

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:
Cortese, R

Title:
Ranthers: Rehearsal and Development Process: How is the Text Enacted?

Date:
2019-04-01

Citation:
Cortese, R. (2019). Ranthers: Rehearsal and Development Process: How is the Text Enacted?. Australasian Drama Studies, 74 (74), pp.243-263

Persistent Link:
<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/352009>

RANTERS: REHEARSAL AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS – HOW IS THE TEXT ENACTED?

RAIMONDO CORTESE

ABSTRACT

*The article analyses the processes in which my postdramatic plays and performance texts, such as **St Kilda Tales**, **Roulette**, **Holiday** and **Intimacy**, are enacted in order to facilitate live interaction in relation to the audience. The application of everyday aesthetics within narrative and dramaturgical structures provides the performers of a *Ranters* production with a platform to focus on the moment-to-moment minutiae of actions that take place between them. In the theatre of the everyday that I describe in this essay, the audience members are invited into the same conceptual space and time as the performers, one that sits in the blurred lines between the fictive and the real. Notions of character are completely avoided, and instead the focus is on exploring and realising*

the possibilities that can be theatricalised by a fluid and open expression of 'self'.

When an actor/performer begins a rehearsal process, they very often begin with a simple question: what is my character? The question seems critical to the rendition of a successful production of a play, classic or contemporary. Yet the notion of character is a theatrical convention, which has altered considerably over many centuries. In my experience working with student and professional actors, character is often defined and categorised with a few reductive sentences, such as: my character is a person who loves money, or my character is motivated by jealousy. According to Tolstoy, defining 'character' in this way is a mistake.

People are like rivers: they all contain the same water everywhere, yet each river at times will be narrow, swift, broad, smooth-flowing, clear, cold, muddy, warm. So it is with people. Each man carries within himself the germs of all human qualities.¹

Similarly Strindberg castigates the use of 'character' in his preface to *Miss Julie*: 'In the course of time the word character has assumed manifold meanings. It must have originally signified the dominating trait of the soul-complex ... Later it became the middle-class term for automaton, one whose nature had become fixed.'² In reality, the

scripted character is just words on a page; it cannot hope to constitute a person's life. But if scripted in such a way, it can permit the actor to complement the dialogue with action and psychological depth.

While most traditional and mainstage theatre-makers utilise a notion of character in the performance of plays, which is used to frame or explain the psychological motivations that drive the action and dialogue, in the postdramatic and hyperrealist work of Ranters Theatre, character is avoided entirely. My early *Roulette*³ plays employ characterisation in the text at a minimal level; the dialogue is nuanced and particularised according to specific character voices, but there is no back-story information about who the characters are. This minimal use of character was gradually eliminated from the later postdramatic plays/texts that followed, such as *St Kilda Tales*,⁴ *The Wall*,⁵ *Holiday*⁶ and *Intimacy*.⁷ The actors did not assume a character in order to perform the text. They were asked to present themselves; the text became an exploration of self. This focus on the self, and questioning the self, and the development of a super-awareness in relation to performative habits, has been a cornerstone of my work with Ranters. It also bridges the concrete truth of the performed reality on stage, with the material presence of the actor. This consistent alignment between the material space and actor is a relatively new phenomenon in theatre.

In Brecht's theatre, the emphasis on the stage reality was not reconciled by his use of characterisation, where an actor is required to 'master their character by paying critical attention to its

manifold utterances'.⁸ As Auslander points out, there is a contradiction at the heart of Brecht's theories on staged performance: 'The dilemma for a Brechtian performance is that, for all of Brecht's emphasis on rationality and the undermining of theatrical illusion, the actor must convincingly portray something that she is not'.⁹ For Grotowski, characters in theatre serve to examine and reveal the inner mechanisms of the self. The theatre becomes a place that reveals the hidden agendas within everyday encounters, 'the language of gestures, mumblings, sounds, intonations, picked up in the street'.¹⁰ In Grotowski's theatre, the self is placed at the forefront in order to perform an exorcism of hidden motives, but not at the expense of character. According to Auslander, character for Grotowski is 'is primarily a means of self-examination and a screen behind which that process can occur safely'.¹¹

Although Grotowski radically redefines the concept of character, it is still a critical component of his theatre. In my work with Ranters, character is seen as a veil to hide what is more essential to the theatre we are making, such as the unconscious forces that lie within the actor. The focus on character can sometimes come at the expense of more unconscious behavioural impulses that we are interested in releasing. External considerations, such as physical blocking, can override an actor's commitment to spontaneity. Character can sometimes be used as an excuse to avoid doing anything that makes the actor uncomfortable, or fearful; the result is a tacit form of 'normalisation' of human behaviour. A refusal to engage in behaviour

considered abnormal or aberrant is a way of creating restrictions around what an actor may or may not do. It allows the actor to control how they might expose themselves in front of an audience, instead of being open and vulnerable to the possibilities that present themselves to her/him. For this reason, Jean Renoir said ‘to understand one’s character one must have no preconceived ideas’.¹²

In the case of contemporary hyperrealist performances, the text is crafted to sound identical or similar to natural conversation. Written dialogue is disguised; conflict, action and story are inbuilt to the text in a way that is invisible to the audience. In order to achieve this, the conventions of plot, narrative structure, characterisation, theatrical duration and language are reorganised, to make the artifice or fiction unreadable. When the spoken text is pre-determined, the actors have to discover a process to make it sound and feel spontaneous, as though they are saying it for the first time. As Joseph Chaikin said, an actor should be as ‘free as his breathing. And like his breathing, he doesn’t cause it to happen.’¹³

Some texts in hyperrealist performances are taken directly from verbatim material and are edited, rearranged in such a way to hide any interference on the part of the dramaturg, as is the case in *I’m Your Man*,¹⁴ by Australian director Roslyn Oades. Rather than place the focus on external indicators of change, such as plot or characterisation, the theatre of hyperrealism places the focus on the minutiae of moment-to-moment expression. Similarly, Aristotle’s notion of unity of time¹⁵ is discarded and replaced with a nonrepresentational

ordering of events that dissolves the disparity between theatrical time and real time. In the postdramatic productions of Ranters Theatre, such as *Holiday* or *Intimacy*, events and scenes are seen in relation to each other by virtue of their context within the show; they do not refer to a time and place outside the theatre space.

In my experience, this perceptual shift has evolved a ‘hearing’ audience into ‘seeing and hearing’ audience. Our exposure to film, television and digital media via the Internet has concentrated and privileged the way we observe human behaviour. The development in dance aesthetics has also impacted on contemporary theatre. The audience is watching more closely. They have become more literate at reading the visual and behavioural aspects of the production. Although it is not possible to measure how this has impacted on the way we view theatre, there is no doubt that theatrical productions have accommodated this perceptual shift in their audiences.

Much contemporary theatre has repositioned itself by presenting in more intimate environments, limiting audience capacities, creating theatre in the round or traverse. By doing so, an intimate proximity is created between audience and performer that in some respects simulates the closeness of the camera. As the audience is drawn closer towards the eyes and faces of the performers, the text has had to adapt itself. The postdramatic, hyperrealist texts that I write for Ranters Theatre are experienced, as in digital media, only in relationship to what is seen. Little or no underlying textual content needs to be explained. Words are seen as prime movers for action.

Within the everyday environment, the performer and audience react to the circumstances as they play out in front of them. Most people are content to behave without restricting themselves to notions of character. Whether on stage or within the everyday, the actors' actions and reactions determine how they are to be perceived by their audience. The audience is given a glimpse into the actors' psyches, as well as their own. There are many ways in which the conventions of staging text-based theatre – or theatre where 'characters' speak lines – are in contradiction to the way that text functions in the everyday. From my observations of the everyday, people's responses to what happens in front of them are generally instinctive, utilising a complex interplay of conscious and unconscious mechanisms. People react to circumstances as they encounter them, often in ways that undermine every effort they have made to direct and control their reactions to those they are engaged with. For example, in a café, I witnessed a young couple have an argument, even though they seemed happy to meet each other a few minutes earlier. After the argument, they spent considerable time 'making up' for their disagreement, only to have another more tempestuous argument towards the end of the meeting. Shortly afterwards, I witnessed the same couple amicably holding hands as they walked down the street. The words people speak are in response to an immense set of forces that they are unable to fully grasp. Words in the everyday are imbued within complex behaviours, and often appear to be in direct contradiction to what is occurring in any given moment. On-stage and off-stage, people 'create an

unconscious and elaborate labyrinth of side steps and manoeuvres with which to hide their feelings and thoughts from others'.¹⁶

The French use of the word *personnage* and the Italian use of *persona*, rather than 'character', allows for the suggestion that what the audience witnesses on stage is a performed reality. In Ranters' process, the essential focus for the actor should be on what is occurring in the totality of any given moment. It is the indefinable 'action', what Artaud refers to as the artist 'signalling through the flames',¹⁷ emanating from the other actor(s) and the audience that shapes how a person might react. As has previously been stated, an actor in a Ranters production is required to present him/herself. Each actor is asked to confront her/his own habitual codes of performance within the everyday, to unveil her/his own performative tendencies in order to present a stripped-back and super-aware version of the self. This is not to suggest that the self is a discrete unit, but rather to try to unpack and question the socialised norms comprising the behaviour of self from a more essential version of self. The body, or self, as Auslander suggests, 'is not an organic, undifferentiated presence'.¹⁸

The Canadian company PME-Art, like many contemporary theatre companies working with postdramatic forms, has adopted a similar approach to character. The impulse to construct character via technical preparation and the exploration of psychological motivations can be used to hide qualities that are perhaps more vital to theatre. According to Jacob Wren, it can be argued that this impulse distances the actor 'from what is most immediate, to defuse

the intimacy and potential for conflict and in doing so undermine what really is at stake'.¹⁹ The artistic director of Pan Pan, Gavin Quin, similarly requires his actors to shed characterisation and to employ tasks to access the core of an encounter. The aim of the task, in association with a segment of text, is designed to create a 'spontaneity that seeks the quality of improvisation or unpredictability to achieve realness as opposed to rehearsed repetition'.²⁰ In the work of NYID, actors similarly engage tasks, which accumulate to form a body of actions, but these in no way suggest character, or psychological motivation. In their 2004 show, *Blowback*,²¹ roles are listed as 'The Actor Playing Scott' and 'The Actor Playing Charlene' and so on. There is a conscious recognition throughout the text that the roles are theatrical constructions, open to manipulation and diverse interpretation, rather than fixed psychological characters. The text in NYID's productions is used to suggest, provoke, inspire actions and reactions; it can only be understood in conjunction with the physical presence of the actors. Their work reflects a repudiation of the literary enunciatory theatre that dominates much mainstage production.

In some mainstage text-based theatre, characters often become the mouthpiece for a discussion based around particular themes or socio-political content or ideas that are external to any exploration of the underlying relationship between the characters/actors. The play often becomes a literal expression of content, rather than seeing the text as a mode for giving expression to behaviour. The text is understood literally and seen to engender the entirety of what

happens, which seems to contradict the way text is signified in the everyday, as in David Williamson's *Don Parties On*,²² or Tim Winton's *Rising Water*.²³ The conventions that govern theatre writing have been so pervasive that they have become the benchmark or standard by which all plays or texts for the theatre are critiqued. The theatrical experience is supposed to revolve around the literal meaning of the text, which very often negates many other complex behaviours that occur alongside and simultaneous with the text.

During rehearsals, it is not uncommon for plays to be read around a table on the first day, where decisions are made about the 'action' of the text, based on this initial 'reading' of the play. 'Characterisation' is also often established relatively early, unfortunately also based on round-table analysis, which negates and undermines the use of physical actions and responses. Usually after these initial and hasty decisions are made, plays are rehearsed for four weeks, which is a relatively short time by European standards, before production.

There is also an expectation that an actor knows what the other actors' lines will be before rehearsal, as they are given the entire script. Many directors have decided to do away with this convention, notably Ken Loach and Woody Allen among others in film, and theatre directors like Tim Etchells and Stefan Kaegi. In the Elizabethan theatre, the actors were only given their own lines plus the cue lines from the other characters – a process known as 'cue scripting'.²⁴ It has been argued that this made the actors listen more acutely, but it was also necessitated by the prohibitive cost of

employing copyists as well as the costs associated with rehearsal time. And in an era with no copyright law, it prevented disgruntled actors from absconding with the scripts.

The notion that an actor should receive the entire play was also not a convention at the time. The concept of having an actor know what was going to happen to them in the story may have been seen as absurd; after all, in life we seldom have the same privilege. The Globe Theatre was, and still is, an intimate performance venue; the audience is proximate to the stage, requiring a high level of veracity from the actors.

The critical question for me as theatre writer is how speech functions in relation to everything else that occurs on stage. A contemporary audience does not experience theatre in the same way as audiences past. The frame has changed. So if we choose not to construct theatre texts from ‘old recipes’ as Brecht stated,²⁵ how might the text elicit the richness and diversity of complex behaviours as presented in the everyday? In postdramatic theatre, the rules that govern traditional psychological narrative are jettisoned in favour of multiple texts, languages and utterances that can create a more open way of reading the performance. When I write theatre texts, I meditate on the imaginary, the presence of the actors, their tasks, how they might be affecting each other, the space, the spatial design, including objects, and most importantly, the proximity of the audience. The text is simultaneously designed to affect all of the actors and the audience that share the space, but only in counter-

point to, or conjunction with, the physical ‘readings’ and actions that are taking place at the same time.

All forms of acting have a very direct relationship to the everyday, whether they occur in a formal theatre environment or in any other form of organised theatre. What occurs between people in ‘real’ life is a significant barometer by which we determine the plausibility, emotional veracity or even at times the quality of what we see before us as a constructed, enacted event. According to Goffman, ‘All the world is not, of course, a stage, but the crucial ways in which it isn’t are not easy to specify’.²⁶ In many cases, the line between fiction and the everyday is so blurred that determining when a person is ‘acting’ or not is difficult to discern, even for a trained eye.

The challenge for an actor performing one of my plays is to create the conditions or processes that enable her or him to react to live situations without any conscious impediment – to be genuinely surprised, upset, angry – and to behave towards another actor in a way that is entirely fluid, without a reflective intervention. An actor in the everyday does not ‘see’ themselves in the way an outside observer does, and so does not cogitate their behaviour while they are doing it. An actor in a Ranters show attempts to mirror this same condition, which is an extremely difficult task to achieve, as actors have already prepared the scene and the text they are about to deliver; for the most part, they have unconsciously worked out ‘actions’ to play.²⁷ In my experience of actors performing in my plays, an awareness of ‘action’ actually makes them more self-conscious and less able to give

themselves over to the immediacy of what is occurring right in front of them.

In my work with Ranters Theatre, the rehearsal period was not designed to control what might occur, but rather to allow the actor to strip away the conscious mechanisms they naturally put into play in order to mediate their behaviour. Everyday life might teach us to learn from mistakes, rather than plunge into the same maelstrom night after night, but this is precisely what a Ranters actor needs to do. Given that the text I write is known in advance, the critical question is: what enables an actor to lose control? How does an actor embrace what Artaud calls the ‘frail moving source forms never attain’.²⁸

Having worked with Ranters for twenty-three years, I have come to understand that an actor cannot discover spontaneous reactions by reducing their awareness of what is occurring within and around them. Rather what is required is a super-awareness of what takes place in any given moment. It is this super-awareness – which directors and methodologists often call ‘presence’,²⁹ such as being ‘present to the moment’ – which permits the actor to respond to the labyrinthine multiplicity of unconscious and conscious mechanisms that are at play at any one time, whether in a play or performing reality.

The Ranters performance process puts in place a number of circumstances to enable the actor/performer to react instinctively to what’s in front of them, rather than to make conscious considerations. An actor in a Ranters show will have learned their lines

prior to rehearsal, so the rehearsal process focuses on elements that can't be controlled in advance – on the behavioural minutiae unfolding moment to moment, which each actor needs to respond to unconsciously. The result is an unmediated action, one driven by 'super-awareness'. The director assists the actors in ensuring that their responses are genuinely free of conscious interference and are not reliant on performative habits, such as affecting emotion, acting in isolation, declaiming, or creating controlled patterns of behaviour. These performative habits also include those from real-life that are used to modulate everyday behaviour. In this context, what we call 'character', the qualities and actions that determine who we are, is merely a substitute term for the accumulation of performative habits over time.³⁰ Ranters' actors are required to dispel notions of 'character' in order to avoid veiled discourse with each other. For this reason, Ranters also work non-representationally, with full-awareness of audience; there is no pretence at creating a fiction. The space is concrete, the audience exists; the relationship between audience, space and performer is one that is free of illusory representations.³¹

Most theatre processes and methodologies spend considerable time discovering what elements are beyond the control of the actor. In classic Stanislavski, the actor discovers an 'objective' and they play an 'action' in order to achieve it.³² By focusing on the objective and action, attention is taken off the line of dialogue. In many cases actors discover something dynamic and fluid between them, only to realise that it can just work once and that the next time they meet

they have to try something different. Attempting to duplicate what worked the previous night is always a trap; the actor has become conscious of what happened. Many actors try to lock down their performance through technical preparation where they repeatedly practise engaging in a particular emotional state to enable themselves to draw upon that same emotional state at the required moment in performance, only to realise that emotion has been tempered by their awareness of it, as though they might rehearse crying for a funeral the day before.

The danger with working with actions is that while consciousness might be removed from the line, it is directed towards the task. The action or the task now becomes ‘readable’ to a discerning audience. Literate audiences, such as those you might find in the international festival circuits or contexts where there is a steady reception of theatrical experiences, can more readily read an actor ‘playing the action’. This visibility undermines the theatrical impact as it renders the performed behaviour predictable. For this reason, an actor working for Ranters is asked to dispense with utilising actions, or tools that will lock down the performance or mitigate their super-awareness.

The one thing that an actor cannot control in a scene, as in the everyday, is how another actor might behave. For this reason the Ranters performance process jettisons focus on the text, as well as ‘actions’ (playing an action can be used as a ‘get out of gaol’ card, when the actor has lost sense of what they are doing), and instead

requires the actor to confer attention on the opposing actor(s) and the space around them, including the presence of the audience. Allowing the actor to react to the immediacy of how the other actor(s) and the audience are affecting him/her assists the actor to dispel the consciousness of speaking prepared lines of dialogue. The manner in which a text is delivered, as well as the meaning that the actors and audience derive from the text, has little to do with any literal interpretation of the text. Rather it is wholly to do with what the line is 'doing' in the context of the performance. The meaning of any line can be utterly transformed by a Ranters actor by simply changing what the actor is 'doing' with the text.

The Ranters process is designed to allow the actor to be open and vulnerable to transformation; the actors affect change in each other. This sounds simple, but in reality is complex and extremely difficult to achieve. It goes against the actors' natural inclinations, which is to protect themselves from revealing what they feel and think. While working on the floor during rehearsal, a Ranters actor must unlearn social constraints that have conditioned their behaviour since childhood. Rather than protect and veil their emotional response, the actor has to overcome the interference of their consciousness and trust, not only the external eye of the director, but also the other actors and the audience. They must learn to lose control in the moment to the point that the 'scene' appears to be unfolding for the first time; the result is the particular hyperrealist aesthetic. The intention is to reveal what is invisible within the real.³³

In my experience, actors betray themselves when they consciously monitor their behaviour and thereby do not achieve what is termed ‘emotional truth’. Peter Brook defines this process as the actor learning ‘how to lie truthfully’.³⁴ The emotions need to be real, even if the circumstances are invented. Seasoned detectives talk of trusting ‘gut instinct’ when ascertaining whether an interviewee is telling the truth.³⁵ But even the layperson is very good at working out when an actor is lying or not; it is extremely difficult, for instance, for an actor to imitate emotion. The audience places their attention on those elements of the performance that they know are hard to fake, or cannot be ‘readily manipulated, thus enabling ourselves to judge the reliability of the more misrepresentable cues in the performance’.³⁶ For a Ranters actor, the key is to discover an unmediated spontaneity that responds to a direct encounter of the other actors, and the audience.

Each production is developed over a three- to four-week period before entering a six- to eight-week rehearsal stage. The length of development and rehearsal enables the actors to work cohesively as an ensemble. The development is used to construct concepts, and methods of working, and for more recent work, such as *Intimacy*, to develop thematic content for the text. The actors are required to know their lines before the commencement of rehearsal. This allows the actor more time to focus on each other’s presence. While the dialogue is known beforehand, the actors improvise, often paraphrasing the text, in order to develop a concrete relationship with each other. The

improvisations are designed to refine the actor's reactive skills, to draw out unconscious forces that are often in counterpoint to the written text. In the early hyperrealist plays, the actors played with objectives in order to draw out hidden conflict in the text. This conflict was often unexpected, or acted out of alignment with the literal content of the dialogue. The narrative content in the *Roulette* plays, or the multiple lines of action in plays like *St Kilda Tales* or *The Wall*, draw the actors towards an emotional end point. But with the later hyperrealist plays, such as *Holiday* or *Intimacy*, there is no drama or conflict inherent in the text. The actors engage each other, and the audience, in a relaxed state. While they perform themselves, they utilise intertextual content that shifts the audience's experience of performed reality, suggesting a 'situated, relational, subjectivity'.³⁷ The actors are neither fictional, nor non-fictional, operating between a fluid and definable space. The actors express an authentic, everyday spontaneity, while simultaneously expressing a super-awareness that what they are performing is theatrically constructed. While acting themselves, they are at once several, having adopted multiple personas; the actors are tangible yet hybridised personas. As Eckersall and Paterson state, 'The performer is a shifting, often multiple presence'.³⁸ This outcome is the result of rigorous rehearsal that details, layer upon layer, the miniscule happenings that occur between the actors, which slowly coalesce to form a visible yet transient relationship. By the time the play is ready to be performed, the actors' senses have been refined; they are super-alert, super-aware, spontaneous and open to each other, but with a relaxed attitude.

Discovering ways to be spontaneous is nothing new. David Garrick, the great eighteenth-century actor who transformed the English stage, was the enemy of formalism. He hated the reduction of characterisations to formulaic narratives, such as ‘tragic struts, elaborate gestures, chanting declamations’.³⁹ But the conventions by which we determine ‘truth’ on stage or in film, or even in the everyday, varies widely. Many directors, for example, who came out of the Actor’s Studio began to disparage the ‘method’, which David Mamet compares to preparing for a lecture rather than for a scene. ‘The Method got it wrong ... It is beside the point to have [an actor] undergo the supposed trials of the character upon the stage. The actor has his own trials ... they don’t have to be superadded; they exist.’⁴⁰ The audience of the Internet age has become increasingly aware of the camera, its ability to ‘close in’ on the action. The audience is now more able than ever to read and interpret human behaviour as it expresses itself physically and verbally. How an audience defines spontaneity changes and evolves over time. While many directors talk about actions and objectives,⁴¹ in everyday theatre this is not something that is so easily reducible to singular impulses. The vast complexity inherent in any given moment is something that every actor has to grapple with; it ensures that their art will always be one of continuous discovery. Engaging theatre occurs when this act of discovery is shared with the audience, allowing them to glimpse and engage with an act of continuous creation.

NOTES

- 1 Konstantin Stanislavski, *Stanislavski's Legacy*, trans. Elizabeth Hapgood (New York: Theatre Art Books, 1968) 15.
- 2 August Strindberg, *Six Plays of Strindberg*, trans. Elizabeth Sprigge (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955) 64.
- 3 Premiered at the Price Theatre for the 2000 Adelaide Festival of the Arts.
- 4 Premiered at the Merlyn Theatre, Playbox, for the Centenary of Federation Festival 2001, in a co-production with Ranters Theatre.
- 5 Premiered at Horti Hall by Ranters Theatre for the 2003 Melbourne International Arts Festival.
- 6 Premiered in 2007 at Arts House, Melbourne.
- 7 Premiered at the Beckett Theatre, as a co-production with the Malthouse Theatre, for the 2010 Melbourne International Arts Festival.
- 8 Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, trans. John Willet (London: Methuen, 1986) 198.
- 9 Philip Auslander, *From Acting to Performance* (London: Routledge, 1997) 33.
- 10 Jerzy Grotowski, *Towards a Poor Theatre*, ed. Eugenio Barba (London: Methuen, 1975) 52.
- 11 Auslander, *From Acting to Performance*, 34.
- 12 Peter Brook, *There Are No Secrets* (London: Methuen, 1993) 27.
- 13 Joseph Chaikin, *The Presence of the Actor* (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1991).
- 14 Premiered at Belvoir Street Theatre, for the 2012 Sydney Festival of the Arts.
- 15 Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Malcolm Heath (London: Penguin, 1996) 15.
- 16 Raimondo Cortese, *Roulette: 12 Dialogues* (Sydney: Currency Press, 2005) ix.
- 17 Antonin Artaud, *Collected Works*, vol. 1, trans. Victor Corti (London: Calder & Boyars, 1971) 6.
- 18 Auslander, *From Acting to Performance*, 35.
- 19 Jacob Wren, 'Theatre Reminds Me of Politics', in Peter Crawley and Willie White (eds), *No More Drama* (Dublin: Project Press, 2010) 65.
- 20 Nicola Ruiz, in Peter Crawley and Willie White (eds), *No More Drama* (Dublin: Project Press, 2010) 129.
- 21 Premiered at St Kilda, Melbourne, 2004.
- 22 Premiered at The Arts Centre, Melbourne Theatre Company, 2011.
- 23 Premiered at Black Swan State Theatre Company, Perth, 2011.
- 24 Patrick Tucker, *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2002) 37.
- 25 Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, 183.
- 26 Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Allen Lane Penguin Press, 1969) 78.
- 27 Konstantin Stanislavski, *An Actor Prepares*, trans. Elizabeth Hapgood (London: Methuen, 1980) 13–16.
- 28 Artaud, *Collected Works*,

- vol. 1, 6.
- 29 Alan Read, *Theatre and Everyday Life* (London: Routledge, 1993) 61.
- 30 Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 78.
- 31 Cortese, *Roulette*, ix–x.
- 32 Stanislavski, *Stanislavski's Legacy*, 46.
- 33 Cortese, *Roulette*, iv.
- 34 Peter Brook, *The Empty Space* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1968) 131.
- 35 Robert D. Keppel and William J. Birnes, *The Psychology of Serial Killer Investigations: The Grisly Business Unit* (San Diego: Academic Press, 2003) xxiii.
- 36 Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 66.
- 37 Peter Eckersall and Eddie Paterson, 'Slow Dramaturgy and the Everyday', *Australasian Drama Studies*, 58 (2011): 8.
- 38 *Ibid.*
- 39 Greg Denning, *Performances* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996) 117.
- 40 David Mamet, *True & False* (London: Faber & Faber, 1998) 22.
- 41 *Ibid* 84.