ 21
- Lorre, Peter 94, 254 (n. 7)
- Lowenfeld, Margaret 44
- ludrug, ludruk* 128
- luxurious balance* 129–30, 148
- Machon, Josephine 104–6, 108, 227
- madang* 141
- Madhavan, Arya 129
- madīh* 132
- ‘Maestro’ (*‘Micetro’*) 113
- Magarshack, David 9
- ‘magic if’ 204
- Magnet Theatre 140
- Magnifico, il* 189
- Maistre, Aman 20
- make-up 39, 129–30, 134, 138, 193, 232
- Makhene, Ramolao 255 (n. 10)
- Mali 117
- Malina, Judith 221
- Malmgren, Yat 146
- Malta, Maltese 115–7
- Malti 116–7
- Mamet, David xxiv, 54
- Mandé 117
- Mangrove Collective 110
- manis / keras* 148
- Marat-Sade* 28
- Marceau, Marcel 17, 86, 111
- Marivaux, Pierre de xx
- martial art 110, 176
- Martian, The* 62
- Martin, Claude 68
- Martin, John x, 5, 247 (n. 1)
- Masala Theatre 118
- mask, masks xii, xvii–xviii, xx, 5–6,
11–12, 14–17, 19–22, 24, 29, 47, 53,
63, 66, 68, 70–2, 74, 76–7, 82, 88–91,
106, 111, 125–6, 129, 137–8, 144,
153, 156, 170–1, 179, 182–96, 211,
213, 225–6, 232–3, 235, 248 (n. 9),
256 (n. 5, n. 6, n. 7), 257 (n. 10, n. 11,
n. 12), 258 (n. 2)
- Maslow, Abraham 218
- Masque of the Red Death* 105, 108
- masque neutre see* neutral mask
- Master-Servant xx, 181, 211
- Masterson Inheritance, The* 46
- Matsui, Akira 125
- Maude-Roxby, Roddy v, x, 62, 64–6, 92,
141, 168, 171, 182, 187, 220, 227
- May, Elaine 33, 45–6, 51
- maya* 231
- Mayakovsky, Vladimir 87
- Mazzetti, Lorenza 31, 249 (n. 16)
- McBurney, Simon x, 70, 76
- McCarthyism 45, 243

- McDermott, Phelim 46, 98, 192–3, 257 (n. 11)
- McGrath, John 83, 237
- meaning xvi, 6, 42, 66–7, 68–72, 88, 108, 118, 144, 156, 173, 205–7, 212, 215, 217, 228–34, 239–40, 246, 256 (n. 3)
- meddah* 134, 255 (n. 7)
- Mediaeval Fayres 59
- Medieval Players 252 (n. 7)
- medieval 22, 80, 82, 84, 115, 117, 132
- meeting 33, 38, 92, 132, 144, 164, 170–1, 193, 195, 204, 211, 241, 243
- Megara xviii
- Meggido, Adam 53
- Mei, Lan Fang 125–6
- Meisner, Sanford xii, xxiv, 10, 26, 163
- melodrama 7, 69, 71, 196, 199, 201, 209–10, 213, 252 (n. 4)
- Melville House 249–50 (n. 1)
- memory 6, 10, 50, 67, 70, 101, 105, 113, 123, 140, 144, 159, 174, 178–9, 183, 196, 202, 210, 245, 256 (n. 1)
- Mendus, Clive x, 252 (n. 7)
- Mercuriali, Silvia 106
- Merlin, Bella 9, 154
- Merton, Paul 46,
- Method, the 158, 180
- Method of Physical Actions, the 9–10, 25, 91, 199–200, 252 (n. 4)
- Meyerhold, Vsevolod 6–7, 11–13, 76–7, 86, 166, 226, 239, 248 (n. 8)
- Mexico 92, 129, 141
- Mickiewicz, Adam 87
- Middleton, Deborah 92
- Milan 68, 76,
- mime xvii, 6–7, 13–15, 17, 19–24, 39, 68, 71–2, 74–6, 82, 121, 139, 174–5, 183, 190, 205, 247 (n. 5)
- mimes, ancient xviii–xix, 80, 132, 248 (n. 8), 256 (n. 4)
- mimesis* 6, 132
- mimmesinger* xix
- Minnie and Moskowitz* 32
- Minute Too Late, A* 74
- Mirecka, Rena x, 86, 88–9, 155
- Mistero buffo* 79–83, 252 (8)
- Mitchell, Tony 79–81, 83
- Mkhwane, Bheki 140
- Mnouchkine, Ariane 74, 76–7, 238
- Moby Dick* 60, 62
- Molière, Jean-Baptiste xx, 132, 240, 253 (n. 14)
- Molik, Zygmunt 86
- Moment Under the Moment, The* 66
- Momma Don't Allow* 249 (n. 16)
- Money, The* 57–8
- Monkhouse, Bob 122–3
- montage 52, 83, 239
- Monteith, John 46
- Montessori, Maria 15, 43
- Monty Python's Flying Circus* 65
- Moreno, Jacob Levy 93–7, 101–2, 134, 176, 178, 218, 254 (n. 5, n. 6, n. 8), 257 (n. 1)
- Moreno, Zerka Toeman 94–5
- Morgan, Ric 62
- Morley, Sheridan 30
- Morton, Timothy 108
- Moscow 7, 11 86
- Moscow Art Theatre (MAT) 8, 14, 39
- Moseley, Nick xxii, xxiv, 10, 163
- Moskvin, Ivan 9
- mõt* xvii
- mountebanks xix
- movement 16, 19, 26–7, 51–2, 67–70, 72, 74–7, 103–5, 109–12, 114, 126, 139–40, 143, 145–9, 151–2, 154–60, 164–8, 173–6, 183–4, 186–7, 191, 195–6, 200, 202, 205, 211, 213, 222, 226, 232–3, 237, 249–50 (n. 1), 255 (n. 1)
- Movement Medicine* 109, 111
- Movement Training for Actors* 159
- MoVimento Cinque Stelle 85
- Moving Picture Mime Show 190
- Movshovitz, Howie 33, 35
- Mr Turner* 36, 249 (n. 15)
- mudang* xvii
- Mugan kõri* xvii
- Muirhead, John 62
- Mummenschanz 70, 190
- Murray, Al 207–8
- Murray, Bill 53–4
- Murray, Simon 69–70, 209, 213, 224, 228, 244, 252 (n. 11), 258–9 (n. 7)
- mushaira* 115, 118
- Mushayara Theatre 118
- musicals 47, 59–60, 137, 140, 166, 251 (n. 9)
- music hall 15, 61, 63
- My Parents Have Gone to Carlisle* 28
- Myerson, Alan 47, 250–1 (n. 2, n. 6)
- Mystery-Bouffe* 87
- Nair, Sreenath 129
- Naked* 33, 36
- narrative xx, 5, 48, 53, 55–6, 60, 66–7, 70, 83, 97, 99, 109, 113, 128, 141, 144, 171, 177, 179, 198–9, 201, 206, 208–9, 211, 214, 213, 236–7, 239–40, 255 (n. 7), 256 (n. 3)

- Natadze, R. 203–4
 National Theatre, the Royal (RNT) 23,
 248–9 (n. 14)
 naturalism, naturalistic 4, 8, 16, 26–7,
 30, 29, 47, 67, 98, 134, 138–9, 148,
 152, 175, 189, 191, 199, 220
 Naumburg, Margaret 15, 38, 43, 94, 146,
 249 (n. 1), 255 (n. 1)
 Neilson, Anthony 235
 Nelson, Luke 60
 Nelson, Ruth 40
 Nemirovich-Danchenko, Vladimir 9
 NENAA 29
 neutral, neutrality xxiii, 13, 17, 68, 70,
 72–3, 89, 107, 129, 150, 154, 159,
 179, 181, 183–6, 193, 211, 222–3,
 226, 228–9
 neutral mask 68, 70, 72, 90, 111, 153,
 156, 171, 182–6, 190–1, 196, 213, 256
 (n. 5)
 New Deal 44, 249–50 (n. 1)
 New Improvised Comedy 19
 Newspaper Theatre 141, 179
New Theatre Quarterly 228
 New York 9, 12, 15, 17, 24, 27, 32, 38–41,
 43–5, 47–8, 50, 54, 66, 94, 97, 110,
 114, 146, 185, 201, 249–50 (n. 1), 250
 (n. 2)
 New York City Players 66
 Newlove, Jean 149
 Nichols, Mike 33, 45–6
 Nigeria 137, 139, 141
 Nikolais, Alwin 114, 249–50 (n. 1)
 Nimble Fish 104, 106
 Ninagawa, Yukio 124
 Nixon, Jon 228
Noah 22
 noble mask *and see* neutral mask 90, 185
 Noble, Ross 122, 207
 Non-Playing Characters (NPCs) *see* LARP
 Nooshin, Laudan 119–20
 North America 49, 56, 224, 255 (n. 1)
 Novack, Cynthia 110–1
 Ntshona, Winston 238, 241, 255 (n. 10)
 Núñez, Nicolás 89, 92
- Obey, André 21, 23, 237
O Dreamland 249 (n. 16)
 objectivity 30, 42, 144, 151, 194,
 198–200, 210, 212, 235
 objects xv, xx, 29, 55, 66–7, 70, 88, 98,
 121, 133, 153, 180, 202, 210, 232, 248
 (n. 9), 253 (n. 2)
 observation 10, 16, 24, 31, 39, 68, 74,
 94, 99, 159, 161, 180, 182, 200–1,
 211
- Odin Teatret 87, 160, 239, 245
 Ògúndé, Hubert 139
 Old Vic, the 248–9 (n. 14)
 Old Vic Theatre School 24
omote 185
Omnibus 28
 one-minute plays 39
One Way Pendulum 65
Omnest'Bo 140
Opening Night 32
Orfeus 229
orta oyunu 131–5, 255 (n. 5)
 Orton, Joe 78
 'Oscar Knie' 21
 Osterwa, Juliusz 86, 223, 253 (n. 1)
ostranenie 258 (n. 4)
otkaz / posil' / tochka 166, 239
 Ottoman Turkey 132
 Oui Be Negroes 54
 Ouspenskaya, Maria 9, 39–40
 Overlie, Mary 112
- Pagneux, Monika 75–6, 146, 244
pakarnattam xvii, 127
 Palestinian 115–7
 Pantalone xx, 20–1, 77, 189, 257
 (n. 10)
 Papaioannou, Spyros 108–9
 Papua New Guinea 129–31, 193
 paradox xi, 80, 225, 258 (n. 4)
Paradoxe sur l'Acteur 203
 Paraguay 115
 'Parapark' 58
 paratheatre xiv, 86, 91, 254 (n. 4)
 Paris 12, 14, 16–17, 21–2, 68, 74–7, 248
 (n. 12), 252 (n. 3), 253 (n. 14)
 Parry, Milman 115
 Participatory Action Research 104
Partito della Rifondazione Comunista 85
 Pavis, Patrice 141, 239
 Paxton, Steve 110–1
paya, payada, la 115
 Pedrolino 21
 Peirce, Charles Saunders 233
 Peking Opera, *see* Beijing Opera
 pelvis 147, 174, 186, 213
penasar 126
penonton 126
 performativity xi, xxiii
 Pernand-Vergeleses 20–1, 253 (n. 1)
 Perrucci, Andrea xx, 202
 Persia, Iran 119, 132, 135–6
 Phelan, Peggy 231
 Piaget, Jean 44
 Piccolo Teatro 68, 76, 80
picong 117

- Pirandello, Luigi 186, 235
Pirates of Penzance, The 249 (n. 15)
 'Pişekâr' 133, 136, 255 (n. 8)
planoi xviii
 Plato 231
 play v, xii, xv, xvii–xviii, xxiii–xxiv, 5–6, 8, 10–11, 18, 43, 48, 64–5, 67–73, 82–3, 91, 95–7, 100–1, 105, 113, 120, 146–8, 150–2, 170, 180–1, 186, 191, 197, 199, 204, 212, 215, 218, 224, 229–31, 233, 240, 242, 246
 Playback Theatre xii, 52, 97–9, 118, 179, 218, 237, 254 (n. 10)
 player xix, 3, 7, 11, 14, 20, 44, 47, 49–53, 56–8, 64, 94, 96, 132, 136–7, 147–8, 150–1, 167–8, 171, 179, 181, 196, 201–2, 218, 248 (n. 8), 250 (n. 4), n. 6), 252 (n. 7, n. 12), 253 (n. 14), 258 (n. 3)
 Players Workshop 54
 playing cards 181, 211, 236
 Playwrights' Theatre 45, 53, 250 (n. 6)
 playwriting 201, 205, 209, 230–40
 plot xx, 29, 32, 53, 60–1, 137–8, 170, 226, 236
 Plotinus 244
 poetics 108, 215
 points of concentration (POC) 50, 143–4, 153, 200–1, 210–1,
 Poland 39, 86–7, 91, 220–1, 253 (n. 2)
 Polish State Theatre School 86
Polish Thanatos 91
 politics xix, xxiv, 5, 76–7, 82–3, 97, 99, 102, 106, 116, 127, 157, 219, 221–2, 228, 240–2, 253 (n. 14)
 poor theatre 87–9, 139
 popular theatre 21, 76, 138, 255 (n. 9)
 potlatch 224
 Poznan 220
 praise-singing 115, 255 (n. 7)
 Prattki, Thomas 209, 244
 precarious balance 129
 Preece, Bronwen 247 (n. 1)
 pre-expressive 11, 17, 70, 92, 124, 158
 Premise, the 47, 250 (n. 2)
 preparation xiii, xxii, 3–4, 6, 26, 70, 72, 107, 119, 122–3, 129, 138, 153, 158, 178, 187, 193, 209–10, 213
 presence xxiii–xxiv, 111, 149, 153, 158, 176, 210, 212, 226–7, 258 (n. 3)
profazadoreak, profazadas 116
 Propeller 26
 prostitutes 93, 95, 135
 protagonist 185, 239
 Protagonist, in Psychodrama 95–7, 99, 217–8
Proust and 'Three Dialogues with Georges Duthuit' 66
 Provenza, Paul 122
 psychoanalysis 34, 131, 177–8,
 Psychodrama xiv, 42, 93–8, 130, 173, 177, 217–8, 224
 psychotherapy 5, 217–8,
 Pulcinella 20
 Punchdrunk 26, 104–6, 108, 248–9 (n. 14)
 puppets, puppetry 30, 70, 80, 140, 248 (n. 9), 252 (n. 12), 253 (n. 1), 255 (n. 10), 256 (n. 4)
 Quentin, Caroline 46
 Quesne, Philippe and Vivarium Studio 65, 104
 RADA 27, 159
 Radlov, Sergei 7
 Radner, Gilda 47, 50
raga 118
Rainbow of Desires 96, 103, 209, 218
 Rame, Franca 64, 68, 78–82, 84–5, 242, 252 (n. 9), 252–3 (n. 12)
Ramlila 258 (n. 3)
 Rancière, Jacques 107
 Rand, Suzanne 46
rasa 224
 Rasmussen, Iben Nagel 160–1
 Rao, Nandini 118
 recognise, recognition xxiv, 18, 47, 69, 84, 90, 100, 107, 112, 124–5, 128, 134, 137, 154, 169–70, 172, 180–1, 184, 199, 212, 229, 231, 237, 244, 252 (n. 4), 254 (n. 11), 258 (n. 4)
 Red Ladder Theatre Company 234, 237
 red nose 11, 72–3, 182, 191, 226, 231
 Red Riding Hood 199
 re-enactment 95, 99, 177–8
Registres 77
 Reisz, Karel 31, 33, 249 (n. 16)
 rehearse, rehearsal xiii, xv–xvi, xx–xxii, xxv, 3, 5–8, 10, 14–15, 24–6, 28–34, 39, 41–2, 46–48, 59–61, 63–4, 71, 77, 79–81, 88, 100–1, 114, 120, 124, 128, 130, 133, 141, 143, 147, 151–2, 159–60, 169–70, 176–8, 186, 190, 198, 203–5, 208–9, 219–20, 235, 241
 reincorporation *see also* callback 198
 relaxed, relaxation 16, 50, 64, 143, 145–6, 152–3, 157–8, 164, 166, 176, 184, 187, 202, 210, 212, 223
renga 141

- research xxiii, 4, 59, 68, 77, 87, 91–2, 104, 120, 141, 220, 226, 234–5, 237–8, 242
- resistance 95, 115, 117, 139, 151, 190, 217–9, 221, 253 (n. 2)
- resistances 144, 198–9, 210, 212,
- respect 11, 51, 106, 144, 163–4, 193–4, 210, 243
- Responsive Scene Radio Show* 250 (n. 6)
- Restoration 24, 210
- restored behaviour 177, 179
- Resznek, Jennie 140
- rhythm xxiii, 3, 8, 11, 18, 68–71, 73–6, 79, 83–4, 109–12, 119, 121, 124, 139, 144, 149, 153, 155, 157, 165–7, 169, 176, 179, 184–5, 188, 195–6, 202, 205–6, 211, 235, 239, 252 (n. 1)
- Ricard, Alain 137, 139, 255 (n. 9)
- Richardson, Tony 31, 249 (n. 16)
- Riley, Alan 191
- Riley, Jo 126
- risk xii, xix, xxiv, 6, 16, 94, 104, 109, 121, 227, 231, 242–3, 258–9 (n. 7)
- Risum, Janne 12
- ritual xvii–xviii, 5–6, 92, 97, 99, 102, 128–31, 139, 170, 177–8, 182, 193
- Rivers, Joan 47
- Robinson Crusoe* 62
- Rogers, Carl 218
- Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* 108, 227
- Roth, Gabrielle 111
- Royal Court Theatre 53, 62–3, 219–20, 235
- Royal Opera House 248–9 (n. 14)
- Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) 23, 28–9, 196, 248 (n. 14)
- Rowlands, Gena 32
- Różewicz, Tadeusz 253 (n. 2)
- Rudlin, John 14, 17, 19–21, 23
- Rudnitsky, Konstantin 6–8, 248 (n. 13)
- Ruffini, Franco 124
- ru-howzi* 131–2, 135–6
- Running Jump, A* 36, 249 (n. 15)
- Russia, Russian xiii, xix, 6, 8, 12, 38–40, 53, 247 (n. 3), 248 (n. 13), 258 (n. 4)
- sacred xviii–xix, 82, 95, 138, 247 (n. 3)
- Sahl, Mort 47, 250 (n. 3)
- Sahlins, Bernie 46, 48
- Saïdi, Lassaâd 256 (n. 8)
- Saint-Denis, Michel 14–17, 20–1, 23–6, 28, 38, 48, 63, 68, 77, 237, 248 (n. 12), 252 (n. 10), 253 (n. 1)
- Saint Petersburg 6–7, 11
- Salas, Jo 97, 99, 254 (n. 10)
- salp'uri* xvii
- samizdat* 219
- sanankuyo* 117
- sandiwara* 127
- San Francisco 47, 50, 110, 250 (n. 2, n. 6)
- Sanskrit xvii–xviii, 224
- sarkar* 118
- Sartori, Amleto 183, 256 (n. 5)
- sastra* 126
- satire xviii, 4, 7, 47, 75, 78, 80, 132, 250 (n. 3), 253 (n. 13)
- Savarese, Nicola 124, 148–9, 158, 203
- Saxe-Meiningen, Duke of 9
- saying 'yes' 172, 244
- Sbait, Dirghām 117
- Scandinavia 56, 103, 117, 251 (n. 7)
- scenario xx, 6–7, 10, 12, 19–20, 46, 72, 82, 96, 100–1, 103, 113, 133, 200, 209, 213, 218, 220
- Schechner, Richard 36, 92, 102, 104, 129, 177, 179
- Schiller, Friedrich von v, xv, 71, 146, 246
- Schino, Mirella 124
- School of Night, The 53
- Schumann, Peter 253 (n. 1), 256 (n. 4)
- Scierski, Stanisław 86
- scop* xix
- score xxi, 3–4, 60, 70, 92, 128, 160–1, 176, 200, 234, 239, 256 (n. 2)
- Scotland 117
- 'Sebastien Congr e' 21
- Second City 38, 46–50, 52–4, 122, 248 (n. 10), 250 (n. 2, n. 5, n. 6)
- Secrets and Lies* 36, 249 (n. 15)
- Seham, Amy 45–7, 49, 55
- self-actualisation 48, 218
- semiotics 68, 72, 88, 130, 228, 232–3
- Sendgraff, Terry 114
- sensation memory 174
- senses, sensitivity 72, 90, 101–2, 106–8, 110–12, 114, 144, 149, 153–5, 159, 164, 166–7, 171, 174–6, 179, 195–6, 210, 212, 223, 225, 227, 238–9, 248 (n. 13), 256 (n. 3), 258 (n. 4)
- 'set' (*Einstellung*), fixated set 203–4
- Set List-up Without a Net* 122–3
- Settlement Houses 249 (n. 1)
- Seyern, Margaret 185
- Shadows* 32–3
- Shāhmāneh* 136

- Shakespeare, William xx–xxi, 74, 78,
189, 196, 231
- Shakuntala* 87
- shaman, shamanism xvi–xx, 5, 89, 92,
109, 111, 130, 132, 177, 182, 192–3,
225, 233, 242, 247 (n. 3)
- Shared Experience 208
- Sharp, Elliott 119
- Sharp, Lesley 36
- Sheffield Crucible Theatre 248–9
(n. 14)
- Shepherd, David 45–6, 48–9, 54, 250
(n. 6)
- shite* 125, 185
- short form improvisation 50–1, 54, 113,
118
- showing 114, 144, 153, 168–9, 175, 210
- '*Siah*' 136
- Sills, Paul 44–8, 53, 250
(n. 2, n. 6)
- Simpson, Lee 46, 257 (n. 11)
- Simpson, N.F. 65
- song, singing 18, 20, 67, 92, 114, 116–8,
120, 125, 130, 137–40, 157, 196, 205,
251 (n. 10)
- Sir and Perkins* plays 62
- site-specific performance xi, 3, 26, 59,
105, 109, 229
- Situationists 3, 96, 178
- Skazka Theatre 11
- Skinner, Cornelia Otis 38
- skomorokhi* xix, 12
- Słowacki, Juliusz 86
- Small Town Anywhere, A* 108
- Smith, Lucy 97–9, 254 (n. 10)
- Smoking Theatre 45
- Snow, Jackie 153, 159, 175
- socialist realism 76
- soggetto* xx
- Solidarity (Solidarność) 220
- Soloviev, Vladimir 12
- sound xxiii, 16, 67, 82, 84, 98, 111,
114, 153–4, 157–8, 164–6, 171, 173,
176, 184, 188–9, 196, 202, 205, 210,
233
- South Africa 113, 115, 129, 137, 139–40,
229, 238, 241, 243
- South America 115, 141
- Soyinka, Wole 235
- space xv–xvi, xxii, 4–6, 12, 48, 50, 52,
68–71, 74, 77, 87–8, 90, 95–7, 105,
108–12, 118, 129, 131, 133–4, 137–9,
141, 143, 148–56, 164, 166–9, 171,
174, 176, 180, 184, 188, 195–6, 199,
206, 211–3, 223, 231–2, 240–1, 243,
245, 252 (n. 4)
- Spark, David 122
- spectactors xxi
- spectators xix, xxi, 3, 5–7, 20, 23, 25,
61, 64, 87–8, 91, 94–7, 103, 107–9,
117, 127, 130–1, 133, 138, 148, 150,
153, 155, 189, 203, 232–3, 239–40,
245, 251 (n. 11), 254 (n. 3), 258
(n. 3)
- Spieltrieb* 246
- spirtu prout* 115
- Split Breeches 234, 237
- Spolin, Viola 43–4, 46, 48, 50–4, 64, 103,
146, 197–8, 200–2, 206, 236
- spontaneity 50–1, 59–61, 65, 81, 94,
96–7, 101, 104, 110, 112–3, 116,
119–20, 122, 124, 129, 156–8, 169,
171, 176, 178, 190, 196, 198, 200,
202–3, 206, 213, 224, 226, 232, 238,
241, 248 (n. 6), 256 (n. 2)
- Spreafico, Marina 106
- Stafford-Clark, Max 181, 200
- stand-up xix, 104, 120–3, 139, 207–8,
243, 249 (n. 1), 250 (n. 3)
- Stanislavsky, Constantin xii, xxiii–xxiv,
1, 4, 6, 8–14, 24–5, 29, 38–40, 42,
44–5, 53–4, 70, 86, 145, 153–4, 174,
179, 187, 199–201, 203–4, 223, 226,
235, 247 (n. 3), 253 (n. 1), 255 (n. 1),
256 (n. 7)
- status 144, 169, 179–81, 195, 197, 211,
236
- Staunton, Imelda 35
- Stegreiftheater* 93–4, 96, 254 (n. 7)
- Steiner, Rudolf 13, 235
- stereotypes, character types 20, 47, 89,
96, 127–8, 132, 134, 187, 248 (n. 10)
- Stewart, Davina 53
- stock characters 133
- stock masks xx
- Stoddard, Eunice 40
- Stoppard, Tom 108, 227
- stornelli* 115
- storyteller, *and see* Teller xvi, 80, 97, 234,
255 (n. 7)
- story-telling xvi, 19, 43, 80, 106, 120,
134, 137, 139, 234, 236, 255
(n. 7)
- Story Theatre 48
- Strasberg, Lee xii, xxiii, 10, 26–7, 40–2,
44, 156–7, 173, 250 (n. 6)
- Strasbourg 17, 24
- Streetmosphere* 59
- Street of Crocodiles, The* 70, 248 (n. 14)
- Strehler, Giorgio 68, 76, 80–1
- Strindberg, August 256 (n. 6)
- subtext 11, 179, 229, 237

- Sulerzhitsky, Leopold 9, 39, 175, 255
(n. 1)
- Suspects* 222
- Suzuki, Tadashi 111, 149, 210
- symbolic, the 34–5, 67–8, 71, 73, 91,
224–5, 233
- System, Stanislavsky's 9–10, 38, 40
- t'ai chi ch'uan* 26, 145–6, 210, 225
- taboo xv, xx, 84, 96, 131, 212, 217–8,
241, 247 (n. 3)
- Tagore, Rabindranath 117
- Taïrov, Alexander 6, 14
- takagism* 58
- Take Five* 119
- taklit* (see also *taqlīd*) 134, 255
(n. 4)
- taksu* 127, 254 (n. 2)
- tal, tala* 11
- Taller de Investigación Teatral 92
- tanzimat* 134
- taqlīd* 131–2
- tarja* 117
- tasse, la* 73
- Taubin, Amy 33
- Taviani, Nando 124
- Taxi Driver* 41
- Tbilisi State University 203
- Teatr Laboratorium x, 86
- Teatr Narodnoy Komedii (People's Comedy
Theatre) 7
- Teatr Ósmego Dnia 220–1, 242
- teatro da bruciare* 64, 79, 161
- Teatro Famiglia Rame 81
- Teczki* 221
- Tel Aviv Playback Theatre troupe 99
- Teller, in Playback 97–9
- telling 144, 153, 168–9, 175, 210
- tenses 144, 176, 178, 195, 210
- text xv, xxiv, 4, 6–7, 9, 11, 16, 18, 21–4,
26, 30, 40–1, 67, 71, 74–5, 79–82,
87–8, 94, 102, 114, 121–2, 136, 139,
151, 160–2, 194–5, 205, 208, 212–3,
215, 219, 222, 230, 232–5, 237–8,
240, 243, 253 (n. 2), 257 (n. 2), 258
(n. 1)
- Theatre and its Double, The* xvii
- Théâtre de Complicité x, xxiii, 26, 70,
74, 146, 163, 224, 234, 248 (n. 14),
252 (n. 7)
- Théâtre de l'Oncle Sebastien 248 (n. 12)
- Théâtre des Champs-Élysées 17
- Théâtre du Soleil 76–7, 238
- Theatre Games* 147
- Theatre Guild 23
- Théâtre Libre 14, 16
- Theatre Machine x, 62–4, 79, 179, 220
- Theatre of Sources 92, 254 (n. 4)
- Theatre of the Eighth Day see *Teatr
Ósmego Dnia*
- Theatre of the
Oppressed 101–2, 118, 146, 218, 254
(n. 11)
- Theatre of the Ordinary 67, 113–4
- Theatre of the Thirteen Rows 86–7
- Theatre Sports 48–9, 52, 104–5, 113, 118,
173, 251 (n. 1)
- Theatre Workshop 149, 219, 255
(n. 1)
- therapy 5, 43–4, 93, 95–6, 99–100,
102–3, 110, 158, 217–8, 221, 225
- Thewlis, David 33, 36
- Third Studio 7
- Thomas, Betty 47, 53
- ThreadBear Theatre 97
- Time Machine, The* 62
- Time of the Mothers, The* 221
- timing 64, 74, 121, 155, 173
- Together* 249 (n. 16)
- Togo 137
- Told By An Idiot Theatre Company 146,
257 (n. 11)
- topeng* xviii, 126–9, 193, 255 (n. 3), 256
(n. 6)
- Topsy-Turvy* 36
- Toronto 48
- Tosun Efendi see *Pişekâr*
- Towards a Poor Theatre* 88
- Towsen, John xviii, 73
- Toynbee Hall 249 (n. 1)
- tragedy xxii, 7, 132, 209, 213,
252 (n. 4)
- training xi, xiii–xv, xx, xxii–xxiv, 1, 4–8,
10, 12–15, 17–9, 22–7, 38–9, 41–3, 46,
52–5, 64, 69–70, 74–5, 88, 93, 100–1,
103, 110, 112–4, 124, 126, 129, 143,
145–7, 149, 155–6, 159–61, 175, 180,
182, 186, 194, 202, 204, 222, 229,
234, 236, 245, 248 (n. 12), 252 (n. 7),
255 (n. 1)
- Training for the Theatre* 24
- trance xvii–xviii, 177, 182, 192–4, 211
- transactional analysis 54, 177
- transactional improvisation xxiii–xxiv
- transformation 8, 24, 56, 70, 81, 92, 127,
130, 168, 182, 184, 192–3, 209, 224
- translation 78–9, 94, 132, 252 (n. 8, n. 9)
- 'Trap' 58
- Trestle Theatre Company 146, 190–2,
257 (n. 11)
- Trinidadian 116–6
- trust xxiv, 51, 90, 144, 163–4, 190, 207,
210, 212, 218
- Tudor, David 121

- tulúat* 134–5
 Turkey 134–5
 Turner, Jane 221, 239
 Tuscany 115
 twelve ‘mistakes’ 236–7
 Two Bobs and their Carolina Girl 137
Two Thousand Years 27, 36, 249 (n. 15)
- UEA x
 UK xxv, 1, 3, 23, 26, 55, 66, 97, 103–4,
 123, 140, 159, 198, 249 (n. 1), 253
 (n. 13), 254 (n. 10), 257 (n. 11)
Uncommercial Traveller, The 106, 108
 undulation 156
 Uruguay 115
Ur-Shadows 32
 USA / United States 1, 3, 26, 48, 59, 104,
 110, 113, 115, 123, 140, 253 (n. 1),
 254 (n. 10), 257 (n. 11)
- Vakhtangov, Yevgeny 7–9, 13, 86, 247
 (n. 2)
 Varèse, Edgard 15
 Vatsyayan, Kapila xvii
 Veltrusky, Jiri 256 (n. 3)
Vera Drake 35–6, 249 (n. 15)
Verfremdung, Verfremdungseffekt 177, 258
 (n. 4)
 Versatile Eight, the 137
via negativa 75, 88, 113, 183, 244, 258–9
 (n. 7)
 video 172, 211, 250 (n. 6)
 Vidusaka xviii
 Vienna 46, 93–6
 Vieux-Colombier 14–5, 17, 19–23, 43,
 247 (n. 5), 248 (n. 11)
 Viewpoints 112
 Vilar, Jean 86
 Vildrac, Charles 16
 Vinterberg, Thomas 35
Viol de Lucrèce, Le 22
 Volkenberg, Ellen van 43
- Waiting for Godot* 141
 Wales 108
 Walker, Nancy Howland 60
waki 125
 WANDA *see* Word and Action
 Watts, Alan 225
wayang kulit, wayang wong 127
We Are the Lambeth Boys 249 (n. 16)
 Weaver, Fritz 45
 Weiss, Peter 28
 Wells-on-Sea (officially
 Wells-next-the-Sea) 63–4
- Wesker, Arnold 76, 235
 West African 5, 115, 137, 139
 West Bengal 117, 243
 West Indian 116
 White, Gareth 104, 106–8
 Who/where/what 113, 144, 197–8, 201,
 210
 whole-body awareness 110, 188, 194,
 212
Whose Line Is It Anyway? 222, 251 (n. 10)
 Widdess, Richard 119–20
 Wigman, Mary 76, 111
 WildWorks 104, 106, 227, 248–9 (n. 14)
 Williams, David 66, 77
 Wilsher, Toby 191, 257 (n. 11)
 Wilson + Wilson 248–9 (n. 14)
 Witkiewicz, Stanisław 86
Woman Under the Influence, A 32
 Wood, Charles 257 (n. 2)
 Wood, Victoria 251 (n. 10)
 Word and Action Theatre Company
 (WANDA) 55
 Works Progress Administration 44, 249
 (n. 1)
World's Worst: Improv Magazine 49
 Wright, John 76, 146, 191–2, 195, 257
 (n. 11), 258 (n. 6)
 writer 7, 12, 14, 18, 21, 23, 29–30, 32, 60,
 70, 73, 78, 86, 94, 122, 181, 187, 197,
 199, 209, 219, 234–8, 241, 244, 250
 (n. 3), 253 (n. 2), 257 (n. 3)
 Writer's Group 235
 Wunder, Al 67, 113–4, 176, 249–50
 (n. 1), 258–9 (n. 7)
- Xhosa 115
- Yakshagana* 138, 173
 Yavin, Naftali 44
 Yemeni 115–6
 ‘yes, and...’ 51, 237, 244
 yoga 145–6, 175, 210, 255 (n. 1)
 Yorùbá 137, 139, 255 (n. 9)
 Young, Phil 31
 Young Vic, The 248–9 (n. 14)
 Yours Truly Theatre 118
- zanni* xix–xx, 82, 133
Zanni's Grammelot 82
 Zaporah, Ruth 114, 173, 176
 Zarrilli, Phillip 129, 254 (n. 1)
zaum 248 (n. 13)
 Zeami, Motokiyo 124–5, 239
 Zed Events 57
Zombies Run! 251 (n. 8)