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PART I:

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Antonin Artaud, whose sanity is the subject of debate to this day, had a very long love/hate relationship with psychology and psychologists. From an early age he had mental problems, and for the greater share of his adult life he was under the care of a psychiatrist or institutionalized. He regarded their medicine as ineffective, because it dealt only with the mind of the patient, not the whole person.

Having rejected this traditional, mentalist psychology, Artaud looked to the theater as an alternative method of therapy. He became convinced that both he and the rest of the world were ill. To cure this sickness he thought he needed to cut across the long, ineffective games for the mind his doctors were always engaging in and work directly on each person's body, reaching him directly through the nerves. One of his favorite paintings, "Lot's Daughters," illustrated the technique for him:

Il semble que le peintre ait eu connaissance de certains secrets concernant l'harmonie linéaire, et des moyens de la faire agir directement sur le cerveau, comme un réactif primitif. (IV, 43)
He centered this new therapy on efforts to help the subject (organisme) exhibit the new, desired behaviors:

Je propose d'en revenir au théâtre à cette idée élémentaire magique, reprise par la psychanalyse moderne, qui consiste pour obtenir la guérison d'un malade à lui faire prendre l'attitude extérieure de l'état auquel on voudrait le ramener. (IV, 96)

This quote summarizes the fundamentally therapeutic thrust of Artaud's work in the theater, both in theory and in practice. It is a side of Artaud often treated superficially in contemporary criticism.

Authors writing analyses or interpretations of Artaud's theoretical work in recent years have become quite prolific. A glance at any recent MLA Bibliography for Twentieth Century French Literature reveals a very large number of entries for Artaud, and the list gets longer every year. More and more drama companies are rediscovering his plays, and commentary on them generates even more criticism. There is a fairly good number of books working from within the often contradictory texts to trace the development of his theories and elucidate their meaning at various stages. Gallimard's reedition of Le Théâtre et son double and of Artaud's complete works in thirteen volumes have abetted this task greatly. By considerably facilitating access to his widely
scattered writings, they have, no doubt, substantially contributed to enhancing his popularity in current literary circles.

Far less subtly engaged in celebrating Artaud, his plays and theoretical works, are those who have sought to interpret his message from outside the texts, that is, in light of another politico-philosophical or psychological system. Unfortunately, for the most part, what might have led to fruitful insights ended up wallowing in saccharine, overblown praise. This zeal to promote Artaud's cause has become so strong that a reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* in a review entitled "Saint Artaud" outrightly calls many of Artaud's literary critics hagiographers. He does not exaggerate.

This is a lamentable tendency, for it downgrades the real value of Artaud's work far more than it ever boosts it. Again and again one must wade through hyperbolized descriptions of Artaud's actions or statements to get to any substantive comment. Paule Thévenin's description of a visit to Artaud is exemplary. She was a very close friend of Artaud's near the end of his life, and she says that he was teaching her how to use her voice dramatically, that is, to speak the new theater language that he had invented:
Dès que j'eus frappé à la porte d'Antonin Artaud, j'eus le sentiment que j'allais pénétrer dans un autre monde. Il faut l'avoir entendu dire, une seule fois, ce simple mot. "Entrez!" pour comprendre cela. Le mot se chargeait d'un sens tout spécial, il était prononcé avec tant de netteté, les deux syllabes se détaichaient avec une si totale précision que l'on avait l'impression de quitter l'endroit où l'on se trouvait pour entrer "ailleurs."5

Marc-Vigier goes even farther to prove the divinity of Artaud: "Artaud le Retranché, Artaud qui est à lui seul son père et sa mère, va se faire Grand Inquisiteur du Verbe pour le salut de l'Occident philistin."6 This type of sloge can only hinder the advance of serious, probing scholarship.

Extant interpretive scholarship on Artaud may roughly be divided into three broad categories: Jungian, Freudian, and the criticism of the Tel-Quel group. The Jungian approach would appear to be the most promising of the three. Artaud frequently referred to the great myths of theater, the theater as myth, the myths of life. In Mexico he came to see archetypal patterns in formations of stone and all about him in nature. Artaud, too, described the theater as a kind of alchemy. (IV, 58-63) Noting these references, Ann Demaître has used Jung's interpretation of the alchemical process to describe Artaud's enterprise of theater. She claims to give the most plausible explanation of an otherwise
inexplicable identity between alchemical and Artaudian methodology. This seems to be the only rigorous, thorough attempt to apply Jung's ideas; yet, it is an interpretation based upon an interpretation. And, by the author's own admission, not all students of alchemy accept Jung's interpretation. Much more important study directly applying Jung's principles to Artaud's work could be done in this area. The actual plays that Artaud wrote would probably be the most fruitful area for study.

It is ironic and slightly humorous that the analytical psychologists, whom Artaud detested so much, cannot leave him alone. He wanted no part of them either for himself or his theater: "Et il me semble que le théâtre et nous-mêmes devons en finir avec la psychologie." (IV, 92)

Dr. J.-L. Armand-Laroche in his study *Antonin Artaud et son double* gives an extended, traditional Freudian view of Artaud's life and works. A comment on Artaud's language is illustrative of one of the major faults of this criticism:

Par voie de conséquence, on peut comprendre facilement que le langage est d'autant plus trouble dans sa forme qu'il est plus délibéré dans son contenu. C'est une éruption de passions inconscientes primaires et brutales. Le discours cesse alors de posséder sa véritable valeur essentielle de communication avec le monde extérieur et FREUD échafaud une hypothèse séduisante tendant à démontrer que le malade retranché de toute vie de relation par une impossibilité radicale reporte ainsi à un amour du langage en soi son intérêt sur la matière inanimée du verbe.
Dr. Armand-Laroche seems unable to distinguish between a man's work and his life. Since for Freudians all of Artaud's writings were exteriorized manifestations of inner drives, conflicts, and passions, their criticism remains not much more than belated psychoanalysis. Artaud was a problem to the psychologists of his time, and the ensuing years have done little to change the fundamental incapacity of psychoanalytic terms to effectively deal with or understand Antonin Artaud's anomalous behavior. Moreover, the thrust of Artaud's theatrical career was against an interiorized psychology of non-action based on prolonged reflection, meditation, and analysis. It is not surprising, then, that Freudian interpretations have been neither numerous nor particularly successful.

By far the most vocal advocates of Artaud's cause are those who are associated with or strongly influenced by the New Criticism of the Tel-Quel group in France. Several of Artaud's letters and poetry were first published in the journal Tel-Quel, and at least two issues of this journal, numbers 20 (Winter, 1965) and 52 (Winter, 1972), primarily consist of articles dealing with Artaud. In 1972 at Cérisy-la-Salle, the Tel-Quel group sponsored a colloquium/conference on Artaud. Others have provided lengthy analyses of the structures and substructures (écriture and sous-texte) of various parts of Artaud's
theatrical and poetical works. One wonders, though, after having read even a few of their articles, if they are talking about the same man as everyone else.

First and foremost to this group is the sign. Certainly this is one of the most important themes of Artaud's writings, and it became more and more important as his life went on. However, Artaud's ideas about signification changed radically in Mexico; they kept changing until he died, by which time he had reached the point of almost completely rejecting the theories he had advanced in *Le Théâtre et son double*. At the end of his life the signifying aspect came to obsess him almost to the exclusion of all else as it seems to have come to obsess these new critics. This side of Artaud is only one side, and a very complicated one at that. Unfortunately, one has the feeling that Sollers and his followers are writing less to explain Artaud than to polemicize and exemplify their own politico-philosophical revolution.

While all these interpretive efforts may have added to a deeper understanding and appreciation of Artaud, they neglect an essential aspect of Artaud's theater. Namely, Artaud wanted to create, in a sense, a theater based on objective, even scientific methods. He wanted complete control to manipulate the very objective acting of his actors. He wanted to use theater to work directly on the
senses to bring about a discreet set of effects and changes in his audience. To a large extent Artaud tried to be as calculating, rigorous, and methodical as any scientist. Thus, a more complete understanding of Artaud's theater can be had by using a scientific approach. Concentrating on establishing as concisely and rigorously as possible his true theatrical goals, the environment he worked in, the audience he addressed, the methods he chose to achieve these ends, and how he intended that they work will constitute this approach. Using the psychological theories of Burrhis F. Skinner, the father of the modern behaviorist school, this study will provide an explanation of the psychological mechanisms at the heart of Artaud's theater and a basis for the evaluation of failures, successes, and lasting contributions.

B. F. Skinner, only recently retired from Harvard University as Edgar Pierce Professor of Psychology, has written more than a dozen books from the 1930's to the present day. He has therein given full form to the basic skeletal structure of behaviorist psychology as proposed by Watson and others in the earlier part of the century. His theories are not limited to explaining normal and abnormal behavior; he has gone on to apply his basic theories to the origin, development, and maintenance of language behavior.
Almost all of Skinner's theories stem from several central ideas:

(1) Some behavior occurs or does not occur in a given environment because of its consequences (operant behavior). In the case of this behavior, one can alter the probability that a person will act in a certain way in the future by altering his environment or by altering the consequences of his actions in the present. A child who studies for an examination and then passes is exhibiting operant behavior.

(2) Other behaviors occur after the presentation of a stimulus as a result of a past history of occurring concurrently with other reflex responses (respondent behavior). Pavlov trained a dog to salivate when he rang a bell by repeatedly giving the dog food at the same time he rang the bell. This is the classic example of respondent conditioning.

(3) Behavior can be explained by reference to objective, scientific criteria. There is no need for recourse to hypothetical, mediating processes such as "drives," "ego," "libido," and "feelings" to explain behavior. Verbal descriptions like "I am hungry" often accompany behavior and are said to cause the behavior. According to Skinner, these are only by-products of the stimuli which also cause the subject to seek the food. To say he seeks food because he is hungry is both superfluous and misleading.
(4) All behavior can be reduced to a variation, complex or simple, of the two basic processes mentioned above or a combination of the two: (a) In the presence of a stimulus (SD) the subject emits a response (R) which is conseuated either by a reinforcer (SR) or a punisher (SP), or nothing (extinction procedure). Thus, SD → R → SR or SP or ∅. (b) If in the presence of a stimulus (UCS) which elicits an unconditioned response (UCR) a second, neutral stimulus is simultaneously presented, the second stimulus (CS) will come to elicit an (often) identical response (CR). Thus, UCS → UCR, CS → CR. In the classic Pavlovian example, the food (UCS) elicits salivation (UCR). When the presentation of food (UCS) is repeatedly paired with the ringing of a bell (CS), the bell soon elicits salivation (CR) also.

(5) Consequation leads to a change in the future probability of the occurrence of a given operant response. Current environmental variables and conditioning history can affect behavior.

(6) An operant analysis is comprised of three terms: (a) an assessment of the current environmental variables affecting the subject and his past history, (b) the target response and the response actually emitted, (c) the consequence of the response.
(7) Normally, an organism works to maximize reinforcement, and/or minimize punishment, and minimize the amount of effort expended to obtain the reinforcement.

(8) Language behavior can essentially be explained in the above terms.11

These behavioral principles will, then, be used in the ensuing chapters to gradually construct a whole explanatory framework for Artaud's theater of cruelty. They are particularly valuable in studying Artaud because Skinner, like Artaud, deals with the spectator as a whole entity, not a symbiosis of mind and body. For both, man can be reached, and influenced, without even engaging the "thinking" part of the brain (although neither totally rejects thinking.)

Skinner's theories will also provide a means for explaining a rather curious contradiction in Artaud's theoretical writings. At one time Artaud insisted that he rejected psychology and mentalism; he wanted to act directly upon the body. Yet at other times, he stated that he had to recall hidden or shadowy images to restore the true life.12 This seems to be little more than disguised mentalism. A most striking statement and definitely contrary to the whole thrust of Artaud's theater, this contradiction has generally been ignored or glossed over. Yet, as will be shown, it is very important in precisely understanding Artaud's desired impact on the audience.
Before beginning this Skinnerian analysis of Artaud's theories and theater, it will be necessary to investigate first the theatrical experiences of the audience (i.e., their conditioning history) and the influences on the author (behavioral engineer) which shape his goals.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1- All quotes from Artaud's texts and plays are from Antonin Artaud, Oeuvres Complètes, Vol. 1-13, IRe-- (Paris: Gallimard, 1956---). They are quoted with permission.


10- Contrary to what one might suppose, the two responses, (UCR) and CR, are not the same, though they may appear to be. Millenson explains: "The similarity between CR and (UCR) in the salivary reflex is probably responsible for the general belief perpetrated until modern times, that CR is (UCR). But Pavlov himself knew this to be untrue. Not only was the magnitude of the CR different from (UCR), but the actual chemical composition of the saliva differed between CR and (UCR). Pavlov, however, chose to ignore the differences...." p. 42.
11- The reader is referred to a glossary of helpful terms and abbreviations used in this study, which will be found at the end of the text. For more detailed information, the reader should consult the indices of Skinner's books, listed in the bibliography.

12- Cf. Chapter 3, p. 44 of this study.
CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Before embarking upon an analysis based upon Skinner's triple term operant model, it would be helpful to briefly investigate two background areas: the popular theater of the time against which Artaud so vehemently reacted, and some of the more influential events in Artaud's life which helped determine not only the technical form of his theater but also what he sought from and for this theater. A review of the popular theater of the early part of the century serves, also, as a collective experiential history of the experimental subjects, in this case, the audience. Herein are explained the stimuli to which they have been exposed and their typical or predictable reactions (behaviors) and the consequences of the behavior. Artaud, himself, was not very specific about exactly what he wanted to get from his theater or have others get. A review now of some parts of his life will help later to better grasp what he was trying to do.

When a modern day reader of Artaud comes upon one of his scathing attacks on the theater in the early part of the century, he probably has difficulty understanding it:

Et nous voulons justement mettre à jour cet amas de désirs, de rêveries,
It is easy to gloss over these passages as the typical polemical excess of a new writer trying to make a name for himself. From today's vantage point, the theater seems to have been rather innovative. Modern anthologies and histories of the period are comprised mostly of plays and commentaries of such playwrights as Apollinaire, Cocteau, Jarry, Claudel, Giraudoux, and such directors as Copeau, Dullin, Pitoëff, Jouvèt, Lugné-Poe, and Baty. All were interested in reforming the theater, most of the directors in crushing rationalism and emphasizing stage decor. A great many of their ideas were used by Artaud. Artaud had in fact worked for Lugné-Poe, Charles Dullin, and Georges and Ludmilla Pitoëff; he was very familiar with the work of all the others and wrote to them or about them often. He visited Meyerhold's Russian troupe while they were in Paris. Certainly, then, Artaud's "innovations" in theater, were more in the spirit of his times than his polemical statements lead one to believe.

The most profound influence on Artaud was Alfred Jarry, whom Artaud considered a spiritual ancestor and for whom he named his first theatrical group (le Théâtre Alfred Jarry). Jarry's plays were very mystical, with elements of the monstrous, grotesque and of the humorous. Extremely
anti-rationalist, he tried to shock his audiences with bizarre and unacceptable language, strange rhythms, unusual analogies and strings of events. Artaud intended to direct a production of *Ubu Roi* (II, 33), Jarry's scandalous, most famous play (of 1896), but the group failed. However, Artaud did borrow many of Jarry's ideas, especially in the areas of lighting, sound, decor, and acting.¹

If there is any comment on the popular theater, it is limited to a few brief pages to note how banal and undistinctive it was. Unfortunately, the histories present a somewhat distorted view. Most of this innovative theater had little influence on the majority of people at that time. Relatively few people saw the plays which are given so much comment, while the popular theater was quite successful. No one really wants to delve into a serious study of mediocrity in his own time, let alone that of half a century ago. However, now one must ignore, for a while, these innovators and go with the crowds to the popular plays to see and feel what they did.

One direction in which this popular theater had moved was towards ideas. Especially in the earlier part of the century dramatists had made the theater basically a vehicle of propaganda; dialogue and action served to illustrate the author's ideas or morals, which he hoped the audience would agree with and accept. (Here, of course, the whole experience of theater engages the mind and encourages prolonged thought.) Eugène Brieux, for example, was a fervent
moralist; he wrote about justice and corruption (*La Robe rouge*, 1900) family problems and a host of weighty social problems of the time. *Les Remplaçantes* (1901), for example, makes the case for a mother staying at home to raise her children personally. François de Curel, wrote dramas (e.g., *Orage mystique*, 1927) about the conflict of personalities and the sentimental and intellectual problems that arose from these conflicts. Like Brieux he wrote abstract works which appealed to a man's reason in an effort to make him a better person. Artaud considered this a degradation of theater, because it had been stripped of its metaphysical dimension:

Mais les mots, dira-t-on, ont des facultés métaphysiques, il n'est pas interdit de concevoir la parole comme le geste sur le plan universel et c'est sur ce plan d'ailleurs qu'elle acquiert son efficacité majeure, comme une force de dissociation des apparences matérielles, de tous les états dans lesquelles s'est stabilisé, et aurait tendance à se reposer l'esprit. Il est facile de répondre que cette façon métaphysique de considérer la parole n'est pas celle dans laquelle l'emploie le théâtre occidental, qu'il l'emploie non comme une force active et qui part de la destruction des apparences pour remonter jusqu'à l'esprit, mais au contraire comme un degré achevé de la pensée qui se perd en extériorisant.³ (IV, 85)
Another direction in which the theater had moved was escapism. The théâtre du boulevard and vaudeville comedies (especially those of Georges Feydeau4) provided a relaxing, amusing rest from the cares of life. No attempt was made here to change a man or make him think; on the contrary, all was superficial and meant to please. The crowds came to laugh at the most improbable but hysterical coincidences. Exaggerated actions and stage effects, the adulterer's madcap attempts to avoid his wife's suspicions were favorite comic devices. The subjects were, however, not limited to comedy. The problems of passion, of a sentimental love, of a mother's duties as opposed to a wife's were treated as well. Whatever the plot, however, it had nothing to do with "real" life; as Artaud said, all worked on the power of illusion (II, 12). People had not come to learn new truths or how to live better, or even to consider rational arguments (as in the theater of ideas). They did not leave disappointed.

One other direction toward which the theater had moved was the theater of love, perhaps the best example of a truly psychological theater. Henry Bataille and Henry Bernstein5 portrayed the problems of passion and the obstacles upon which it falls. Georges de Porto-Riche, the best known and beloved writer of plays about love, dissected the many facets of love almost as a surgeon would. Amoureuse (1891) is his most famous play. Porto-Riche, a firm realist, portrayed the many problems that face two people in love,
both externally and internally. However, Artaud felt that none of them brought much more than a conventional approach to the topic.

Mais ces conflits moraux par leur nature même n'ont pas absolument besoin de la scène pour se résoudre. Faire dominer à la scène le langage articulé ou l'expression par les mots sur l'expression objective des gestes et de tout ce qui atteint l'esprit par le moyen des sens dans l'espace, c'est tourner le dos aux nécessités physiques de la scène et s'insurger contre ses possibilités. (IV, 85)

These plays touched the mind and perhaps the heart, but, like the théâtre du boulevard, it is unlikely that they ever affected anyone's life very much.

Just as, in the mentalist theater (or psychological theater, to use Artaud's terminology), the choice of subject matter emphasized the distance between the artificial world of the stage and the real world, so did the staging. Until the work of the great directors of the early twentieth century, the stage and physical setting had not changed a great deal for two hundred years. For the audience at a performance "life" came prepackaged in a neat, little rectangular box at the front of a room. To be "caught up" in a performance required suspending cognizance of the physical distance between oneself and the players, to forget that all the sound and action was coming from one direction, and to believe that a two-dimensional backdrop could evoke the countryside. This union of minds is certainly not
impossible, but the spell is too easily broken. Throughout the performance you are reminded of the fundamental artificiality of the whole process. You are at a play, you came to be entertained, soon you'll leave, and if you come back tomorrow, you'll see the exact same thing.

Artaud thought the popular theater against which he reacted had ceased to be art; it was little more than a highly successful financial enterprise? The public, for him, was hardly more than a group of voyeurs (IV, 101). Artaud revolted so violently because he viewed the theater as art, an experience which has an impact on the audience and communicated something new to be used in life.

One gets the impression from reading Artaud's description of the Lucas Van den Leyden painting "Lot's Daughters" that art has an irresistible, inescapable impact. When Artaud speaks of the theater and its double, he really means that theater is at the heart of life and life is at the heart of theater, there can be no barriers, physical or mental, between them as there were in the popular theater. Many of Artaud's own experiences demonstrated to him the need to eliminate all that hindered the truth's direct impact on a man.

Just as there were to be no barriers between the theater and life, so there were no barriers between Artaud's life and his theatrical production. For Artaud, theater was the great quest of salvation, the consummate act of
living. "Pourquoi j'écris? Pour me libérer, m'atteindre, et atteindre la Vérité sensible et magique par tous les moyens que je connais." (V, 159) The major influences on Artaud's own life are inextricably bound up to his theater. But in discovering himself and truth, Artaud found out that he could not simply tell everyone about them with words. He tried to do so in his early poetry, but in the course of his prolonged correspondence with Jacques Rivière he had realized his words were impotent. The truths he understood defied words and still do. It is an experiential truth. Artaud thought, thus, that he could only communicate by creating in abbreviated form some similar experiences in each spectator.

Several rectilinear narratives have traced the history of Artaud's life and extensive career in acting and directing. The general student of Artaud should refer to them. For this study, though, the succession of events in his life is less important than the constant influences on his life. These may be better presented as in Figure 1, where the importance of the major variables and their interrelationship is more evident. (See Figure 1.)

Artaud had a long history of sickness. At the age of five, Artaud claims to have fallen ill with a severe case of meningitis. Whether it was meningitis or a severe infection complicated by a nervous disorder is not clear. Whatever it was, from then on Artaud complained of
Influences on Artaud’s Life

Figure 1
frequent, severe headaches, traumas, and nervousness (e.g., II, 99-100, ff.) This suffering and pain surely influenced his understanding of life and truth (which he wished to communicate). At the purely physiological level, it is known that severe pain alters the body's chemistry and changes perception.\textsuperscript{10} At a psychological level, it causes an immediate reordering of priorities and perceptions. The severely ill often are more keenly aware of the (commonly held) important questions in life and are not apt to be turned aside by day-to-day problems of lesser importance. Consequently they see a different world than the pain-free.

At a metaphysical level, the experience of the great mystics, who almost all practiced self-induced physical or mental suffering, indicates that suffering can induce a process of purification or of transformation; whatever the case, the result is a very different view of reality. Artaud's continual physical ailments, then, probably colored his own perception of the world. The problem, again, was to create an analogous experience for others without making them ill.

Many people do not understand Artaud because they have never taken drugs or know nothing of drugs' effects. Artaud was an addict. From the very early age of nineteen he became enslaved to them.\textsuperscript{11} During the course of his life, Artaud used laudanum (opiated alcohol), opium, heroin, and peyotyl. They ravaged his body and his mind. Before
going to Mexico, Artaud went through detoxication procedures, but they failed. Yet the effects were not all bad. As a result of his drug euphoria, he had seen, touched, smelled, and heard in a myriad of ways unlike the people around him. In fact, although fellow Parisians occupied the same physical territory, one could safely say that they lived in very different worlds (or, as Barrault is reported to have said, Artaud was a living example of his theater\textsuperscript{12}). Artaud had a burning desire to tell them about this world, but the problem was how to do it without giving them drugs.

Drugs and suffering certainly were related to Artaud's passion for mysticism and the exotic, but they were surely not the sole cause. In 1931 at the Dutch pavillion of the Colonial exposition Artaud saw a group of Balinese dancing; for him, they seemed to perfectly capture the body and soul together in transcendent art. This was without doubt the central mystical experience of Artaud's life and the one which his theater most seeks to replicate for an Occidental audience. He had had, however, many other mystical experiences; he studied yoga, alchemy, and tarot cards, he wrote an address to the Dali Lama and a letter to the school of Buddha while with the Surrealists which reflected his desire to seek the inner life. He was intrigued by magic. These forays into the mystic, too, colored his perceptions, which he wished to share.
The final lasting problem in Artaud's life was a simultaneous, conflicting need. He wanted to "discover" or "save" himself, alone and apart from society, and yet all the while he wanted to communicate about this salvation to men. Certainly Artaud shared some common ideas and a common method with the Surrealists; their ends, however, were quite different with regard to society and the individual. Unlike the Surrealists, Artaud did not reject the world. He sought, instead, to reestablish communication with men (albeit in his own way). More importantly, Artaud pointed out that his struggle was a spiritual one and he rejected the Surrealists' commitment to the physical (I, 287). Virmaux points out that it was the double psychological role of the theater that allowed this communication about the spiritual and simultaneous introversion. There are several indications in Artaud's writings that he personally was struggling (I, 93; II, 99-100, 114-119). However, instead of blending into society to end the struggle, he asked his public to meld into him, to follow and react with and through him: "... nous sommes tous fous, désespérés et malades. Et je nous invite à réagir." (IV, 93)

Drugs, suffering, mysticism, and the isolation/communication dichotomy were, then, major influences on Artaud's life, and, as will be seen in the next section, on his theater. While none would claim that Artaud's was a
purely personal theater devoid of any professional interest in the evolution of theatrical form, it would be equally wrong to do the opposite. To completely divorce the author from his work and try to intelligently consider it would be folly. Many of Artaud's writings are incredibly ambiguous or puzzling until one roots them in the experience of Artaud's life, as he himself suggests: " Là où d'autres proposent des œuvres, je ne prétends pas autre chose que de montrer mon esprit." (I, 49)

Now, with an understanding of the prior theatrical experiences of the people coming to the theater and an understanding of the major directive influences on the man to provide the new theatrical experience, the reader can move on to consider in detail Artaud's proposed new theories and the behavioral mechanisms behind them (Part II). There will follow a similar analysis of the actual implementation of these theories and of their failures and successes (Part III).
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2


3- For a more sympathetic (and perhaps fairer) appraisal of Brieux, Curel, and the other playwrights mentioned below, see S. A. Rhodes, The Contemporary French Theater, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1942). Rhodes' bibliography will guide the interested reader to other commentary.


6- The term "mentalistic" would be a more appropriate term today, since it is now commonly used by psychologists to characterize theories of psychology which focus on the mind as the prime mediator of action.


8- Almost all of the major books contain some biographical indications, but for especially good treatments see: Esslin, Artaud; Knapp, AA: Man.

9- Cf. Esslin, Artaud, for the most comprehensive history of his illness and commentary on the diagnosis.


11- Esslin, Artaud, p. 18.

12- Anon., "Saint Artaud."

13- Virmaux, p. 25.
PART II:

THEORIES
INTRODUCTION TO PART II

Perhaps the best place to begin this analysis is at the end; in that way, the goal can be constantly in sight for ready reference. It will also be easier for those unfamiliar with Skinner's work or with Artaud's to follow the discussion and variations upon the schematic point by point.

This analysis, then, will end up being a variation of the basic schematic presented in Figure 2. (See Figure 2).¹

\[
\begin{align*}
S^D \rightarrow R \rightarrow S^R \\
\text{(language of theater)} & \quad \text{(better life)}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2
The Basic Schematic

Very simply, in the presence of the set of discriminative stimuli \(S^D\) presented, that is, the lighting, sounds, words, etc., which Artaud calls theater language², the members of the audience respond. This response \(R\), which Artaud has defined and which he worked to evoke, was that the spectator "perceive" new, deeper truths, a new, deeper life, both different from the banal, impotent "truth" and "life" he confronted around him every day. The reinforcement 31
(SR) for responding in that way to the discriminative stimuli is the potential of leading a richer, more satisfying life or the realization of such a life.

This outline is, of course, too simple. It might even be claimed that it is applicable in the loosest sense to almost any playwright. In this and the following chapters, however, the schematic will be expanded and several auxiliary psychological processes added to it; it will become clearer how Artaud was so different from other playwrights and how a behavioral analysis can make these differences apparent and understandable.

The following chapters in this theoretical discussion each treat a different aspect of the above process: First, Artaud's goal is explored: What did he want the spectator to do (the desired response and the reinforcement)? Second, the means of achieving the goal are discussed: In a theatrical setting, what methods did he have to make the spectator do what he wanted? The section on the language of theater treats the means, that is, the set of discriminative stimuli (SD). Third, the problems of stimulus generalization, stimulus control, and stimulus presentation arise: Who controls the quality of the stimulus set, and how are the stimuli presented? Herein, comes a discussion of the director and of the actors. Fourth, and last, the spectator's role and reward are of concern: How does he
respond to all these stimuli, and what auxiliary, concurrent contingencies affect this response? In this last part the basic, explanatory schematic will be represented, but in full form, with the additions of expansions made in each section.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION, PART II

1- The reader in need is again referred to the glossary of behavioral terms given in the appendix.

2- For a fuller description of theater language, see Chapter 4 of this study or Sellin, pp. 82-92.
CHAPTER 3
THE GOAL OF THEATER

If one looks carefully at Artaud's reproaches against the popular theater, he notices that these are not so much the plaints of a young revolutionary trying to bring fresh ideas into his profession. Nor are they simply attacks on the stagnation of the imagination or the lack of technical innovations. There was something intensely personal, a cry of anguished frustration, when he spoke of the wasting away of theater. The alarming fact for Artaud was that the practitioners of theater had lost a worthy goal. Without a metaphysical or even aesthetic goal, theater as a method of (distinctly different) communication between men and to men would be lost. Artaud sought first, then, to restore to theater an aim, indeed, for him the aim.

Artaud was absolutely convinced of the theater's potency. In fact, it was a power independent of men; they should only hope to guide it. In a letter to Orane Demazis dated December 30, 1933, (V, 224) Artaud stated: "Tout ceci pour en revenir à cette idée que le théâtre agit et qu'il suffit de savoir le manier." At first reading, one may not be struck by the force and the conviction of the phrase"...le théâtre agit..." Herein lay a key recognition
by Artaud that many, both playwright and public, still choose to ignore. Theater, a part of life, a form of behavior, always has an effect, however small. The experience of theater will always change those involved. Skinner points out the impossibility of destroying control by denying it: "To refuse to accept control, however, is merely to leave control in other hands." (SHB, 439) To ignore the power theater has or to act to minimize it (as did the théâtre du boulevard) does not render it impotent. When a person refuses to control stimuli or other behavior, he does not destroy the power, he simply allows forces outside himself to direct the action: "le théâtre agit..." Artaud recognized this existing power and had to learn to shape and control it.

Artaud did not want the director to be enamoured with his position and unresponsive to its obligations. As the next sentence of this same letter suggests, he held this power to guide in great reverence; it was the irreverence of so many others that angered him: "Que ce moyen précieux doit servir à des choses graves, et qu'il est ignoble de ne s'en servir que pour des simples objets d'amusement." (V, 224)

Thus, theater was a power, but not an end. Unlike some of the other innovative directors at this time, Artaud thought of theater as a means to an end. At as early a
time as his efforts with Le Théâtre Alfred Jarry he said: "Le Théâtre Alfred-Jarry a été créé pour se servir du théâtre et non pour le servir." (II, 31) Others, like Gaston Baty, founder of the Compagnons de la Chimère, sought to retheatralize theater. Like Artaud, he wanted to elevate direction of a play to the importance of writing one. He wanted to make theater a vehicle to express all reality but to remain distinct from that reality. Artaud rejected these attempts to segregate theater from life. With this position Artaud made an important split with a significant faction in the philosophy of art. Art is not for art's sake; a part of life, theater has powers which must be harnessed in order to reach the masses.

Recognizing the potency of theater, Artaud then chose to channel this power to certain important (graves) ends. However, he recognized that theater had a limited potential. He could direct it to achieve some ends for men but not all: "Je voudrais faire un théâtre qui serve, qui s'applique à capter les forces que le théâtre peut capter." (V, 224)

In behavioral terms, Artaud said here that theater is another activity of life. People try to change the behavior and thoughts of others in order to better their own lives or others' lives. Theater is one means of changing behavior within a limited range. The measure of theatrical
accomplishment is the ability to effect these goals. In short, theater is a form of behavioral engineering, albeit a very sophisticated and rich form.

In what general directions, then, did Artaud choose to direct this power? First, he wanted to repair the split between the physical and mental sides of his public. He felt that for too long there had been a senseless division between the analytical theater and the plastic world. (IV, 104) This is not to say that the spiritual should be brought down to the level of the mundane. (He totally rejected the untransformed physical level.) Instead, Artaud wanted in a sense to spiritualize the physical: "Le plan social, le plan matériel ... n'est pour moi qu'une représentation inutile et sous-entendue." (I, 371) Man would have to act as a total responding unit, body and soul, and the theater would be a catalyst for this. Drastic changes would therefore be necessary in the form of theater. Theater, could no longer be simply a "texte réalisé" addressed to the head. In fact, Artaud even went to the extreme of claiming that theater could no longer be a branch of literature, which he considered a mental activity. (IV, 82)

This fundamentally monist attitude Artaud took is very much akin to Skinner's philosophy of man. For him man is a whole, reacting unit. Those who ignore this unity or
postulate a dualist position minimize their chances of influencing others' behavior, their effectiveness, or their efficiency. The mind alone does not assimilate knowledge and direct action. As will be discussed later, there are many things that Skinner considers men learn which do not involve what is classically termed "thinking."^3

A second general goal, already mentioned briefly, was the reintegration of theater and life. At one level Artaud meant to reinstate theater as a valid method of vital communication between living beings. Yet at another level, Artaud was not talking about life, but about another life. It is this transformed life wherein the physical is elevated to commingle with the spiritual. Artaud himself had glimpsed this life in his drug and mystical experiences as well as in his suffering. This, he wanted to rejoin the theater not so much with day-to-day life as with this higher life. In a hyperbolic, very lyrical moment he called the theater a "... spectacle d'une tentation où la vie a tout à perdre, et l'esprit tout à gagner...." (IV, 105) So, theater had to establish and join up with this renewed life. (IV, 18)

A third goal Artaud sought, one very indicative of the lingering influence of the Surrealists, was to conjure up a general aura of magic or sorcery. There are several references to magic and sorcery in his writings (e.g., IV,
88), and at one point he called the theater "la magie du réel." (IV, 282) Since Artaud himself had seen this new life in part as a result of mystical, or magical experiences, it is understandable that this should be an element of a theater trying to recreate these experiences. At the psychological, dynamic level there are further reasons for the inclusion of a magical atmosphere. Magic defies reason; it makes a mockery of it. Since (as will be shown later in this section) Artaud's truths were irrational, a magic atmosphere would help the spectator suspend his reasoning faculties and go beyond them. Too, in a magical setting, strange, unusual happenings and connections abound. They are to be expected, and the audience is more disposed to accept them. Artaud's truths are unusual enough to profit from this posture of tolerance. Finally, magic often has curative or transformational powers and these emphasize the central process of Artaud's theater.

A fourth general goal was to offer to his public a taste of the detached, panoramic view of life that is the artist's. He claimed in the essay "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté" (IV, 102) that theater must recapture and return that which is at the essence of living: "Tout ce qui est dans l'amour, dans le crime, dans la guerre, ou dans la folie, il faut que le théâtre nous le rende, s'il veut retrouver sa nécessité." Artaud did not advocate the
demonstration of these passions or violent actions on the stage but sought to extract the vital parts from them and to find what caused their concrete manifestation. This quest for purity recalls Plato's discussion of the contemplation of beautiful objects at the concrete level evolving to meditation of abstract beauty. A little later in this essay Artaud himself suggested he wanted to create this same Platonic, artistic, transformed state, l'état poétique:

Avoué ou non avoué, conscient ou inconscient, l'état poétique, un état transcendant de la vie, est au fond ce que le public recherche à travers l'amour, le crime, les drogues, la guerre ou l'insurrection. (IV, 146)

However, this état poétique unlike Plato's, is a very active state and not one of passive, abstract contemplation. (Cf. II, 28-29) The poetic state, then, joins with the magical, the spiritual and the unified man as directions towards which Artaud wanted to move the power of theater.

So much for the general goals of theater. What, though, did Artaud the behavioral engineer as well as artist, hope to accomplish in the specific individual? How can the general goal, mentioned in the initial paradigm (Figure 2), of having the spectator perceive new truths in order to have a "better life" be more concretely explained?
Artaud was always quite vague when he referred to his specific goals. Perhaps this was a purposeful evasion, because what he wanted to express could not be told by words but had to be experienced. Probably his best panoramic statement of what he wished to accomplish occurs in "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté" (IV, 110) wherein he said that theater must "... remettre en cause organiquement l'homme, ses idées sur la réalité et sa place poétique dans la réalité." In other words, Artaud wanted to make men think about themselves and their relationship to reality: at a physical level, at a metaphysical level, and at a poetical level. With a man's whole being thus in question, the theater, according to Artaud, could go beyond the psychological, social, and moral conflicts and into the cosmic. Theater has its full effectiveness:

...s'il dépasse le plan psychologique, le plan des caractères, des sentiments, et des passions humaines, si un geste fait sur la scène évoque toute la ruée des forces cosmiques.... (V, 195)

In large part, the success of this theater would depend upon a man's experiencing the mystical. With man's understanding of self called back into question, he is open to new perceptions and theater can "... exprimer objectivement des vérités secrètes...." (IV, 84)

Gouhier calls this process the "conversion" to the "profound life" or to the "cosmic life." What is involved
here, though, is much more than is ordinarily understood in the term conversion. Voluntary conversion bases itself most often upon an appeal to the mind or a demonstration of a potentially better situation for the convert. In Artaud's stratagem, it is more a case of destruction, even annihilation, of the status quo followed by rebirth:

Pour le théâtre comme pour la culture, la question reste de nommer et de diriger des ombres, et le théâtre, qui ne se fixe pas dans les formes, détruit par le fait les fausses ombres, mais prépare la voie à une autre naissance d'ombres autour desquelles s'agrège le vrai spectacle de la vie. (IV, 17-18)

One cannot reiterate often enough that this response, this process, is an active one in which the whole man is engaged. It is not simply a call for the conversion of the mind. Artaud wanted to "remettre en cause organiquement...", to "exprimer objectivement des vérités secrètes."

Why such stress upon physical participation in the realization of this new life? Artaud knew the truths remained secret because they were impenetrable to earlier attempts to reach them by the detached mind. The words of men's day-to-day lives were useless. Just as they had been useless in Artaud's attempts to describe himself, so were they useless in describing the truths of life he eventually found.

To indirectly express what he wanted to do to his spectators, Artaud found a very apt simile. He said the
theater was like the plague: "Il importe avant tout
d'admettre que comme la peste, le jeu théâtral soit un
délire et qu'il soit communicatif." (IV, 33) It was an
incredibly rich comparison. Therein Artaud suggested
that the present situation be totally decimated, as plague
destroyed a nation. He suggested, too, that severe sickness
causes a massive shift in priorities, a délire, and that
this state is crucial to the communication process. By
calling theater a delirium he emphasized that it is a shift
in favor of the non-rational or, as Guicharnaud says 18,
towards a restoration of the inhuman in man. Délire also
emphasizes that these truths are of a hallucinatory nature,
and suggests they are like those a drugged man learns.
Finally, the word communicatif has a double sense: It
connotes the transmission of truth, from cosmos to man,
from author to spectator. In the other sense, communicatif
calls to mind the spreading effect both of theater and
plague. The man who actively learns these hidden secrets
will actively demonstrate and spread (communicate) them
just as a sick man can spread disease.

The theater communicated this truth by means of images,
according to Artaud. Like plague, it evokes a chaotic
flurry of latent imagery and extracts new life from it.
La peste prend des images qui dorment, un désordre latent et les pousse tout à coup jusqu'aux gestes les plus extrêmes; et le théâtre aussi prend des gestes et les pousse à bout....

Une vraie pièce de théâtre boscule le repos des sens, libère l'inconscient comprimé, pousse à une sorte de révolte virtuelle.... (IV, 34)

This goes directly to the unconscious to free it and bring it forth. (The automatic writing of Breton and the Surrealists, of course, similarly liberates the unconscious, and the main lines of this plan for theater may well find themselves here.)

There is a blatant contradiction here. Throughout Le Théâtre et son double Artaud had condemned the psychological theater. He said he would deal with the whole man to effect his "cure". Yet here he most certainly appealed to mentalism. The mind was once again the major battle field, just as it had been in the psychological theater. (To my knowledge, the major critics have all failed to acknowledge this major discrepancy.) There seems, now, to be no way to understand how this destruction/rebirth cosmic change could occur.

Artaud was not a haphazard thinker; at least he would not have let such an obviously paradoxical statement stand, if he could have found other words to express what he knew he was doing. With recent advances in the understanding of psychology made by Skinner, however, there are words.
It is not suggested that Artaud said he was doing one thing and was really doing another. Rather, Skinner's theories offer a way out of the verbal paradox. They suggest what Artaud might have said had he lived in our time.

Like Artaud, Skinner thinks that truth is ineffable. In About Behaviorism he states: "There is no way in which a verbal description of a setting can be absolutely true." (AB, 150). In other words, verbally one cannot describe all the stimuli which impinge on the subject. In fact, to go one step farther, one cannot even perceive them all. Thus, for example, if you came into a room where a glass of wine was on the table, a truthful rendition of the situation would consist of reporting the exact color, taste, smell, density of the liquid, viscosity, feel (which could be further divided into greasiness, slipperiness, temperature, etc.), and so on. The list is almost infinite.

Of course, men do not respond to all these stimuli. They soon learn both from their own experience and from explicit training by society, to attend to the "relevant" stimulus features of an environment. That is to say, they come to be controlled more or less exclusively by those stimuli in the presence of which actions will be considered. For example, who cares if a wine is slippery or not? Wine is not generally used in conjunction with that property.
However, it may be very helpful to notice the color. A brown or gray wine is likely to taste spoiled and be a bad purchase.

Because, in general, men act to maximize the amount of reinforcement they receive while minimizing the effort they expend, they create laws and rules to guide their behavior. According to Skinner:

Scientific laws ... specify or imply responses and their consequences. They are not, of course, obeyed by nature but by men who deal effectively with nature.... As a culture produces maxims, laws, grammar, and science, its members find it easier to behave effectively without direct or prolonged contact with the contingencies of reinforcement thus formulated. (CRF, 141)

According to Skinner, a culture allows men to live an existence one level removed from life. Socialized man no longer reacts to the contingencies of life (e.g., drinking discolored wine and find out it is bad) but according to a description of the contingencies (e.g., one reads a book on wine and learns that one of the indices of a good wine is a certain color.) In point of fact, many times man never comes in contact with the contingencies, or at best, rarely. When a man is thus taught what the relevant stimuli are and the contingencies associated with them, he rarely, if ever, attends to other stimuli in the same environment. This, then, is the "truth." When one thinks of wine, he thinks (for the most part) of that aggregate
of stimulus properties that most men commonly confront in wine (taste, color, smell, etc.) and about which they talk and write.

For Antonin Artaud this was not life. This was not reality. Hahn put this well in his article "La littérature et la drogue": "Artaud n'oppose donc pas son hallucination à la réalité, mais son hallucination à l'hallucination collective." By limiting themselves to consideration of an object or situation in society's terms, men succeed only in talking about a fiction, a creation of their own minds. Their lives are hallucinations, for they are no more living in reality than the drug-addicted Artaud was.

Drugs and suffering had liberated Artaud from the chains of society. He wanted to liberate others too. Artaud well understood that the common man hungered for mystery and to understand his destiny. (IV, 90) However, he thought the approach was not to go beyond reason, as mystery commonly implies; rather, he sought to go back before reason, to reach the elemental and primitive. If a man could pull back from socially reinforced modes of existence and respond to some of the stimuli commonly deemed irrelevant, he would come to a new reality, a new truth.

Consequently, Artaud hated "clear ideas", that is to say, typical situations or ideas: "Car pour moi les idées claires sont au théâtre comme partout ailleurs, des idées
mortes et terminées." (IV, 49) Behaviorally speaking, "clear ideas" may be regarded as synonymous with S-R patterns where the response to a stimulus is highly predictable and stereotypic. Novel responses are improbable. (See Figure 3.)

An example may help to elucidate the schematic. If a playwright presents a typical domestic situation in which the wife cheats on the unsuspecting husband, the most likely responses are evident: pity for the husband, or disgust for the wife (or vice versa, depending on the play's goal.) One "understands" something about "human psychology" or "character" or "marriage" or "family" or "conformity" or "love." It is highly unlikely that this clear situation will instead start someone thinking about adultery as an allegory for the birth, rise, and fall of a civilization. Even rarer would be the spectator who associated the plot and the mal du siècle of French Romanticism (and then go out and behave differently as a result of this new connection.)

Perhaps the above "free thinking" examples are ludicrous. Yet it is this sort of seemingly ludicrous process of association that Artaud wanted to encourage as possible avenues to a fuller life. He wanted to create "Bref, un théâtre où la liberté de l'esprit trouve son expansion absolue et sous toutes les formes possibles...." (V, 64) Theater, then, is a process of deconditioning, of the
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reordering of response probabilities. The formerly high probability responses no longer exclude those of low probability; in fact, these low probability responses may come to preclude the expression of those high probability responses. Schematically, Figure 4 replaces Figure 3. (See Figure 4.)

Here, the "vague" situation generates many responses of varying response probability. Some are unconsequated (and thus extinguished or diminished in response probability), some are punished, and some lead to reinforcement situations of varying magnitude. Theater is a liberating process because it opens up new ways of responding and consequently new sources of reinforcement. A return to "unsocialized" man, theater liberates all kinds of behavior, good and bad, but it is a liberation of life:

Il dénonce des conflits, il dégage des forces, il déclenche des possibilités et se ces possibilités et ces forces sont noires, c'est la faute non pas de la peste ou du théâtre, mais de la vie. (IV, 38)

Theater did not stop at being revelatory; Artaud intended that these revelations be the basis for action to improve the quality of life. Like the plague, theater would induce liberating frenzies to rid man of his social chains (those of Occidental man) and restore to him his true powers. (IV, 37-8) Artaud believed that the only value of the
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metaphysical was rooted in the physical, earthly world men live in (V, 110). He did not want his theater's influence to rest in the domain of the mind, but to open up new ways for men to explore to reshape their lives and behave so as to be happier:

...l'action du théâtre comme celle de la peste est bienfaisante, car poussant les hommes à se voir tels qu'ils sont, elle fait tomber le masque, elle découvre le mensonge, la veulerie, la bassesse, la tartuferie; elle secoue l'inertie asphyxiante de la matière qui gagne jusqu'aux données les plus claires des sens; et révélant à des collectivités leur puissance sombre, leur force cachée, elle les invite à prendre en face du destin une attitude héroïque et supérieure qu'elles n'auraient jamais eue sans cela. (IV, 39)

Clearly, Artaud was aiming to better the quality of man's (active) lives: "Car si le cinéma imite la vie, c'est-à-dire les apparences, le théâtre refait de la vie." (V, 51)

These new insights into the goals of Artaud's theater can now be included in an expanded version of the basic schematic. (See Figure 5) In the presence of the $S^D$s, the spectator now has many responses, both because of the nature of the stimuli ("vague") and because of the liberating effects of theater. Artaud is vague about the nature of these responses. They may be new associations, or identification of new characteristics, patterns, irregularities, and so on. They may, too, be different or more intense physical reactions to the stimulus situations. The result
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of the subject's responding is sometimes immediate reinforcement ($S^R$). More often, though, the opportunity to engage in reinforcing activity is the reinforcer\textsuperscript{16} the spectator, as a result of his theatrical experiences ($S^D \rightarrow R$), is now able in the presence of the same or other stimuli to emit novel or more adaptive responses which result in reinforcement. Collectively, this new ability to behave differently and be reinforced can be called "better living." Of course, if this schematic is to work in practice, these reinforcers must either be unobtainable elsewhere or more difficult to obtain for all those who do engage in the new association behavior.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1- "To refuse to accept control, however, is merely to leave control in other hands." (SHB, 439)

2- The théâtre du boulevard chose not to try to influence men’s behavior. The appeal of such a theater lay in its minimization of overt attempts to change its public.

3- Cf. Chapter 4 of this study.

4- I join Esslin (Artaud, p. 80) in this opinion.


6- I think this fragment is properly translated "to express secret truths concretely."

7- Unfortunately, words like "perceive", "understand", "know", "realize", and so on, will be used all too frequently in this study. Such words, according to Skinner, are "mentalist terminology", because they imply that the mind is actively engaged as an independent, intermediary organ through which outside stimulation is interpreted and from which orders for action are given to the rest of the body. These mentalist terms clearly spring from a fundamentally dualist view of man, quite contrary to the main thrust of both Artaud and Skinner. It is possible to translate these words into a behavioral idiom. For example, to "realize" the truth might variously be rendered as "in the presence of certain classes of stimuli to act in a socially-sanctioned manner, or a more efficient manner, or under the control of novel contingencies." The particular definition would, of course, depend upon the situation. However, the problem is that such a translation soon proves cumbersome, redundant, and boring for the reader. Normal English terminology, albeit mentalist, will thus be retained in most cases. For assistance in translating any of this mentalist jargon, or for a fuller discussion, the reader is referred to About Behaviorism, pp. 24-36 et passim.

9- There are, of course, a great number of contradictions in Artaud's works. He recognizes many of them and accepts them as contradictions at the superficial level. There is, however, no mention of this fundamental contradiction.

10- Again, a mentalist term is used. What is meant is that the subject could not give a verbal account of all the physical properties and stimuli present when he is in the presence of an object or in a situation. Whether they are subconsciously registered by his brain is another, irrelevant issue.

11- In truth, it may be infinite. Its limits are the limits of the human mind's capacity to distinguish the qualities or properties an object may potentially have.

12- Hence, the distinction between discriminative stimulus and stimulus. Stimuli are omnipresent and need never occasion a response. Discriminative stimuli have evoked a response or are considered likely to evoke one.


14- It is most paradoxical, however, that Artaud expressed this distaste for reality and language in a quite lucid manner using everyday language. He wanted to break through the limits of society but tried to do it within the social confines of "reason" and "language."

15- The underlining is my own.

16- Quite often reinforcing stimuli are not simple objects or rewarding events. The opportunity to engage in behavior which can eventually lead to another reinforcer often serves as a reinforcing event. A good example of such a system is the use of grades in American universities. Presumably, a student rewarded with an A at the end of a course can look forward in the future to participating in a good career, where he will have access to many powerful reinforcers. The A itself may have no value except in relation to the possibilities for future reinforcements which it makes possible. Cf. SHB, 76-81.
Artaud realized that if he were to achieve the goals of his theater, this metaphysical awareness of the deeper life around men, he would have to make radical changes in the traditional understanding of the theater. He chose first and foremost to strike down words, the most important vehicle of Western theater, and replace them with a new language.

Throughout the long history of French theater, words, the text of the play, have reigned virtually unchallenged as the most important element of a play. They supply the key to meaning, to the "truths" or "morals" the playwright wishes to convey. The seventeenth-century French neoclassical theater seems to have been the apogee of the word's power. The great débats and tirades of Corneille's theater alone carry the weight of translating the hero's quest for honor and glory; they similarly unveil the deep passions of the tormented soul in Racine's work. By means of words the dramatist could not only communicate "news" but also amplify upon or quickly and efficiently portray emotions, passions, psychological upheavals. He could show not only their
effects upon the character in question but also the secondary reactions of the other characters to these emotions. The only real injunction against the author was that he preserve vraisemblance—but only in the psychological conditions he sought to portray. Many of the other aspects of the play were far from true to life. Men, for example, do not usually talk in alexandrin couplets nor do most great events take place in a single day in an antechamber.

The problem with such a theater of words, according to Artaud, was that a technique good for a certain epoch had been far too frequently used and abused. For the popular theater (and Artaud thought for Western society in general) words had become foremost definitive rather than connotative. Names for objects (tacts) are shorthand ways of referring not only to their objective existence but often to a whole series of relevant stimulus conditions.

To understand just how Artaud drags the public from the mundane into the deeper truth of images, one should understand Skinner's explanation of the tacting (naming) process. Suppose a child is shown an armchair and told it is a "chair," he is "correct" and gains some sort of reinforcement. If, then, upon seeing a sofa, he calls it a chair, someone will usually tell him no, and point out some features distinguish it from a chair. Gradually, as a result of these instructions and of environmental contingencies the child learns exactly which features of a chair
must be present to call it a "chair." Either the community or practical consequences extinguish or lower the response probability of saying chair when "non-relevant" stimuli are the only ones present.

Thus by calling an object a "glass" one immediately knows not only its general shape, but also that it can hold liquid, that it is probably non-porous, that it is generally smooth and often transparent, and so on. Fortunately, almost all people in the verbal community will respond identically when one talks about a glass and would describe a glass in roughly the same manner. As Skinner points out, daily life depends upon these common generic tacts for communication--they sum up succinctly those elements of a situation which the community deems worthwhile or important. (VB, 91-99)

These tacts, however, paralyze creative thought, which depends upon the connotative, evocatory powers of language. Verbal behavior sometimes fails to adequately portray all the important stimulus conditions which constitute an experience; hence, the compensatory expressions "indescribable beauty" and "ineffable thoughts." (VB, 451) It might, for example, be extremely difficult to describe the beauty of a certain rose--to describe the interplay of light, perfume, movement, form, possibly texture, quickly enough to replicate the experience one has when suddenly coming upon this rose. Furthermore, rarely does the spoken word
"rose" recall images of beauty, deep love, gardens, freshness, etc., quite as well as being in front of a rose does.

The product of a whole language built chiefly upon definition is what Lyons calls "anecdotal reality." People's vision becomes limited, superficial, and stilted; they attend exclusively to the community-reinforced aspects of an object or situation. Not only does their language hinder them from actively creating or seeing below the banal, but it also prevents them from understanding or appreciating the artistic insights of others. For Artaud the language of glasses and forks would be hard pressed to communicate the deep spiritual truths that he had experienced.

To solve his difficulty Artaud proposed a radical, revolutionary answer: to reject the mediocre medium called "language" and to develop and substitute a new language of theater. To do this he wanted to return to the state of mind before articulated language, the state between gesture and impulse: "Dans ce théâtre toute création vient de la scène, trouve sa traduction et ses origines mêmes dans une impulsion psychique secrète qui est la Parole d'avant les mots." (IV, 72) Theatrical language must, then, avoid the trap of becoming a visual, plastic materialization of words (IV, 83). Instead, it bases itself upon what behavioral
scientists might call a whole set of non-linguistic, interiorized operants, whose eventual response form is often, though not exclusively verbal. (This state is that of the moment a child first jumps back from touching a hot stove and before screaming "Ouch!") The eventual form of overt expression once this state is gained is manifold:

On sent dans le théâtre balinais un état d'avant le langage et qui peut choisir son langage: musique, gestes, mouvements, mots. (IV, 74).

Le théâtre qui n'est dans rien mais se sert de tous les langages: gestes, sons, paroles, feu, cris, se retrouve exactement au point où l'esprit a besoin d'un langage pour produire ses manifestations. (IV, 17)

For Artaud, the possibilities of expression were almost limitless: "Tout a un sens." In 1923 during a visit to the Chimère theater group of Gaston Baty he was very struck by the scenic decor. A lit white wall suggested a background moving into infinity; the tic-toc of a pendulum and the closing of shutters impressed him as did a play of light to suggest autumn. Artaud became convinced that everything on stage could speak in unison to the audience and could create a "poetry in space":

...en quoi consiste ce langage physique, ce langage matériel et solide par lequel le théâtre peut se différencier de la parole?
The range of vocabulary suddenly stretched forth in all directions: cries,plaints,surprises,all kinds of dramatic surprises, costumes, the splendor of lights, the incantatory beauty of voices, the charm of harmony, rare musical notes, colors, physical rhythms of movements (which correspond to the pulsation of rhythms familiar to all), masks, huge mannequins, abrupt lighting changes and lighting changes which evoke feelings or emotion (IV, 111).

It is important to note that Artaud really sought to create a new language, not just to reemphasize the value of the scenic milieu. Such a language was indeed language first because of its precision. Like that of the Balinese theater, Artaud's theatrical language was to be based on proven (SD → R) operants. The form of his vocabulary would not be haphazard but "une quantité précise de gestes sûrs" (IV, 66); the response of the spectator would be as predictable as it was to traditional vocabulary: "effets méthodiquement calculés et qui enlèvent tout recours à l'improvisation spontanée" (IV, 66). This new creation was indeed language secondly because the constituent elements had an effect or meaning independent of the
meaning of what was being said; they now could claim alone to point to truths:

...le langage visuel des objets, des mouvements, des attitudes, des gestes, mais à condition qu'on prolonge leur sens, leur physionomie, leurs assemblages jusqu'aux signes, en faisant de ces signes une manière d'alphabet. (IV, 107)

Artaud was so sure that he was developing a new language and an extremely valuable one that near the end of his life he was preparing two books, Surrealism and the End of Era and Measure for Measure to deal with his new linguistic discoveries. His aim was eventually to find that original language which predated the Tower of Babel. 4

Since he was creating this new language, Artaud had to investigate the potentialities of each element in his new vocabulary. Each method of reaching the audience's senses was intrinsically poetry all by itself as well as being poetry in combination with the other methods:

Chacun de ces moyens a sa poésie à lui, intrinsèque, ensuite une sorte de poésie ironique qui provient de la façon dont il se combine avec les autres moyens d'expression; et les conséquences de ces combinaisons, de leurs réactions et de leurs destructions réciproques sont faciles à apercevoir. (IV, 47)

Although he described the range of most of these elements only briefly, Artaud paid particular attention to sound (perhaps in an attempt to obliterate the definitive character of words.) In his theater he sought constant
"sonorization" so that the ears might be as fully attacked as the eyes. The vibratory quality of sounds was of prime importance, perhaps in order to try to suggest infinity or the continuation of apparent reality into the metaphysical beyond; the representational side took second place (IV, 98). He wanted to use new, unheard musical sounds unplayable on today's instruments. Artaud decided he would have to use old instruments or invent new ones to produce intolerable sounds which shot the ear through with pain (IV, 114). Besides instruments, the timbre of the actors' voices had to be rare and evocatory: "un ton d'un naturel peu employé, enfoui et comme oublié, mais aussi vraisemblable et aussi réel qu'un autre" (II, 138). Sound, thus, would work directly upon the senses of man to create moods, emotions, even ideas. Its effects would be similar to those of the now illicit Tridentine Latin Mass on many Catholics. Although they did not understand the words, the sounds and the quiet, flowing rhythm developed in them a sense of mystery, awe, and piety which is now lost in English.

Costumes and even hair-styling form another part of this new language. He called Balinese actors in their costumes "véritables hiéroglyphes qui vivent et se meuvent," "des hiéroglyphes animés" and "des hiéroglyphes à trois dimensions." (IV, 73) The horizontal lines of their unusual costumes led his senses out of his body into a deeper, unknown plane.
Ils sont comme de grands insectes pleins de lignes et de segments faits pour les relier à l'on ne sait quelle perspective de la nature dont ils n'apparaissent plus qu'une géométrie détachée. (IV, 77)

Even the women's hair styles evoked in him impressions of inhumanity, of the divine, and of miraculous revelation (IV, 71).

Pantomime, as well as light and mannequins, played a role, too. Artaud condemned what he called perverted pantomime, that is pantomime which only represents words or sentences. He lauded instead that pantomime concretely based upon ideas, attitudes, or aspects of nature. This kind of pantomime brings forth ideas whose meaning is derived from the movement itself (IV, 48). Like pantomime, Artaud believed that lighting could directly affect the emotions. There is a great difference in the resultant sensual disposition upon seeing the green light of a cave and a windy day's light (IV, 98). Light may be used to instill directly cold, terror, gloom, joy or any number of feelings. Similarly, the presence of a mannequin directly communicates without the intermediary of words: "(ils) seront là pour faire dire aux héros de la pièce ce qui les gêne et que la parole humaine est incapable d'exprimer." (V, 46) Their stage presence, like constant sonorization and lighting, provides a continual sensual assault which affects responses to other actions.
Perhaps one of the most important and radically unusual elements of this new language was the scenic decor. Traditionally, the props and background were used in a play to simulate reality to give the illusion of a setting or cadre for the actions of the characters. This illusion certainly was not important for the progress of the play and the mind, so one ceased to notice it. Such "theatricality" disgusted Artaud very early in his career, and he was in the forefront along with Craig and Appia in eliminating the backdrops and artificial props of the "picture frame" theater: "Il n'y aura pas de décor." (IV, 116) As early as the Théâtre Alfred Jarry Artaud noted that the illusion that scenery might once have produced had lost its power. He wanted to restore this lost ability. Later, in the Théâtre de la Cruauté he decided that he must restore scenery's power. Instead of fading from the spectator's mind, the "scenery" would speak to him, too, and join the barrage of signs leading him beyond himself.

What, then, becomes of words? For Artaud they were relegated to a much lower position for the dramatist than in former days. With the new language of theater he wanted to provide "une immense expérience scénique." (IV, 69) However, it is important to note that Artaud wanted to devalue words, not completely reject them. Their use, like all other elements, would vary depending upon the nature of the production and the other media used.
Perhaps the easiest and best statement of how he felt about words is that he accorded them the same place in theater as they have in dreams (IV, 112). They do not predominate, nor is there lengthy rational discourse. Instead they come in fragments, often isolated, often echoically and eliciting strong emotion. (Already in life, according to Skinner, we often react emotionally to the sounds of words. VB, 158.) Artaud wanted to go further in this vein, to treat language physically, to manipulate it like a solid object which can shake things up:

He wanted to make words in some way "gestes sonores". 8 This physical language would be a violent one. It would shake up the senses and make the public experience in such a strong manner that it would be impossible to replicate with logical, discursive language. (IV, 56)
The new object-words, no longer the essence of language but a small part of it, would shed their traditional role as thought conveyors. They would function sooner as instruments, gestures, or even objectified props. As such, "words" could consist of mere tones or modulations of some duration, whether harmonious or not. Even yelps and barks would be used in this new system. The audience would understand their "message" without words, much as in life they understand the danger of the snake's hiss or the fright of a shrill cry.

This whole system of language was no mere substitute for the traditional vocabulary of theater. The whole purpose of language had consequently and necessarily been revolutionized much like the purpose of theater. First, Artaud wanted to hypnotize the public with his imagery, to control them and their reality. By flooding their minds with his own stage imagery, he hoped this would set off an independent, chain-reaction production of imagery in everyone's head. By overwhelming them with his and their own imagery, Artaud could so fully hypnotize the spectator so as to crush (broyer) him. (IV, 99)

Second, he destroyed the traditional narrative, didactic, and reflective functions of theater language. To feel, to emote, to experience were the wherewithal of poetry. To experience theater was to experience the
incertitude and ineffable agony of "real" life. This was "le propre de la poésie." (IV, 76) In his drama and in his writings, as Virmaux says, "la phrase attaque perpétuellement;" his form was the invective. Third, this new language was to destroy traditional, occidental language and help to open up new vistas of communication. By destroying the banal, shallow modes of intercourse available, Artaud hoped to induce men to throw off the shackles of their accepted limits and potentials. Then they, too, like him, could see that reality was infinite in all directions and wide open to them.

This new language system is the key to Artaud's more scientific approach to theater. A behavioral analysis indicates how he intended to create and build upon a participatory dynamic with his audience in a very controlled, studied way. It was to be a theater of senses, of imagery, of personal language, and of experience.

Gaining and captivating the audience's attention is the first goal of a successful playwright, because this is the first step in communication. Although many great writers may have captured the mind, and some even the soul, few could lay claim to having captured the total man. But Artaud had to capture this unified being, because the truths he had to show were not restricted to the head but were so very profound as to be visceral. Artaud assaulted the sense organs directly.
...ce langage physique et objectif de la scène qui cherchera à atteindre l'esprit par le moyen des organes, de tous les organes, avec tous les degrés d'intensité et dans tous les sens." (V, 121)

Je dis que ce langage concret, destiné aux sens et indépendant de la parole, doit satisfaire d'abord les sens, qu'il y a une poésie pour les sens comme il y en a une pour le langage, et que ce langage physique et concret auquel je fais allusion n'est vraiment théâtral que dans la mesure où les pensées qu'il expriment échappent au langage articulé. (IV, 45)

He thereby avoided the weakening effect of interior mediation by the mind. The spectator could not miss the message because he failed to make crucial, perhaps difficult, intellectual connections; like someone going down the first hill of a roller coaster, he could not dilute the emotion by first experiencing it via his brain. "Reality" was to become inescapable.

Once having gained the public's attention, he could begin the process of building up the desired emotional state with the new language. It was necessary for Artaud to build up in his audience an enchanted or distracted state in order to get them to suspend their inhibitions and socially imposed ways of acting and reacting. By means of repetition of key words, sounds, and symbols, by his arrangement of stimuli, and by his suggestive, animated hieroglyphs, Artaud wanted gradually to induce this increasingly emotional, necessary state in each individual. A
series of otherwise weak emotional stimuli are presented so closely together that their cumulative effect is very great. (VB, 161) All these non-intellectual stimuli could be arranged to produce the maximum emotional effect on the public.

The precision of the arrangement of stimuli (which will be more fully discussed in the section on the director, chapter 5) was another important aspect of his sensual language. Artaud was proposing a language as precise, if not more so, than ordinary language. He praised Barrault, as an example, for his rendition of a horse in Autour d'une mère, because Barrault had achieved such stylized, precise movement that the audience is said to have actually "seen" a horse. (IV, 169) Artaud himself suggested that, as a part of his new concrete scenic language, that over 10,000 facial expressions evoking different audience responses could be noted down and cataloged for further use. (IV, 112)

To further strengthen precision of stimuli, Artaud proposed that a way should be found of transcribing this new language. Using hieroglyphs as an inspiration, he wanted a method that would be readable, reproducible at will, and consist of precise, symbols. (IV, 112) Ordinary writing possesses a high degree of stimulus control—by the literate person or actor they are almost infallibly responded to correctly. But writing only controls the
pronunciation aspect of reading aloud or speaking a text. This new writing system would optimally enhance stimulus control by specifying as much as possible the intonation, speed, inflection, and the numerous other variables involved in vocalization. The benefits of such increasingly complex direction would include easier reproduction and easier revision of the "text" in the places where it does adequately lead to emission of the right responses by the spectator.

Precision of stimulus control (i.e., precision of theater language) was coupled with multiple concurrent stimulation as well as wide diversity in that stimulation. To evoke a response or establish a defined state in the individual Artaud wanted to engage several of the senses, thereby increasing the probability of the desired response. Schematically, this process of multistimulation is as in Figure 6:

```
\[ \begin{array}{c}
  s^D(\text{dance}) \\
  s^D(\text{sounds}) \\
  s^D(\text{pantomime}) \\
  s^D(\text{lighting}) \\
  \vdots \\
  \vdots \\
\end{array} \rightarrow R \\
\text{Multiple Stimulation (Figure 6)}
```
Skinner sums up the phenomenon thus: "The more complex the stimulus pattern, the more specific the verbal occasion, the stronger the control exerted over a single response." (VB, 76) So, one technique for increasing the response probability of a given response is to present many stimuli, each of which has some probability of evoking the response. The same basic process can be repeated for each member of a whole set of responses. It forms the first element in the theatrical paradigm.

The use of concrete stimuli was to further augment the increased probability of response begun by multistimulation. Traditional speech consists of abstract terms which rely upon thinking, association, and memory, and other verbal processes for its effectiveness. Such intellectualization often weakens its effect, especially when the effect is emotional. One would be far more likely, for example, to respond with a smile or happiness upon seeing a pretty little girl than upon hearing a discussion about little girls or even a description of one. Skinner explains why:

"It has often been pointed out that concrete terms usually have greater emotional effects than abstract. The difference is that the concrete term, in the sense of a response under the control of a particular stimulus, is more likely to coincide with emotionally effective stimuli. The abstract term, being controlled by a property of a large class of events, is not likely to be affected by any other event frequently correlated with that property." (VB, 158)
Thus the concrete images of Artaud's theater were much more likely to elicit emotions than the earlier dialogue theater.

As the background chapter pointed out, Artaud had experienced, at least to some extent, a "deeper" reality. It was his reality, and he could not share it with other men using common language. He needed and sought to create a new, personal language. Of course, it necessarily would not correspond to daily reality; he had to express himself "... en un langage dont il semble que nous n'ayons plus la clef." (IV, 68) No words could adequately describe this knowledge because they were outside the realm of most men's experience (and hence, "deeper"):

Et il ne s'agit pas de savoir si le langage physique du théâtre est capable d'arriver aux mêmes résolutions psychologiques que le langage des mots, s'il peut exprimer des sentiments et des passions aussi bien que les mots, mais s'il n'y a pas dans le domaine de la pensée et de l'intelligence des attitudes que les gestes et tout ce qui participe du langage dans l'espace atteignent avec plus de précision d'eux. (IV, 85)

These situations and feelings do not arise much in the course of day-to-day events or are deemed irrelevant. The community, thus, has simply failed to reinforce or has punished attending to these unusual stimuli (to which Artaud attended), and consequently no terms exist to describe the stimulus conditions. A similar situation arises when words are
borrowed intact from a foreign language because no native word sufficiently explains an alien concept (e.g., Gemütlichkeit, joie de vivre):

"If it is 'impossible to express a given idea' in a given language because a necessary term is lacking, we have only to say that the contingencies arranged by a verbal community fail to respect a possible variable. If 'it is difficult to express the same idea in two languages,' we have merely to say that the reinforcing practices of two verbal communities differ." (VB, 451)

So, like those who cannot find adequate equivalents for these foreign words, Artaud simply chose to abandon all efforts to use common words to describe what he knew; instead, he tried to make the audience feel somewhat as he must have, to experience the same contingencies he had and be subject to the same reinforcing practices, because "Tout vrai sentiment est en réalité intraduisible." (IV, 86)

The conditioning process for the establishment of tacts is not so simple: "If a response is reinforced upon a given occasion or class of occasions, any feature of that occasion or common to that class appears to gain some measure of control." Though the response is weak, it can be strengthened, thus, a bottle tapers near the opening at the top and is said to have a "neck." Although this neck is not of flesh, nor does it have vocal cords, nor is it on a living being, it is narrower than the "body", you can grab on to it, it is near the "mouth" of the bottle.
The first time this was called a neck, control was being exercised by $S^D$ properties which were not part of the contingency that the community had set up. This is called metaphorical extension. When such responses become simple tacts, their isolated properties then can control similar tacts in a generic way. Thus, a human neck is the model for a bottle neck, which then may lead to discussions of violin necks, lamp necks, etc.

Metaphorically extended tacts are the basis of literary, aesthetic, non-factual communication. It is a kind of creative shorthand which points out unusual, often highly expressive connections that the community overlooks or ignores. Calling a man a tiger is faster and easier than listing all the properties they share. Even further, because the relevant stimulus properties of the objects become free in this process (the narrowness of the neck, its proximity to the end) the connections to be made are not limited to the realities of the physical world. Stabilized metaphorical tacts are thus the basis of even remoter extended metaphorical tacts (e.g., the "neck" of the woods.)

The problem, however, was not limited to just sharing his discoveries with other men, but to describing them for himself in some manner. In *Verbal Behavior* Skinner describes at some length society's process of establishing descriptive tacts for interior, unobservable events. (VB, 130-146) Basically, society can establish and
reinforce descriptive terms for self-tacting by common public accompaniment, by collateral responses, by metaphorical extension, or by reinforcing similar but more magnified responses. But Artaud had a sense of being a distinct, unique person quite apart from the impersonal masses. Because his experiences were unique (or at least very rare), no community-established tacts could describe what he felt. Artaud, for example, could not describe what it really feels like to him to "be cold." (I, 320-1) The words he had to use were alien to him and like a foreign language could not really express a native truth: "Non mon cri ni ma fièvre ne sont de moi." (I, 105)

Therefore, he needed a special, personal language to come to grips with being and meaning: "...in order to achieve a spiritual revolution we must first understand the true nature of our being--an understanding that must be preceded by a radical change in our language." 15 This new language, then, was important both in a personal quest of self and in a sharing of this new consciousness with others.

Although the theater was first to direct itself to the senses, the intellectual consequences were also to be fully developed:

Ce langage fait pour les sens doit au préalable s'occuper de les (sens) satisfaire. Cela ne l'empêche pas de développer ensuite toutes ses conséquences intellectuelles sur tous les plans possibles et dans toutes les directions. (IV, 46)
Above all, this new consciousness he wanted to instil was to be metaphysical as was the language which conveyed it. Artaud had been most impressed by the revelatory signs of the Balinese theater. He thought their signs and actions were done in lasting ways (i.e., that the contingencies were not subject to weakening because of the passing of time) and because they helped men see the metaphysical identity of the concrete and the abstract. (IV, 72) Skinner explains that "seeing" the meaning of an action is another way of saying that the audience can infer some of the independent variables of which the action is a function. (VB, 14) Artaud wanted his audience to "see" signs and images in the same manner, that is, to have the spectator infer or even feel the forces controlling the signs. These metaphysical ideas were never to be formally portrayed but only touched upon in this indirect manner. They are the limitless forces involving creation, being and chaos. (IV, 107) Artaud gave as an example of this metaphysical aspect of language a wind instrument which prolongs the vibrations of the vocal cords to the point where one cannot tell if it is the vocal cords or the instrument which sounds. (IV, 67) It thus indirectly "draws the mind with it into the mysteries of the metaphysical."
Language was to be a radical new means of theater. It is the most important element of the stimulus sets that evoke the desired response. This multistimulation, as earlier depicted in Figure 6, can now be added to the basic schematic. (See Figure 7.) Just as important, though, to the mission of theater were the choreographer of this new language, its medium, and the public who reacted to it. By understanding all these parts in conjunction with language one can understand the whole theatrical dynamic of Antonin Artaud.
"The Expanded Schematic: Multiple Stimulation"

Figure 7
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2- As reported in Gouhier, p. 44.

3- Ibid.

4- Knapp, p. 171.

5- Gouhier, pp. 79-80.

6- Ibid., p. 53.

7- Virmaux, p. 98.

8- Gouhier, p. 143.


10- Ibid., p. 87.


12- Virmaux, p. 31.

13- Lyons, p. 121.

14- While we cannot describe this process in detail here, it is crucial for understanding Skinner's total concept of verbal behavior. Anyone wishing to pursue this analysis further would do well to read these pages in *Verbal Behavior* carefully.
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CHAPTER 5
THE DIRECTOR AND THE ACTOR

Until now the discussion has centered around discovering the basic behavioral paradigm which explains the dynamic relationship between theatrical event and spectator in Artaud's theater. Before completing the paradigm, it would be wise to consider two roles which cannot be included per se schematically, but which are essential to the efficacy of the S → R relationship; the director and the actor. (In a scientific experiment, they would correspond to the experimenter and the stimulus set.) Artaud had very definite, unusual views about both. His views stress the very serious preoccupation he had with behavioral change.

The Director

Almost any good playwright could have written plays aimed at the goals and using the methods discussed up until this point. However, the question is, can the process be carried out. Will the stimuli be presented appropriately and will they achieve their effect? Who will keep the S → R process intact and minimize competing responses and how will he do it? Who will control the stimulus presentation process? Artaud realized that a strong director was needed for this, to guarantee maximum success in
achieving his goals at the theater. He made many changes in the traditional role of the director, although most were not original with him. Collectively, they greatly enhanced the potential ability to induce behavioral change.

The usual relationship between an author and a director makes the end product a joint effort in which neither really imposes his views totally. At best, the two work hand-in-hand, with the director acting as a technical adviser, who uses his stage experiences to help the writer adapt the play to the particular actors, public, and accommodations. More often, the director simply "interprets" the text himself by changing, deleting or adding to the various elements of the play. The result is a weakening, if not falsification, of the original intent of the writer. The spectator is asked to respond to a variety of stimulus situations which compete at least for his energies if not against each other with respect to the terminal behavior.

Artaud had worked with or under many of the great directors of this time: Baty, Copeau, Jouvet, Pitoeff. Like many of them, especially Baty, he eventually understood that this division of control could seriously undermine his efforts. Artaud was already asking the public to behave in a radically different manner. To strengthen his chances of succeeding, he needed to be able to constantly evaluate the process and make modifications as well as initially coordinate all the stimuli to focus on the target behavior.
In short, he needed full control. In the beginning, Artaud was content to collaborate with living authors or specially adapted plays or on specially written plays. It did not seem to work, though, and with the collapse of his negotiations with André Gide to specially adapt "Arden of Feversham", Artaud seems to have moved almost exclusively towards the position that the director should have complete control.

For Artaud, theater was *la mise-en-scène*. It was not simply, though, *la mise-en-scène* but *la mise-en-scène directe*. Again Artaud emphasized that pure theater is not on words (IV, 65), but on a bombardment of sights, sounds, and other scenic stimuli. The text could eventually be suppressed because theater was a living process, a process of cure and discovery. A strong director could best orchestrate these sights and sounds to these ends.

To further increase his potential of succeeding, Artaud decided that the absolute control of the director could not be used haphazardly or as a function of personal aesthetics or whim. Nor could *mise-en-scène* be based on intuition. Instead, Artaud insisted that it become a rigorous, scientific discipline, a superior mathematics: "C'est assez d'une magie hasardeuse, d'une poésie qui n'a pas la science pour l'étayer." (IV, 163, 181) The director had to have absolute control not only of the "text" but of everything that went on. Further, he had to know in advance the exact effect each stimulus should have and plan accordingly:
Tout en effet dans ce théâtre (le théâtre balinais) est calculé avec une adorable et mathématique minutie. Rien n'y est laissé au hasard ou à l'initiative personnelle. C'est une sorte de danse supérieure, où les danseurs seraient avant tout acteurs. (IV, 69)

Pas un jeu de muscle, pas un roulement d'oeil qui ne semble appartenir à une sorte de mathématique réfléchie qui mène tout. (IV, 81)

This is the most significant change Artaud made in the director's role with respect to the behavioral change paradigm. By giving the director full control to use in a studied, scientific manner, he guaranteed that all stimuli chosen would be picked in view of their ability to contribute to the goal behavior. Moreover, he guaranteed the uniformity of the stimulus situation. In other words, a given stimulus is chosen because of the desired response it evokes. The more uniform the stimulus remains from presentation to presentation, the greater the probability that the response emitted will be the desired response. In behavioral terms, uniformity of the SD enhances the stereotype of the response as well as increasing the probability of the response.²

Besides being able to control individual responses with great accuracy, Artaud insisted that the director be able to induce a general trance over the audience. He did not mean simply that a director should be able to captivate his audience so much so that they become totally engrossed in the play and lose track of time and space.
He quite literally wanted the director to be able to induce a trance, a kind of magical spell. The metteurs-en-scène were to be sorcerers, "spécialistes de cette sorcellerie objective et animée." (IV, 88) From his own trance-like experiences with drugs, magic, and pain, Artaud must have known that this basic state altered perception and consequent behavior. The trance was a necessary condition for seeing the truths of life. He said that the trance brought about a "prise de conscience et aussi de possession de certaines forces dominantes, de certaines notions qui dirigent tout." (IV, 124) The director had not only to be able to induce these trances, but to know how the spectator would react to stimuli within the trance. Comparing the process of theater to acupuncture, Artaud said the director must know the exact location to place the pin to get the precise result he wanted, even the subtlest result. (IV, 97-98) In behavioral terms, thus, the director had to be able to quickly, radically change the base state of the subjects before trying to induce behavioral changes. In the next chapter this trance state will be further explained and incorporated into the basic schematic.

One further clarification should be made about the director, although it does not constitute a change Artaud made in the director's role: The director was an inter­mediary, not an innovator. As in the Balinese theater, he was "un ordonnateur magique, un maître de cérémonies
sacrées. (IV, 72) The themes and material he used were not his own; they came from the gods. Artaud had looked at the other side of life. Yet he did not claim to know all about it nor did he want to teach men about it. Rather, he invited them to experience it, as he himself had, by calling up existent imagery within themselves and pursuing this imagery to its extremes.

Again, the problem of imagery and mentalism arises. It warrants reemphasis that, from a behavioral viewpoint, this can be explained as increasing the probability of a latent response. The spectator may have "forgotten" the response, the response probability may have diminished because of punishment or of extinction, or the response may not have been thoroughly conditioned. Whatever the case, the director adds supplemental strength to an already extant response; he does not create a new, primary response. (VB, 269) This is not instruction; however, it may be the basis for later learning, as it is in Artaud's theater. Here, a low probability is strengthened and is the basis for new associations and behaviors. The director facilitates and guides this process.

By making the director of the theater of cruelty the strongest person in the behavioral changes process, Artaud took another step to maximize the chances of effecting his goals. Unity of purpose could be sustained from inception of the project through its realization, reevaluation and revision.
The Actor

At the same time that Artaud was greatly increasing the controlling powers of the director, he greatly reduced those of the actor. Again, he made the changes to maximize the potential for behavioral change.

Traditionally, the actor has acted as a sort of mirror for man. Men "identify" with the actor or characteristics of the actor. Sometimes they reject him and watch what happens as a result of his unsavory characteristics. In any event, the actors are the focal point for the spectators. When they effect a behavioral change, it usually is a result of the process Bandura calls modeling. In the modeling process, a spectator observes a stimulus situation (complex or simple), the behavior of the other person in this situation, and the consequence contingent upon his action or non-action. The observer, then, is more or less likely to emit a similar response in a similar situation. For example, it has been reported that one reason for the increase in suicides in recent years is that people have watched distraught television actors escape their problems by jumping out the window. For years citizen groups have been trying to show that there is a similar link between televised violence and real aggression, especially among children.
Often it is the actor who makes a play a success. People come because a certain actor is starring in it, and they acclaim the particular way in which he interprets the text. In a letter to Gaston Gallimard (V, 124-6) Artaud described this kind of actor as one who imposes his own rhythm and personality on the whole production. He called such plays zeroes ("pièces nulles ou une mise-en-scène nulle"), and said they had come about because every play needed a strong element about which to turn. (V, 125)

In Artaud's theater all elements had to be subjugated into a contributory role aimed at achieving the primary goal. Artaud wanted to merge the author with the director or at least put the author's product under the director's complete control. He thus squelched one source of interference with the primary process. Similarly, he subjugated all the elements of theater (light, dance, etc.) to this goal. By severely stripping language of its normal communicative properties, he likewise limited the interference words could cause. Actors were the only other major element which might have disrupted or destroyed his unity of purpose. Although an actor's interpretation may contribute to obtaining the effects desired by the director and the playwright, it may just as well seriously weaken or undermine this effort by encouraging reactions which compete with the desired effects.
Consequently, Artaud demanded complete control over his actors. He criticized Copeau's control, for example, because Copeau let his actors improvise too much. (IV, 131) Artaud would not tolerate this personal interpretation which could possibly undermine his effort. The actor became another object of the stage to be manipulated by the director: "... une sorte d'élément passif et neutre, puisque toute initiative personnelle lui est rigoureusement refusé." (IV, 117) The actors had to be depersonalized.

In "Sur le Théâtre balinais" (IV, 70) Artaud described the necessity of systematic depersonalization of all facial expression. Then the director can carve a mask on the face. Because of the director's vast knowledge of cause and effect in the spectator and his knowledge of all the other elements' contributions, he alone could pick the correct face (mask) for maximum effort. From a behavioral viewpoint, this was an important modification. Actors are the most variable of the stimuli presented to the spectator. With absolute control (down to the very musculature), Artaud was able to be sure that the actor as stimulus would not evoke competing responses, as has been previously mentioned; but further, he was capable of reducing stimulus variation. Stimulus variation can reduce the probability of the desired response, because the more the stimulus presented differs from the known controlling stimulus, the less chance there is of its controlling a response. Thus, Artaud's control of the
actor increases the probability of success in the basic 
\[ S^D \rightarrow R \] process. By deemphasizing the importance of the
actor and refusing him any control in the behavioral change
process, Artaud made him, in essence, simply another stimulus
set to be controlled by the director. Indeed, Artaud called
the actor a "living hieroglyph" and a part of his new
physical language (IV, 65).

Although the actor was now only a part of the whole
and not its focal point, he was a very significant element:
"L'acteur est ... un élément de première importance, puisque
c'est de l'efficacité de son jeu que dépend la réussite
du spectacle...." (IV, 117). Artaud disliked using film,
radio, or records in part because they stole some of the
actors' powers from them. The actual presence of the actor
on stage was necessary to act physically on the spectator. Actors had to put on a production that was as real as life
(II, 23), and film and sound recordings only captured
a portion of the stimuli present in this original production.
Excellence in technique was not enough for success in
the Théâtre de la Cruauté. Artaud was very aware of the
trance state or other-worldliness of the Balinese dancers,
and thus he, too, sought above all a vital sincerity in
his actors. This "vital sincerity" was a form of total
acting, making the actor as a unit of body and soul act on
the spectator as a unit of body and soul. Grotowski explains
this total acting sought by Artaud:
In behavioral terms, this kind of total acting, source of multiple, concurrent stimulation, is the most effective means of evoking a response.

The director and actor, thus, expedite the \( S \rightarrow R \) process by reducing irrelevant stimulus variation or presentations and by enhancing stimulus control. They work together to maximize probability of the target responses by developing and presenting complementary, cohesive stimulus sets based upon their knowledge of theater and of behavior. The final step is to see how all the processes come together in the individual.
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1- Artaud did his own *Ventre brûlé ou la mère folle* (1927) and plays by Vitrac, Aron, and Claudel. At first he relied principally on the shocking parts of each, but gradually he enlarged his own control. Artaud's most famous *mise-en-scène* was of Strindberg's *A Dream Play* (1928) and was greatly admired by the Swedes. Here, as in Vitrac's *Mystères de l'amour*, he tried to crush the rational, spatial, and chronological dimensions in his audience. Unfortunately for Artaud, though, the vast critical reaction was unfavorable. He turned next to writing film scenarii (Cf. III) of which, being their author as well as potential director, he could have more control. *"La Coquille et le Clergyman"* was the only one of Artaud's scripts to be made into a film (produced in 1928, directed by Germaine Dulac). An abstract movie, *"La Coquille et le Clergyman"* had no plot and was a series of purely visual situations. Like Artaud's plays, it was meant to have a direct action on the nerves of the spectators. However, Artaud was very disenchanted with the result and Mme Dulac's refusal to collaborate, and so he denounced the effort. With his failure to secure a movie contract for his adaptation of Lewis' Gothic novel *The Monk* (Cf. VI), Artaud abandoned film to return definitively to the theater where he eventually gained the full control he sought. (For a fuller treatment of Artaud's work as a director of others' plays, see Knapp, pp. 45-83.)


3- Cf. Chapter 3 of this study.


5- Cf. Lyons, p. 124.

6- Cf. Virmaux, p. 73.


8- Esslin, Artaud, p. 86.

CHAPTER 6
THE SPECTATOR

Until this point, this analysis has dealt primarily with the mechanics of the theater process from an exterior perspective; the stimuli and predicted responses have been treated. The one significant part of this whole process yet to be discussed is also the most important: the spectator (or, collectively, the public.) Now, this study will switch to examine the issues from the spectator's standpoint so that his position can be assessed: Who is he? What happens to him in this new, strange theater? How does he come to understand the truths to which he is being exposed? And what does he find rewarding about this experience? Although the individual himself cannot answer, Artaud provided the answers to these questions in theory. A behavioral assessment of these responses will expand and complete the behavioral schematic which describes Artaud's basic theatrical theories.

Many of Artaud's ideas which define his public had already been set forth in the manifesto "Le Théâtre Alfred Jarry" (II, 11-14). First of all, he was very aware that he needed a public: "Car à l'encontre des littérateurs ou des peintres, il nous est impossible de nous passer du public, qui devient d'ailleurs partie intégrale de notre
tentative." (II, 12) Here again, there is an indication that theater is a dynamic process of changing another person. Without the patron there is no theater and without considering his background, needs, and reactions the enterprise will fail. Second, Artaud sought to communicate with all men, not just a small group of elitists: "On doit en finir avec cette idée des chefs-d'oeuvre réservés à une soi-disant élite et que la foule ne comprend pas...." (IV, 89) The practical result of this desire was that Artaud would have to limit himself to stimuli (and expected responses) of a universal nature. However, this universality needed to be a contemporary universality. The potential audience had to share these common reactions. The artist who extended this universality to encompass those in other parts of the world or from other times would fail.¹ Third, Artaud wanted to act on each individual in the audience, not the group as a whole (II, 14). Moreover, he wanted to act on the total man, not the product of society (IV, 147). Thus, Artaud wanted to eliminate the deforming influence of religion, laws, and training (IV, 147). In behavioral terms, he would have to find some way to alter each person's base response state (or return it to the original base state before socialization).

Consequently, Artaud rejected the traditional use of illusion on stage and the use of life-like situations and characters. Social man had been taught how to "suspend
his disbelief" for the duration of the traditional play. However, when he left he could lessen the impact of the theatrical experience by denying it could happen. Artaud, on the other hand, refused to separate illusion from action. The only illusion he sought was the ability of the action to be communicative (II, 16). In other words, illusion's impact did not lie in the fact that it was life-like (II, 16), but in that it transferred the action taking place to the spectator. Two contemporary examples may clarify what he meant. In the movies "Roller Coaster" and "Earthquake" the reality of the action was conveyed by illusion. In the case of "Earthquake", a huge auxiliary sound system and shaking seats communicated the action of a real earthquake. In "Roller Coaster", special cinematography brought across the reality of being on one of these trips so well that people went just for the thrill of the experience. So, by communicating action, Artaud hoped to deprive social man of his habitual refuges.² Social man would no longer talk about what could happen but what did happen.

This union of illusion and action was a step towards denuding man of his social conditioning (changing the base response rate), but it was not enough to call forth the visionary in Artaud's public. He himself, as early as "Sur le Théâtre balinais" had great praise for those who sensed the mystical in almost all things, even a simple dress. He said they had an innate sense of the absolute, magical
symbolism of nature. (IV, 75) Yet his own visionary powers were probably in large part due to his drug experimentation and addiction.

Opium played the double role of liberator and oppressor in Artaud's life. His addiction became so intense that it gradually ravaged both his body and mind. In a letter (October 7, 1931) to J. Paulhan he described how totally he considered himself a victim of drugs: "Le goût, l'habitude, et la nécessité de l'opium me préoccupent physiquement et intellectuellement plus qu'ils n'auront jamais préoccupé le plus fidèle de mes amis." (II, 122) At one time, however, opium had liberated him, and even given him back life. (II, 123) It was the source of his creativity, his new insights into the truth.

Skinner explains the drugs' effect as the result of a reduction in conditioned aversive stimulation. When a person takes drugs, behavior of low response probability, because of a history of social aversive conditioning, becomes more likely to be emitted. In other words, the automatic punishing effects (conditioned aversive stimulation) of this creative behavior are reduced. (VB, 213) Earlier, in the sections on the goals of theater and language, social conditioned attention to selected stimulus features and the development of language were discussed. Because of drugs, much of this social conditioning was undone for Artaud. Drugs "liberated" him both by changing response probabilities and by changing the consequences of the
newly-emitted responses (i.e., they were no longer punished as severely by social disapproval and in many cases they resulted in the positive reinforcement of "understanding" new truths.) However, as his addiction became more severe and, consequently, as the amounts of opium Artaud consumed increased, these effects were greatly reduced, and he considered himself victimized by opium.

Artaud seemed to realize even in his theoretical writings on *le Théâtre Alfred Jarry* that the success of his enterprise depended upon reproducing the creative energies of his early opium experiences in his public. In these early writings he termed hallucination the principal dramatic method of theater (II, 34). Further, the main problem for the inspired director in "le Théâtre Alfred Jarry" was whether he could find the necessary element to shake up the public (II, 17). It is obvious that one could not pass out drugs to the audience before the play. Not only was this patently illegal, but also Artaud, much like Baudelaire, wanted both himself and his audience to achieve this state of creative frenzy and discovery without drugs.

In an excellent article in a special issue of *Yale French Studies* devoted to intoxication and literature, J. Lyons*4* notes the importance of drugs in Artaud's artistic development (an influence usually mentioned briefly by most critics in the biography but left undeveloped.) He claims Artaud was looking for a "super-opiate" to transform
himself and his public and that he found it in language transformed by cruelty. Lyons has made an important contribution with his theory of the quest for the super-opiate. However, one must now pay more attention to the very real and important physiological dimension of drugs. In Lyons' formulation, language is the super-opiate. Rather than simply language, however, cruelty itself is the super-opiate. Language, in Artaud's sense, serves instead to create cruelty and amplify its effects in the spectator. Once the effects of cruelty are established, language serves, too as a set of stimuli to which responses are made. It is, though, cruelty which disorders and liberates as opium had for Artaud.

When Artaud spoke of cruelty (cf. IV, 120-124), he did not limit the meaning to the traditional sense of evil which mercilessly causes pain. His definition encompassed these physical aspects within a broad, metaphysical sense (or "ontological sense", according to Virmaux.) For Artaud, cruelty was an inescapable, subjugating force: "Du point de vue de l'esprit cruauté signifie rigueur, application et décision implacable, détermination irreversible, absolue. (IV, 121)" In a letter (November 14, 1932) to Paulhan he went on to define cruelty as "an appetite for life, a cosmic rigoressness, an implacable necessity", "a whirlwind of life which eats up the shadows". (IV, 122). Not content with that definition, two days later he added:
...le désir d'Eros est une cruauté puisqu'il brûle des contingences; la mort est une cruauté, la ressurrection est cruauté, la transfiguration est cruauté.... (IV, 123)

Artaud was perhaps carried away into metaphysical reverie with his newly-found discovery. What can be reduced from his widely-ranging definitions is that cruelty should completely take a person over and compel him to action. He was much less concerned with the sadistic or violent aspects of cruelty than with the fact that cruelty completely dominates a person, both at a physiological and psychological level. When faced with a display of cruelty, one cannot continue thinking about next week's concert. One becomes, at least momentarily, totally caught up in the present. The intense stimuli provoke a total disorientation of emotion and behavior.

Experimental behavioral psychologists have not worked extensively with emotional behavior, primarily because they are interested in opposite results: They do not generally want to decontrol behavior but to control it. Practical applications of their research center more around increased efficiency, not creativity. Skinner, nevertheless, has provided a brief, theoretical analysis of emotional behavior. His theories illustrate in what ways the effects of cruelty might simulate or replace drug effects for Artaud.
According to Skinner, stimuli which elicit emotional responses (à la Pavlov) also bring about other, concurrent behavioral changes. (SHB, 162) These stimuli may elicit emotional responses, glandular and smooth muscle responses, and changes in the probability of behavior. Such stimuli, consequently, change the basic physiological state of the behaver as well as reorder response probabilities (i.e., they change his base response state). For example, Peck details the effects of stimuli inducing fear:

During the first half-second after a person is stimulated by a sudden, loud sound, flash of light or intense odour, there occurs a rapid response, known as the startle pattern, consisting of a sudden movement of the head, blinking of the eyes, a characteristic facial expression, raising and drawing forward of the shoulders, turning upward of the upper arms, bending of the elbows, turning downward of the arms, flexions of the fingers, forward movement of the trunk, contraction of the abdomen and bending of the knees. Not all of these movements occur in every individual every time he is so stimulated; the number of elements and the completeness of the pattern vary with the novelty and intensity of the stimulus. This response is probably the initiating element of many, more general, emotional reactions, both motor expressions and conscious experiences.

It is important to note that these concurrent changes are not the result of the emotion but of the initial stimulus. (VB, 158)

Further, as the level of emotional responses increases, the amount of stimulus control decreases. That is, the more emotional people become, the less likely they are to respond
to a given situation in a predictable, stereotypical manner. In the case of fear, they may even hallucinate. By means of emotional stimuli, then, control of behaviors socially conditioned and maintained in the presence of given stimuli can be drastically weakened.

Emotional stimuli wreak further havoc on socialized man by changing consequence values: "Moreover, fear, anger, and joy imply diffuse, non-specific changes in the value of all reinforcers...." Operant behavior is maintained by reinforcers, and changes in the reinforcers result in more changes in response probability. Thus, from a behavioral vantage point, emotional stimuli can work to "liberate" men by changing response probabilities, weakening or destroying stimulus control, and revaluing reinforcers.

Figure 8 summarizes these liberating changes, which can be induced by "cruel" stimuli (a shorthand way of referring to stimuli which are called "cruel" because of the emotional responses of fear, stress, anxiety, and so on, which they induce.) The disordering effect of these stimuli closely parallels the effects of opium, which induces a similar state. Figure 8, then, should be added as a subordinate, concurrent behavioral process to the basic schematic. Throughout the play this process works to facilitate the main changes.
"Cruel" Stimuli

Revaluation of Reinforcers
Emotional Responses
Glandular Responses
Smooth Muscle Responses
Changes in Probability of Operant Behavior
Weakening of Stimulus Control

"Effects of Cruel Stimuli"

Figure 8
The "cruel" stimuli which cause these changes need not be simple stimuli. In the simplest case, the director could use what Skinner (or Pavlov) would call an unconditioned stimulus (UCS) to elicit the unconditioned response (UCR). The UCS → UCR reactions, because they are not dependent upon conditioning, are almost universal in man. For example, suddenly presenting a bloody, mutilated head will make a person react with fright, disgust, and usually some sort of escape or avoidance behavior (e.g., turning the head, closing the eyes.) Cruel stimuli can also be of a more complex nature. As Pavlov demonstrated with his salivating dogs, previously neutral stimuli can be paired with unconditioned stimuli or extremely strong conditioned stimuli to elicit almost exactly the same response. (UCS → UCR/ CS → CR).¹³ Within the play itself, then, the director can pair two such stimuli to augment the effect of the "cruel" stimulus. The two stimuli may both be objects (e.g., the sight of mutilation and the appearance of a man), or one or both may be verbal stimuli (e.g., coupling the name of a cruel person with a loud, sharp sound) (Cf. VB, 357). This final elaboration, added to Figure 8, completes the auxiliary process to be included with the main schematic.

One other aspect of the use of cruel stimuli merits comment before passing. Since cruel stimuli usually are violent, what effect do violent actions have on the
speculator? The immediate reaction of almost anyone knowledgeable about the history of theater is to cite the Aristotelian concept of catharsis:

Having given us fear enough, the masters of tragedy melt us with pity, purging us of our emotions, and reconciling us to our fate, because we understand it as the universal human lot. Aristotle's word for this is "purification" or "catharsis."^14

Sellin comes to this position for Artaud (as does Hayman, who calls it a spiritual purgative) and includes it as one of the three major themes of *Le Théâtre et son double*^15. One cannot fault him for believing in the use of catharsis (though, given the infrequent references to this process, it is difficult to believe it was a major theme.) Artaud himself really does seem to believe, too, that in some sense he was employing this Aristotelian process and sublimating the violence in his audience:

...le théâtre enseigne justement l'inutilité de l'action qui une fois faite n'est plus à faire, et l'inutilité supérieure de l'état inutilisé par l'action qui, retourné, produit la sublimation. (IV, 99; italics his)

One wonders if Artaud has not simply found in the concept of catharsis a convenient solution to a troublesome problem. He certainly was very sensitive to possible criticisms that his stage violence would engender more violence in his public. (Cf. IV, 99). To keep his public from thinking about anarchy, war, and so on, he believed that theater violence had to be "pure" and "disinterested."
Truly pure, disinterested acts would bring about sublimation and a "supernatural, bloody spray of images." (IV, 98-99) Although opinion is not unanimous, the prevailing view today, as expressed in the report of the Surgeon General on televised violence, is that viewing violence does not result in catharsis, as was formerly believed. Indeed, the report indicated that the viewing of televised aggression can lead to violent behavior through imitation or by simply increasing the probability of violent behavior.

There is some chance, then, that the violent stimuli which Artaud proposed may have indeed been capable of influencing subsequent violent behavior. If so, this violence would fall within the category of changes in the probability of operant behavior; it would not substantially change the basic schematic per se. If, however, the reader agrees with Sellin and believes Artaud was not simply deflecting social criticism, it must be stressed again that such a cathartic action was not central to the theater process for Artaud. Liberation was to be the result of reaching the untapped forces of the unconscious, not of sublimated emotions.

At this point it is clear, then, why novel responses or low probability responses are emitted. The question previously raised in Chapter 3 about the unconscious recurs, however. Novel responding can be easily explained by novel associations. It is more difficult to ascertain from where
the low probability responses originate. Artaud claimed that his plays spoke directly to the unconscious, and here the liberating imagery was found:

Et qu'on les (les forces pures) accepte ou qu'on les nie, il y a tout de même une façon de parler qui appelle forces ce qui fait naître dans l'inconscient des images énergiques, et à l'extérieur le crime gratuit. (IV, 98)

Indeed, the critics, as has been noted, readily accept this explanation and ignore the obvious contradiction. If the unconscious is the source of the saving imagery, and the unconscious is part of the mind, then the mind again saves the man and all of Artaud's talk about effecting a cure through the body is little more than gibberish.

A far more tenable position, one which preserves the logic and coherence of method in Artaud's theories, takes into account that Artaud did not have the proper technical words to describe what he called the "unconscious." This is not an uncommon occurrence among artists or philosophers. One reads repeatedly of those who would take us back to the freedom and spontaneity of childhood, of those who would go before or beyond experience, of tapping the inner resources of the mind. A great many use the term "unconscious", but more in the general sense of something known of which there is no awareness than in the strict, psychological sense of Freud. The language is so vague, yet so directed, that one sees an obvious attempt to explain that
which cannot be explained. Pascal put it most lyrically and probably most concisely in the celebrated fragment number 243 of the *Pensées*: "Le coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît point."\(^{18}\)

Skinner provides an explanation of the unconscious and behavior which can considerably help the reader to understand what Artaud was seeking to draw out in the individual members of his public. According to Skinner, learning can be divided into two broad categories, rule-governed and contingency-shaped. (Cf. Chapter 6, CR) Rule-governed behavior consists of following verbal instructions. These instructions may be proverbs, adages, rules, laws, advice, directions, and so on. By emitting the specified behavior in the presence of the appropriate stimuli, the individual obtains reinforcement. Contingency-shaped behavior, on the other hand, is naturally consequated by the environment without intervening verbal mediation. A man who learns to play tennis by noting the swing's effect on the ball engages in contingency-shaped learning.

Skinner postulates that what has been classically called the unconscious\(^{19}\) is in reality largely made up of contingency-shaped responses. (CR, 170) To expand his idea, one can break behavior controlled by the unconscious down into three parts: 1) behavior whose contingencies cannot be verbally described, either because of insufficient vocabulary or because the description, although not
impossible, would be so long and cumbersome as to be impractical; 2) contingency-shaped behavior without awareness; and 3) formerly established behavior which could now be termed "forgotten" either because of extinction, the establishment of competing responses, or the passage of time.

In the first division falls behavior like that of the Pascalian fragment 243. A person responds appropriately to a situation, but he cannot tell an observer why, or he cannot do it concisely enough. For example, people often try to explain why someone will or will not succeed in a given profession by saying, "Either he's got it or he hasn't." Exactly what constitutes "got it" is very indefinite. When you ask, you usually cannot obtain an accurate verbal description of the contingencies, if one is offered. Yet skilled evaluators know who has "got it."

In the second division fall those behaviors which one learns in a situation without any verbal help and without being aware he is learning. In these cases, the subject learns to affect his environment without knowing the response and sometimes without being aware of reinforcement. The classic, designed example of this undefined responding was given by Hefferline and Keenan in 1963. In this experimental demonstration men learned to obtain reinforcers by twitching a small muscle in the thumb. The actual twitch was so small that it could only be detected by an electronic monitoring system. The subjects could not describe how they obtained reinforcement.20
In the last category come those behaviors which a person has once learned but "forgotten". When he exhibits these behaviors again, he claims not to know why he can perform because he never remembers learning the action. Perhaps the memory is at fault; in other cases, many such "latent" behaviors were initially only partially or poorly learned. When they are not used or are supplanted by competing responses, one claims he never knew "x". Many childhood and adolescent experiences fall into this category.

The differences between rule-governed and contingency-shaped behavior are marked. These differences are the same differences as those between Artaud's Western man and his "new" man. Artaud's Western man is superficial and lacks depth; the "new" man responds from the deepest part of himself. Skinner makes a similar distinction between rule-governed and contingency-shaped behaviors: "Rule following behavior is said to be the veneer of civilization, whereas behavior shaped by natural consequences comes from the depth of the personality or mind." (AB, 140). Artaud's Western man is a victim of his culture; the "new" man responds in a universal way. Skinner points out that rules evolve with a culture and therefore are different from culture to culture. (CRF, 169) A socialized man responds in the ways his culture has instilled in him. Natural contingency-shaped behavior, on the other hand, is not inseparably bound to a culture. The way a man acts in such
situations is as universal, as true to "real" life, as the contingencies which shape his behavior. (CRF, 169) Thus, such (contingency-shaped) behavior could be said to come from the depths of a man. Finally, Western man is very stilted; he communicates almost exclusively through language and acts in a highly predictable, sterile manner; the "new" man places language in its proper place and learns from all the stimuli which surround him. He acts in strange, new ways. Skinner's rule-governed behavior is usually monotonous or highly stereotypic. Since a rule only prescribes necessary behavior for a given result, rule-governed behavior is often deemed "sterile" or "cold." Contingency-shaped behavior, on the other hand, is more variable; in the shaping process many extra behaviors may have also been conditioned which are superfluous or seemingly inefficient. (CRF, 84-87)

To put the issues in larger terms, contingency-shaped behavior results from living; it encompasses all the "richness" of life. Rule-governed behavior only comes in contact with someone else's distillation of life. Artaud's Western man has too quickly deduced the rules necessary for life. He has gone on to alter others' behavior with these rules instead of letting them become exposed to the genuine contingencies themselves. Western man is, hence, a product of his rules, not of life. When Artaud railed against psychology and denotative language, he was really bitterly
complaining that people were no longer "living." To the extent that society, with its ever-present desires for conformity and efficiency, removes man from the contingencies of life and makes him live by its rules, it robs him of the chance to discover in new ways, to make unusual connections and learn new truths. Some people, like the artist, poet, the religious mystic, the drugged seer, can escape from these rules and rejoin life (what Artaud called the double of life, or the life behind appearances.) Artaud wanted all men to be able to do this.

Consequently, he addressed himself to the unconscious and the body and avoided the mind. The mind is the domain of rules and reason. What Artaud hoped to bring forth from the unconscious was not latent thought or simple, surrealistic imagery. When he reached the unconscious, he believed he would hit hidden, dynamic forces. (IV, 98) He thought these forces were the sources of "images énergiques" and "crime gratuit à l'extérieur." Artaud stressed the dynamic dimension not only of the forces but also of the unbridled, almost involuntary, products of the forces. It becomes strikingly clear, then, that he sought out bodily reactions as the basis for the new knowledge. Artaud's unconscious is definitely not the traditional subdivision of the mind, the unknown segment. It is a bodily part which reacts similarly to other parts. The forces are not mental
reactions, but a predisposition to action. This concept of forces, thus, gives support and added meaning to Artaud's original claim to effect his cure by a direct attack on the body and the nervous system.

In the theoretical writings it is not very clear what these truths are or even what kinds of knowledge man should seek from the theater. The third major part of this study will examine these questions in greater detail using the theatrical works as a point of reference.

Almost equally vague is what Artaud hoped to finally accomplish in each spectator. In "le Théâtre Alfred Jarry" he partly described the physical state of the patron upon leaving:

Voilà dans quelle angoisse humaine le spectateur doit sortir de chez nous. Il sera secoué et rebroussé par le dynamisme intérieur du spectacle qui se déroule devant ses yeux. (II, 16)

Moreover, though, he expected each man to experience some sort of spiritual revitalization, a better life which resulted from the new knowledge. Artaud pointed out that his stimuli, like those of the Balinese theater, were bivalent; they fulfilled an immediate psychological need, that of preparing the spirit, and they built up a "spiritual architecture," fostered a "communion with the universal." (IV, 67; V, 38-39)

It is difficult to describe the new life Artaud aimed for without falling into the hyperbole and rhetorical
excesses of Artaud’s hagiographers. Within the basic schematic is the behavioral description (explained in Chapter 3) of the reward system such experiences could bring about. Still, this description is only a general summary of what reinforcement any new knowledge might bring about. Perhaps the “new life” cannot be described because it is precisely that, new and beyond current experience. For the reader who is not satisfied with this non-answer, two other critics (Grotowski and Libéra) have attempted to verbalize their conception of Artaud’s final goal for the individual:

When the act completely takes you over, body and soul, you begin to exist.23

Par la grâce au théâtre, tout participant descend en son corps pour y trouver une vie fondamentale qui y a été occultée par la quotidienneté et l'organisme.24

Par lui (le théâtre) le corps est délivré de toute localisation, de toute repartition géométrique des présences (les membres, les organes). Une nouvelle figure s'avance; celle du corps restitué dans toute son épaisseur, dans toute son énergie.25

At this point, the basic explanatory schematic, presented in Figure 2, has been expanded to full form. (See Figure 9). It summarizes from a behaviorist viewpoint the conversion process that is at the heart of Artaud's theories. In the following part this schematic will provide a basic framework for evaluating the triumphs and failures of Artaud’s own application of his theories.
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NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1- Artaud was deeply concerned that the director provide stimuli which he knew would definitely evoke certain responses. Cf. Chapter 5 of this study.

2- Virmaux, p. 76.

3- Cf. Chapter 3 of this study.

4- Lyons, pp. 120-9.

5- Ibid., p. 128.

6- Virmaux, p. 50.


10- Millenson, p. 441.

11- Hilgard offers another, supplementary theory for the breakdown of established behavior, which neatly agrees with Artaud's own strategy of attacking the nerves: "At high levels of arousal performance begins to decline. Presumably, the central nervous system is so responsive that it is responding to too many things at once, thus preventing one set of responses from dominating." (p. 357)


13- Cf. Chapter 1 of this study or SHB, Chapter 4, 45-48.


15- Sellin, Concepts, p. 82. Hayman, p. 78.

17- Ibid., pp. 10-11.


20- Millenson, pp. 171-175.

21- Skinner reports an experiment in which several pigeons were taught to peck at a disk for reinforcement within an experimental chamber. The birds were not returned to the chamber for six years nor reinforced for any similar behavior. When they were returned, the pigeons responded almost as strongly as six years earlier. This is the classic experimental demonstration that forgetting is not so prevalent as once believed and that time alone may have little influence on operant behavior. A more common example is that most people never forget how to swim or ride a bicycle, though years may pass between instances of either behavior. Cf. B. F. Skinner, "Pigeons in a pelican," American Psychologist, 15 (1960), pp. 28-37.

22- Skinner has written an excellent, long note detailing these differences using classical terminology. The interested reader is strongly advised to refer to this analysis in CRF, pp. 166-171, Note 6.4.

23- Grotowski, p. 1892.


25- Ibid.
PART III:

THEATER
INTRODUCTION TO PART III

The third section of this study will treat Artaud's own implementation of his theories. Most general books on Artaud's theater make frequent references or have devoted a section to other authors who have relied on his ideas. The reader may turn to them for a full discussion of how these ideas were integrated into others' directing and playwriting.¹ The last two chapters, on the other hand, will focus on Artaud's own attempts to translate his ideas practically onto the stage.

Artaud's own dramatic career was quite varied and lengthy. Throughout the years he was not confined, he worked as an actor, playwright, director, cinematographer, designer, producer, and publicist.² His first real play, le Jet de sang, was written in 1925 and published in l'Ombilic des limbes. He wrote the outline for two more plays, la Pierre philosophale and Il n'y a plus de firmament as well as founding and directing the short-lived Théâtre Alfred Jarry.³

In 1931 came the Balinese dancers, who, as was mentioned, so profoundly influenced Artaud and whose arrival marks the beginning of the most fruitful portion of Artaud's dramatic productivity. Artaud announced a new theater
group, eventually to be called "le Théâtre de la Cruauté."
Artaud planned in the future present plays by Webster, Ford, Tourneur and Shakespeare (IV, 118-119), and he made a tentative agreement with André Gide to collaborate on a new production of Arden de Feversham. Artaud himself wrote two plays for his new theater, la Conquête du Mexique (1933) les Cenci (1935). La Conquête du Mexique, the story of Cortez's conquest of the Aztecs, was first published in incomplete form in le Théâtre et son double. Although it was never completed, Artaud called it the only pure example of theater of cruelty. Les Cenci, Shelley's (and Stendhal's) account of Renaissance incest, parricide, and torture, was the basis for the only full-length play Artaud actually staged for the Théâtre de la Cruauté. Its failure after a brief run marks the end of the Théâtre de la Cruauté.

Artaud's physical and mental health declined severely in the ensuing years. He abandoned the Théâtre de la Cruauté and came to reject the great majority of the ideas he had proposed about theater in le Théâtre et son double. By 1938 theater for Artaud had lost its metaphysical dimension. Plays were a one-sided experience of the physical. Although he wrote one other "play", Pour en finir avec le jugement de Dieu (1947), it stands as an anomaly in the body of his works. It is excluded from consideration here because it negates all the principles Artaud had worked for earlier.
Gouhier has discussed the incongruency of this work in a section of his book.5

The present study will focus on the five plays of the years 1925-1935 named above. In this first of two chapters the minor plays will be discussed: le Jet de sang, Il n'y a plus de firmament and la Pierre philosophale as a group, and la Conquête du Mexique separately. None of the first three plays was written for the Théâtre de la Cruauté, but all have elements which played an important part in the evolution of Artaud's theories and which later appeared in the cruelty plays. The analysis of these plays will involve detailing Artaud's first attempts to communicate certain truths and his discovery and initial attempts to use multiple stimulus dimensions to unveil these truths.

Included in this same chapter will be a more careful analysis of la Conquête du Mexique. It is included among the minor plays, despite Artaud's protestations of its orthodoxy, principally because of its short, sketchy nature. La Conquête du Mexique was only fully formed in Artaud's mind; without the full text and detailed stage directions which would necessarily result from any production by Artaud, it would be impossible to thoroughly analyze this play from a behavioral vantage point. Nevertheless, following the outlines of the schematic, this play will be investigated as fully as possible within the announced methods and aims.
Les Cenci, Artaud's only full production for the Théâtre de la Cruauté, forms the basis of the principal practical application of Artaud's theories from a behavioral viewpoint. The play will be considered in detail behaviorally, scene by scene, using both the written text, photographs, reports of interviews, and various other documentation to recreate this play as much as possible for the present-day reader. Les Cenci illustrates a gradual, well-designed behavioral change process that might have worked. The bitter failure Artaud experienced as well as possible reasons for this failure (based upon the schematic) will bring the chapter to a close.
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2- For a brief but detailed overview of Artaud's work in the theater, consult the summaries in the appendices of Hayman, pp. 170-172, and Virmaux, pp. 240-244.

3- The first production of the Théâtre Alfred Jarry (a group which existed from 1926-1929) consisted of three plays, les Mystères de l'amour by Roger Vitrac, Gigone, by Robert Aron, and the first presentation of a new play by Artaud, le Ventre brûlé. Unfortunately, almost all documentation concerning the play has been destroyed, and little is definitely known about the play. Virmaux has reprinted (pp. 319-320) Robert Maguire's reconstruction of the form he thinks the play may have taken (based upon participants' recollections.)

4- This "play" was performed on radio on February 2, 1948. Knapp, among others, does not even classify this as a play, but as a poem.

CHAPTER 7
THE MINOR PLAYS
THREE SHORT PLAYS

These three plays were all written during the time when Artaud was moving away from the Surrealists and trying to formulate his own theories. Before considering the plays in detail, it may be helpful to review the plot of each briefly.

*Le Jet de sang*, written in 1925, still has strong Surrealist overtones, if it is not indeed a completely Surrealist play. Several critics have dealt with this question, and the controversy is an interesting side issue in Artaud studies.¹ The play itself is probably the best known of Artaud's plays outside of *les Cenci* and is said to have greatly influenced later absurdist writers.² It differs markedly from Artaud's other plays because of its heavy use of more or less traditional dialogue, minimal emphasis on staging and use of symbols which appeal more to the mind than to the whole person.

The play begins with a young man and woman professing their love to each other in varying voice registers. Then, from the convulsed heavens fall legs, feet, hands, hair, masks, columns, porticoes, temples, alembics, scorpions, a frog, and a scarab.³
The couple leaves, and in come a medieval knight and his giant-breasted nurse. He is nourished from her breasts, but surprisingly enough, he eats gruyère cheese from them. The young man returns, having lost his girlfriend and discusses this with a group of people (a priest, a cobbler, a beadle, a procuress, a judge, and a merchant). The priest tries to get the young man to describe his sexual activities, first in a Catholic voice, then Protestant, but to no avail. A sudden storm arises and brings about general pandemonium. From above God suddenly grabs the procuress with a giant hand and tries to shame her. She, however, bites his hand and causes an immense spurt of blood on stage. All who have witnessed this die, except the young man and procuress. The nurse, now without breasts, returns carrying the dead girl. The knight reenters and is extremely upset to find the nurse can no longer nourish him. There follows a hideous sight, scorpions crawling all over the nurse's sexual organs. The young man and procuress flee. Finally, the young girl is resurrected as if she were the Virgin. (I, 74-81)

*La Pierre philosophale*, which Artaud called, a pantomime, was composed in 1931. A scant eight pages, the text outlines a complete performance with little dialogue but (given its length) rather extensive stage direction. Set in the experimental chambers of the sadistic Doctor Fâle, the play revolves around the attempts of the Doctor to discover the philosopher's stone, the mythical source of
identity. The experimental victim of the doctor's sadomasochism is the dashingly handsome Harlequin, who has consented to participate in order to be near his beloved Isabelle. Isabelle, the sexually frustrated wife of Dr. Pâle, watches in horror as her husband hacks away at Harlequin's limbs, which mysteriously reattach themselves afterwards. When they are left alone, Harlequin and Isabelle make love and produce a baby, a miniature mannequin replica of Dr. Pâle. The doctor's own sadistic attempts at love are fruitless. Harlequin reenters as a double character, one an ugly, despicable monster, the other the handsome Harlequin. The monstrous one presents himself saying, "JE VIENS POUR FAIRE TIRER DE MOT LA PIERRE PHILO-SOPHALE." The doctor proceeds to hack him up and then pushes the handsome one onto the stage to hack him up also. The doctor sleeps, and Harlequin, recomposed, hurries to make love with Isabelle and produce a child (another Dr. Pâle.) All this love-making is done in mid-air, while jumping. The play ends with Harlequin's hiding behind Isabelle, who is kissed by Dr. Pâle when he sees "his" new child. (IV, 84-90)

Il n'y a plus de firmament, an incomplete "argument pour la scène" in five movements, was written sometime in 1931 or 1932 (II, 276, note 57). The text presented in the Œuvres complètes was pieced together from several
copies but is complete up to the uncomposed fifth movement. Artaud wrote a great deal more dialogue for this play; more importantly, he went into great detail about the sounds, lighting, and imagery, at the expense of an elaborate plot.

After an initial light and sound play, the play opens with mass confusion among the people at twilight. Something horrible has happened to the sun, which an incomprehensible voice is trying to announce. Hysteria takes over among the people as they voice their opinions about what is happening. Newspaper vendors shout out:

GRANDE DECOUVERTE. DEMANDEZ LA GRANDE DECOUVERTE. OFFICIEL. LA SCIENCE BOULEVERSE. OFFICIEL. ET IL N’Y A PLUS DE FIRMAMENT. ET IL N’Y A PLUS DE FIRMAMENT.

Gradually all learn that the distant star Sirius has established contact with Earth and is about to destroy it. At this point enters le Grand Flaireur (The Great Sniffer), a grotesque character with a giant nose attached to his right fist. Surrounded by a hideous cohort, he tries to start a revolution among the people. In the fourth scene the scientists debate among themselves about possible actions to avert the cataclysm, but they cannot agree and end in mass confusion. The piercing cries of sirens and a cold, glowing light finish the scene and the extant text.

None of the plays is a good example of the theories Artaud espoused in le Théâtre et son double. However, all three of them contain elements which Artaud would use a
few years later in his Theater of Cruelty productions. A reading of the plays in the accepted chronological order (le Jet de Sang, la Pierre philosophale, Il n'y a plus de firmament) shows how Artaud was experimenting and moving in the direction of the theories he proposed in le Théâtre et son double. The entire schematic given in the previous section is not applicable here, because Artaud had not yet reached that full stage in his development. Their brevity also precludes extensive behavioral analysis, but it must be remembered that these are primarily outlines for a series of experiences and not full-blown mental constructs. Still, parts of the analysis are valid even here. Studying various elements of these plays (dialogue, sound, lighting, decor, costumes, movement, imagery, theme, and audience effect) will demonstrate some of his first attempts at changing people's behavior theatrically. Moreover, it will show that Artaud's theories grew in part from his successes and failures in the practical realm of playwriting. They were not solely, as many critics would seem to imply, the result of his tortured existence, his quest for mental health, or his mystical experiences.

Reading chronologically, one sees Artaud quickly abandoned the use of traditional dialogue and of words. Le Jet de sang is almost entirely made up of dialogue. There are some directions for the actors, but they are hardly as extensive or detailed as those of the later plays. The
dialogue consists of traditional words and does not seem confused or disjointed. In sharp contrast, there are only four short sentences indicated in la Pierre philosophale. The dialogue in Il n'y a plus de firmament, while more copious, is very disjointed, often incomprehensible, and meant to support the general pandemonium. In le Jet de sang words still communicate primarily a meaning, without which the message would be lost. Save for Harlequin's one line, "JE VIENS POUR FAIRE TIRER DE MOI LA PIERRE PHILOSOPHALE," the speeches in la Pierre philosophale are superfluous. Speech has been suppressed and is not missed. The moderation of Il n'y a plus de firmament reflects the practice that Artaud would eventually support: words are ancillary to the meaning of the production, useful but not indispensable.

There is a great deal of experimentation in these plays with the various stimulus dimensions of human speech. Le Jet de sang starts out with the young boy and girl repeatedly expressing the beauty of their love in a quasi-chant. Their voices change throughout. Similarly, Doctor Pâle's "voice" is very high and grating. Curiously enough, it is a dislocated voice coming from the stage wings; the doctor pretends it is his own:

Cette voix se sera élevée, comme si elle sortait de la bouche même du docteur et on aura vu le docteur bondir un instant sur la scène et mimer à voix muette les paroles suivantes, avec la gesticulation qui leur convient:
"As-tu fini de m'empêcher de travailler? Elle vient!" (II, 86)

The effect is to strip the words of their authenticity, since their apparent source is obviously not where the sound is coming from, and to reduce them from the level of rational discourse to pure sound. Indeed, although the words form two sentences, they make little sense in the play.

Having thus denuded words of their traditional role, Artaud further breaks them down in Harlequin's speech and makes the sound convey his message. The line "JE VIENS POUR FAIRE TIRER DE MOI LA PIERRE PHILOSPHALE." is broken apart by silences into small parts, with the longest pause before -PHALE. Harlequin's voice changes at this point, too, from bleating and punctuated to the very high voice of a hoarse eunuch. The implicit sexual message dominates the literal one. Still, at this time the main conveyor of this message, -PHALE, is a monovalent stimulus. It does not open up to evoke a richness of reactions, but focuses in on a single association.

Within the three plays there is a great amount of experimentation with the neglected stimulus qualities of human speech: pitch, speed, accentuation, intonation, volume, pauses, meaning—word association. Unlike normal human communication, where these factors add a certain nuance to the words' message, the attempt is to let these
elements carry the meaning themselves. In the limited scope of these play outlines Artaud succeeded, but one wonders how much these sketches would have been diluted by words if the whole play had taken form (as in les Cenci).

With each play Artaud extended his experimentation with pure sound and attempts to let it replace speech. In le Jet de sang the ghosts all ask at once "qui" in a different tone. Although the query is answered, this is really an early example of the sound technique indicating ethereality that Artaud was to use in les Cenci. "Omph," an enormous roar, is the involuntary reaction of Doctor Pâle at the moment of every violent emotion. (Artaud suggested that the doctor might utter it each time with a different sense and intensity.) In effect, the exclamation "omph" derives its total communicative ability from all its stimulus features except its denotative associations, which are nonexistent.

Much more impressive is the beginning of Il n'y a plus de firmament, an entire overture in sound and light. With raw sound Artaud wanted to evoke and elicit the general terror and pandemonium of the world on the brink of disaster within his audience:

Son bruts. Détimbrages de sons.
This is one of the most illustrative passages in the minor plays of the complexity of Artaud's evolving sound system. Not limiting himself to dissociating sound from speech, he talked about sound as if he were talking about matter: "tombant d'une hauteur vertigineuse," "tombent," "s'arrêtent...s'étendent en jaillissements, formant des voûtes, des parasols." He was thus building a sonar edifice. Western man is not used to speaking about sound in this fashion nor in responding to these stimulus dimensions. Social man has been prevented from attending to these novel stimulus features. By using such sounds, Artaud thought he would be able to evoke and elicit new, direct responses in his audience, to make them experience new relationships and truths.

Similarly, Artaud wanted to use lighting to directly affect his audience. There is little unconventional use of light in _le Jet de sang_ and _la Pierre philosophale_, but in _Il n'y a plus de firmament_ Artaud seems to have started on the path to a whole system of correspondances between
emotion, thought, light, and sound. Immediately after the lengthy sound overture directions (cited above), Artaud detailed a light show to complement the effects of the sound:

Amorces de lueurs dont l'ambiance
s'altère, passe du rouge au rose
aigre, de l'argent au vert, puis
tourne au blanc, avec tout à coup
une immense lumière jaune opaque,
couleur de brume sale, et de simoun.

Nulle couleur ne sera pure. Chaque
teinte sera complexe et nuancée jusqu'à
l'angoisse. (II, 91)

It is important to note that before this point the stage has not yet been lit. Artaud was trying to establish direct, immediate communication with the soul through the nerves. In fact, these color changes often do create changes in mood and in the environment such that events may evoke different reactions in different lights. Commonly people speak of cool and warm colors, dirty, pure, bright, soft colors, and so on. The knowledgeable director would know how they could be used in conjunction with other stimuli to elicit given reactions. He would, too, face the more practical problems of knowing how to schedule these stimuli, i.e., the order of the colors as well as their purity and the best interval between color changes. By controlling the various aspects of color and light the director has a potentially very sophisticated method of non-verbal communication. Artaud calls these lighting
changes, along with sound, a kind of Morse code. (II, 91) However, this method of direct communication, he said, was as superior to Morse code as Bach's music of the spheres was to Massenet's *Clair de lune*.

The comparison to Morse code is particularly appropriate. To those who do not understand the system of dots and dashes, Morse code is indecipherable, and perhaps unrecognizable as communication to someone totally unfamiliar with the system. This light and sound code would have probably been similarly indecipherable to the unprepared mind of the audience.

It is safe to conclude that a large part of this direct correspondance of thought with light and sound stems from Artaud's drug experience. It is well known that opium makes one perceive colors, lights, and sounds much more intensely than normally. He sees patterns where there is none discernable to other people. Baudelaire and Rimbaud, the two most famous French drug users of the literary world in the last century, understood and discussed this mysterious interrelationship of light, color, sound, and thought. Like them, it is quite probable that Artaud had for many years experienced color, light, and sound in ways unknown to his contemporaries and to his public. The impure, complex light was most surely meant to be a replication of his own drugged experiences of light with all the stimulus conditions he responded to only in this drugged state. The responses
to the stimuli would lead the spectator deep into the metaphysical, "jusqu'à l'angoisse," to a new truth. This sound and light show, then, was an attempt to replicate the correspondance between pure thought and the new meanings he had found in the otherwise incoherent patterns of sound and light that surround men.

The practical problem which never arose for Artaud since he never staged this play centers on its implementation: Will anyone who is not drugged respond to this overture as Artaud did? Artaud himself never addressed the question, since he did not credit drugs for any personal liberation. He rarely viewed himself as anything but a victim of drugs. Except for the early years, he scarcely mentions any positive or liberating effect of opium other than as a pain reliever. There seems to be some implicit realization of a fundamental fault in his strategy here, because after this play he never again began with such an extensive direct assault on the senses nor did he even mention this specific opening technique in the major theoretical writings. By the time of _les Cenci_ he came to realize that there must be a fundamental shock, a reordering of the physiological system, similar to the shock of drugs, before a man can receive this pure thought.
The experimentation with light was not limited to the sound and light overture (which is paralleled by a similar ending in the fourth movement.) Artaud chose to populate his scene in Il n'y a plus de firmament largely with shadows. He wanted to project shadows on a huge, white wall to simulate a busy metropolitan intersection with cars, people moving about and disappearing, subways, trams, all meant to look like a giant swarm of ants from above. All this was to be scrupulously controlled to simulate real beings complete with voices.

In Il n'y a plus de firmament is the first evidence of Artaud's dramatic affinity for twilight. It is the time setting for this play as well as for la Conquête du Mexique and les Cenci. Traditionally twilight's opposite, dawn, the coming of light, is the setting for the rebirth of innocence, of purity, of the Christ. In the medieval aubade, dawn is the time when the illicit lovers must separate and when birds announce the return of the gilos. Twilight, on the other hand, marks the beginning of the reign of terror, of the unknown. Twilight is the bewitching hour, the hour of magic.

The choice of twilight as the time setting is a good example of Artaud's use of preconditioned operant and respondent stimuli as building blocks to his own ends. The stimulus darkness has a long history of associations
for most people. It may elicit many conditioned responses, such as perspiration, feelings of fear, accelerated heart beat, and changes in the endocrine system and smooth muscles. Darkness makes a person emit other, supplementary operant behaviors such as acting in a cautious manner, attending to otherwise weak stimuli, and escape or avoidance behavior. In this play the twilight lighting accentuates the brink point, the crisis point where the characters find themselves. The responses to darkness are used to increase audience involvement in the anticipation of the cataclysmic event. In the later plays, however, Artaud was to use darkness' conditioning history to a much fuller extent.

Scenic construction and decor do not play any large role in the three minor plays. For the most part this may be attributed to the brevity of the plays' outlines and to Artaud's growing insistence on removing all artificial illusion and unnecessary detail from the stage. The photographs Artaud had taken of him, Vitrac, and Mlle Josette Lusson to illustrate the "Théâtre Alfred Jarry" productions (II, between 48-49) depict a bare, Italian stage (the "optical box" Artaud later rejected.) The one notable feature in decor that appeared at this time, apart from the shadow images mentioned above, was the use of a multilevel set. Both la Pierre philosophale and Il n'y a plus de firmament use more than one level as does les Cenci.
However, the use of multiple levels in these plays remains at the purely representational or symbolic level. The different planes do not act themselves as independent stimuli with a direct effect on the spectator. Like the other imagery (discussed below) these planes are symbols for the mind to decipher.

Just as there was little done with the stage levels, so do these plays lack the geometrically complex movement of *les Cenci*. The actors' movements may be garish or grotesque (in the case of Dr. Pâle's hacking away at Harlequin or the birth of the miniature Dr. Pâle), but they remain at the representational level. They do not evoke metaphysical responses from the spectator. However, Artaud had begun to evolve towards use of the metaphysical signs of the later plays. In *la Pierre philosophale*, for instance, Dr. Pâle's wife, who is in the background, imitates the doctor's sadomasochistic destruction. This imitation, though, is not exact imitation but "en écho vague, lointain, à peine esquisé." (II, 85) They are like sound waves, more distorted and weaker the farther they are from the source. In this distant, weak double of the primary stage action is some sense of a movement into the beyond, perhaps into infinity.

Another element of movement (which reappears in *les Cenci*) is the use of slow motion to give a dream-like quality to the action. When Harlequin offers himself as the
experimental victim for the doctor's search, Pâle responds with a grotesque, scientific curiosity while his wife is ecstatic and stunned. Artaud indicated that their action would be done in slow motion. The resultant setting is not only unreal and dream-like but also reminiscent of movement executed and viewed by those under the influence of drugs.

As has been noted briefly before, the imagery in these three plays is quite different from the imagery Artaud used in the Théâtre de la Cruauté. These plays are filled with representational, symbolic symbols. They have an intellectual rather than a physical meaning. In le Jet de sang, for example, when three scorpions, a frog, and a scarab fall from the sky, the spectator does not jump back in horror; he finds himself in an intellectual quandry rather than in an emotional or physical assault. At best, he may finally arrive at Knapp's understanding that these symbols represent the three division of existence: "... the will of the conscious mind, the amorphous material of the conscious mind, the amorphous material of the unconscious world, and the spiritual character of the upper regions." This intellectual process of déchiffrément continues throughout the play. Later in le Jet de sang when the priest affects a Swiss accent, the spectator can easily recognize it as a symbol for changing from Catholic to Protestant.
In *la Pierre philosophale* Artaud has Isabelle symbolically manifest her sexual desires: "... ses désirs, aspirations inconscientes, se traduisent en vague soupirs, plaintes, et gémissements." (II, 83) All these signs are the clear, dead ideas, analyzed in the previous section, which Artaud later decried in film because of the low quality and quantity of response they evoke.\(^{10}\) He later abandoned them in his theatrical productions as well.

The Artaud of these early plays is a writer in search of meaning. Hence, the themes of these plays do not reflect found truths or act as initial conduits to truth. Rather, they reflect a desperate search in many areas for some certainty and sense, a movement towards maturation. Concurrently, the young director pillaged and destroyed many established social views and patterns which he found useless or limiting. Reflecting a process of exploration and evaluation, the themes of these early plays also clear the ground for later, new foundations of thought.

The strongest themes of *le Jet de sang* and *la Pierre philosophale* revolve around sexual identity and function. *Le Jet de sang* explores the evolutionary love relationship: separation from the mother (as exemplified by the nurse-knight encounters), the initial purity and idealism of adolescent love, the corrupting influences of society and church, and the adult divorce of love from sexuality
(exemplified by the procuress). La Pierre philosophale, according to Knapp, is based upon the conflict of carnality versus spirituality and the possibility of uniting the two. It delves further into this topic than le Jet de sang, and makes initial explorations into the realm of sexual deviancy, violence and sex, a subject Artaud was to more fully investigate in the relationship between Beatrice and her father in les Cenci.

Doubles, whose relationship with drugs will be explained later, make their first appearance in Il n'y a plus de firmament. At one point Harlequin enters as a double character united in one body (which Knapp suggests represents the two facets of the doctor's own sexuality): one side the handsome Harlequin, the other a lame, ugly monster. Other, less obvious doubles abound. The wife "echos" the doctor's sadomasochistic actions. The couple (double) unites in love to give birth to an offspring which is a miniature double of Dr. Pâle. When Harlequin comes in, he enters the stage area backwards in a military march as if he were introducing another person. Although the theme of doubles and multiples is introduced here, once again, not much is made of it and the fuller development comes in the later plays.

The complicated set of relationships and authority between the individual, society, and God appears in all
three plays. The most striking confrontation is between the procuress and God in le Jet de sang. God's enormous hand has come on stage from the heavens to grab her by the hair. He has shamed her and caused her clothes to become transparent, thus exposing her wicked body to all. Then,

Elle (la maquerelle) mord Dieu au poignet. Un immense jet de sang lacère la scène et on voit au milieu d'un éclair plus grand que les autres le prêtre qui fait le signe de la croix. (I, 80)

It is meant to be a gripping, blasphemous, total rejection of God and organized religion.14 Benedikt feels that the disintegration of civilization's values is symbolized earlier in the falling down of pieces of human bodies and human temples. The biting of God's wrist furthers the revolt against "all super-imposed, man-made (therefore unnatural) conventions."15 Whether that potent a symbol or not, Artaud did demonstrate his great distaste for the Church. It is, after all, a sexual pervert, a procuress, who wounds God in front of his own representative, the priest. The priest himself demonstrates the corruption with his relentless interrogation of the young man about his sexual adventures. Artaud used this theme of the corrupt Church as part of his broader thesis that Western civilization had fallen into stagnant decadence.
The lack of any real basis for society's authority to guide the individual appears strongly in these plays. In the fourth movement of *Il n'y a plus de firmament* Artaud brought forth *le Grand Flaireur*, a grotesque man with a gigantic nose on his right fist. Surrounded by a hideous cohort which represents all the vices and sicknesses of mankind, the *Grand Flaireur* issues pronouncements about the impending cataclysm in a high, sharp, nasal voice which the choir echos. He is a grotesque portrayal of human gullibility and the ease with which humans let society lead them about by the nose. Other facets of society are also attacked in *Il n'y a plus de firmament* and *la Pierre philosophale*. In both Artaud exposes the pretension, stupidity, and utter uselessness of the institutions of science. Doctor Pâle's sick experiments, under the guise of science, show the worthless, misguided directions in which science really runs. The scientists in *Il n'y a plus de firmament* are little better: entrusted by the people with the most urgent goal, to save them from destruction, these scientists engage in extended academic prattle and end up in total confusion. In a vicious commentary on their worth to society and on the worth of so-called science, Artaud gives the scientists the voices of animals.

*Par moments les voix des savants dans un coin sifflent comme des géais sur des fils télégraphiques, à d'autres croassent comme des corbeaux, à d'autres braient comme des boeufs ou soufflent comme des hippopotames dans une cave.* (II, 107)
The theme of rebirth or rebeginnings is an important, albeit subtle, theme in all of Artaud's plays. Like the young girl in *le Jet de sang*, it is as if Artaud is not quite sure that this is exactly what he is seeking. At the very end of *le Jet de sang* the girl, who had been brought in dead by the nurse after the incident with God, is miraculously resurrected. Astonished, she stands up and says, "La vierge! ah, c'était ça qu'il cherchait." Surprisingly, death and rebirth or transformation to a new life were never the strong themes one might expect from Artaud. In *la Pierre philosophale* the only allusions are the repeated rejoinsings of the hacked-apart Harlequin and the birth of the miniature Doctor (although no death precedes this.) The sole reference to rebeginning in *Il n'y a plus de firmament* occurs at the end of Movement 1. After a whirlwind and general pandemonium, a brusque stop occurs and all starts from the beginning as if nothing had ever happened. (II, 94) However, no transformation takes place, and the only purpose of this direction seems to be to increase the general feeling of helplessness and confusion. This surprising weakness of the death/transformation theme may perhaps be attributed to Artaud's being firmly rooted in his own present life and bettering it as opposed to an after-life or forsaking it for another life.
Another briefly treated theme, the conflict and integration of good and evil, takes on major importance in the Theatre de la Cruauté. The two allusions to it in these plays are minor. In Le Jet de sang the innocent, pure young man engages in some pre-sexual activity with the procuress. It quickly ceases, though, when the nurse reenters. In La Pierre philosophale there is the broad conflict throughout the play between Harlequin and the doctor (especially through the wife). Artaud represented this good/evil conflict more graphically in the double character of the Harlequin/monster. The good/evil problem is only presented in these plays and never dealt with extensively or resolved. Taking on increasing importance, it becomes a central problem of Les Cenci, where Artaud presents a detailed exposition of the problem.

The last major element of these plays to be considered because of its recurrence in the Theatre de la Cruauté is cruelty itself. There is cruelty in these plays, but not a great deal and Artaud uses it principally for its ability to grab the attention of the spectator. As mentioned earlier in this study, Artaud sought some way of seizing the audience's attention to make them hallucinate. However, by this time he had not quite yet fully realized the powers of cruelty nor had he evolved his own conception of cruelty and its uses. These early plays especially reflect Artaud's
basic exploratory orientation. There is no full expression of this technique of cruelty at this time because Artaud was "feeling his way." As in so many other cases, theory here developed with and from his practical experiences. The uses of cruelty in these plays do, then, form the foundation for his later refinements of this technique.

Benedikt claims that the cruelty of *le Jet de sang* is symbolized in the frenzied, discontinuous activity of the whole play. In his zeal to see cruelty everywhere, he has undeniably diluted the concept beyond recognition. Cruelty first and foremost plays violent, physical havoc with the spectator's body; nothing here seems to approach fulfilling this requirement. There are several grotesque sights, though. God has a gigantic voice and gigantic hand which seizes the poor girl; dead bodies litter the stage and parts of bodies fall from the heavens; scorpions crawl all over the nurse's genitalia. The effect is nausea, discomfort, or surprise, not terror, and some of this grotesqueness is actually funny.

In *la Pierre philosophe* there is real horror at the Doctor's hacking up Harlequin and a number of mannequins. But again, this is representational rather than transformational horror; Artaud directed it more to the intellect than to the body. Also in this play occurs the curious reaction of Isabelle to the Doctor's hacking:
Comme un bûcheron, ou un boucher, le docteur Pâle, dans un coin de décor, est en train de procéder, à coups de hache, à un véritable massacre de mannequins. Isabelle, à une table au premier plan, tressaute, se tord et se désespère. Chaque coup retentissant profondément dans ses nerfs.¹⁹ (II, 85)

Her reaction parallels the desired reaction of Artaud’s spectator in the later plays to such violence.

The cruelty of Il n'y a plus de firmament lies throughout the play in the general terror conveyed through the pandemonium of the people. This terror almost duplicates the terror of being caught in a storm, Artaud's favorite chaotic situation. There are storms in le Jet de sang and la Conquête du Mexique and les Cenci, as well as in Artaud's favorite painting, "Les Filles de Loth"; one might whimsically be tempted to call Il n'y a plus de firmament an extended storm without the rain, thunder and lightning. Artaud gradually learned to use these scenes to induce severe disorientation and terror in his public.²⁰

The other instance of cruelty in this play is the spectacle of le Grand Flaireur's hideous cohort:

Une véritable cour des miracles s'installe sur la scène par invasion lente. Des figures déformées, hideuses se glissent, d'abord comme un suintement, une transpiration des bas-fonds. On voit des têtes joues, vertes, cadavériques, trop larges ou trop allongées, apparaître disséminées
et tout à coup la scène en est pleine. C'est une cohue féroce qui déferle vague par vague, chaque vague amenant une couche nouvelle de terreur. Étalage d'horreurs. Les têtes deviennent de plus en plus grosses et menaçantes, frappées de stigmates, caractérisant par des symboles, en gros traits synthétiques, tous les vices et toutes les maladies. (II, 102)

Indeed a frightening sight, this is typical of the cruel imagery of the later plays, with one fundamental exception: nothing happens as a result of the cruelty. This monstrous throng is never mentioned again and seems to act here only as a very forceful underlining of the Grand Flaireur's basically evil orientation. The fine attention to the details of the cruel image here evidences Artaud's technical control of multiple stimulation in the staging of cruelty.

These three early plays, sketchy as they may be, do, then, contain many elements common to the later plays of the theater of cruelty. Actions and scenic effects replace and transcend words. Networks of complementary, diverse stimuli introduce and develop the ideas. The themes of good versus evil, sexuality, authority, rebirth, and doubles, all of which reappear in some shape take first form here. Finally, these early experiments with the possibilities of cruelty are the rudimentary basis for Artaud's later use of cruelty as a fundamental
component in the total change system. Many of the parts of Artaud's behavioral change process evolved here to be later assembled in the integral process of the Théâtre de la cruauté.

La Conquête du Mexique

La Conquête du Mexique, written in 1933, in full outline form takes up nine pages of Volume V of les Oeuvres complètes. (V, 21-29) Artaud also inserted the beginning parts in "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté (Second Manifeste)." (IV, 151-153) He read it on January 6, 1934, before an audience at the home of Lise Deharme in the hopes of raising money for the fledgling Théâtre de la Cruauté. He claimed that Deharme herself had pledged 30,000 francs. His hopes were illfounded, though, and he was bitterly disappointed when he raised only a paltry sum. He never finished the full text.

The story itself, Cortez's conquest of the Aztec empire, is simple enough. Preceding the scenario comes a relatively lengthy introduction of the basic goals of this play. The first act, which then follows, is entirely taken up with a panoramic view of the Mexican countryside and the Aztec culture, all seen from the perspective of the Aztecs. They are quite disturbed, "un paysage qui sent venir l'orage," but the impending trouble is unknown.
The second act, in sharp contrast, portrays Cortez's distorted perception of this same culture and of the appearance of Montezuma, leader of the Aztecs. The ensuing battle, both magical and physical, occupies the third act and part of the fourth. Finally, Montezuma abdicates. Cortez loses his leadership, there is a small revolt (quickly put down), and the conquerors enjoy their spoils. The play ends with the funeral for Montezuma, where the beginnings of revolt are renewed.

One of the most readily recognizable features of this play is the simplicity of its plot. Artaud has reduced the discovery, conquest, and pillage of the Aztec Empire by the Spanish to a few incidents. The story line has been denuded of all the tangential actions and subplots which traditionally lend interest and a feeling of vraisemblance to the main action. It could be termed a stylized plot. This stylization is not a function of the shortness of the text, for les Cenci shares this same concentration and concision of plot. Rather, Artaud purposely arranged his "text" to provide a series of concentrated, multi-stimuli assaults on the body of his spectator. He expected to evoke "deep, terrible ideas."

In this play, then, for the first time, he has practically illustrated the goals, desired responses, and stimuli of the theater of cruelty. Analyzing this illustration
within the framework of the previously established behavioral schematic will furnish an even clearer understanding of how Artaud tried to influence his spectator. As before, the analysis will be broken down into four broad areas: the goals, language of theater (stimuli), desired responses of the spectator, and problems affecting control.

Unlike the other plays, \textit{la Conquête du Mexique} is preceded by a discussion of what Artaud wished to accomplish within the production.\textsuperscript{21} Of course, it was only an incomplete list, a list of his most superficial goals, or else a very inadequate representation of his real ends. If he could have truly expressed his ends so easily with words, there would have been no need for the theatrical experience. This elaboration of his goals here can only be considered partial. Throughout the analysis additional, "deeper" goals will be referred to, but even these allusions can only hope to constitute a partial listing.

The bulk of Artaud's truths (Cf. V, 21-24) can be placed into one of two categories: the decadence of European civilization and the richness of the Aztecs'. On one side Artaud placed the evil Spanish \textit{conquistadores}. They embody the evil, brutal forces of colonization, the fatuous arrogance of supposed European superiority, the shallowness of Christianity, and the false European ideas about paganism and other religions. In sharp contrast
stand the Aztecs. They embody the forces of a truly superior race, the truths of a religion much older than Christianity as well as the poetry and splendor of such an old religion. Artaud put in conflict the materialism of the European monarchy and "la conception dynamique, mais dirigée dans le mauvais sens, des races soi-disants chrétiennes." With the spiritual superiority of the Aztec monarchy and "la conception statique des races intérieures d'apparence contemplative, et merveilleusement hiérarchisées."

To reduce these statements to their basic meaning, Artaud wanted to illustrate in this play what he had long contended in his theoretical writings. Western man responds in a superficial, stereotypical manner to a very narrow range of stimuli or stimulus features. He claims to be superior on the basis of his religion, social structure and truths, all dynamic, but misguided so. Artaud in this play urged Western man to return to a more primitive, yet richer state, free of the restrictions of European society, all of which are called civilization. La Conquête du Mexique "souligne d'une manière pathétique, brûlante, la splendeur et la poésie actuelle du vieux fonds métaphysique sur lequel ces religions sont bâties." (V, 21-22). He fostered, thus, a process of destruction and restitution.
The choice of the Aztec civilization in opposition to the European civilization is an interesting one. As the reader will recall, Artaud's primary fascination was with Oriental civilization. The Balinese dancers had mesmerized him, not an Indian tribe. Yet neither la Conquête du Mexique nor les Cenci nor any of the other announced plays of the Théâtre de la Cruauté had anything to do with the Orient. One sure reason for this seeming contradiction lies in cultural relevance. Artaud wanted his theater to furnish the same things for Western culture that the Oriental theater provided for its culture. Thus, he did not transplant an Oriental theater, whose stimulus sets would be ineffectual and which depended upon a conditioning history nonexistent in Western man. He kept his theater Western in character and tried to create within this character a system of behavioral change similar to that of the Orient.

A more important reason, though, is that Artaud really does not seem to have been all that interested in the Oriental culture, after all. He was more taken with the aura of mystery about the culture. In truth, as was pointed out in the introduction, Artaud was fascinated with a wide variety of non-Western cultures: He studied Tantrist Yoga, Hatha Yoga, the Tibetan Book of the Dead, the Upani-shads, the Bhagavad-Gita, Milarepa, Pythagoras' Golden Verses, and the works of Fabre d'Olivet. Enchanted by
all these civilizations, Artaud seems in his minimal contacts with these civilizations to have relished most the feelings of awe, mystery, magic, and mysticism which stem from incomplete knowledge. In an incisive article about Artaud, Jerzy Grotowski, one of Artaud's most successful modern heritors, shares this same opinion about the Balinese experience. Grotowski points out that to those Balinese watching the performance there were no such mystical, metaphysical impulses; having long been familiar with the basic outlines of the story and the gestures which depict the various parts, the Balinese crowded into the performance for a well-known religious rite. 26

Clearly, then, Artaud's choice of the Aztecs and their marvelous religion was more a function of his own incomplete knowledge of the Aztecs than of their actual superiority. In fact, for an Aztec life might have been equally as decadent and stagnant as for a European. But for Artaud, the outsider, who was not burdened with the conditioning history of this people, with their language, with the almost certain sterility of at least some of the truths of their religion, theirs was a liberating and liberated culture.

There is a certain naïveté in this enchantment with the foreign. Yet Artaud underlines a very pragmatic method for better life, forgotten by most men: cherish the mysterious. A behavioral analysis shows why Artaud might have believed this. When some sets of stimuli, whether out
of deliberate action or out of ignorance, are kept from entering into the normal, daily environment with which men interact and are guarded from the overpowering, stereotypical associations of daily life, mystery is preserved. These "mysterious" stimuli, more precisely, are operant stimuli which control no strong responses or sets of responses as well as respondent stimuli with no strongly associated conditioned responses. Thus, when these stimuli are present, any number of weak responses or associations may be made because of the absence of the normally strong conditioning typical of much of the rest of life. The associations or emission of new responses then become the possible basis of new perceptions, "religious" or otherwise. This retention of mystery (the purposeful blockage of stimulus control or associations) is complementary to the use of drugs or cruelty to weaken established patterns of response and allow novel or weak patterns to appear.

Besides the overall conflict between the European and Aztec civilizations or, more properly, superficial and predictable life versus "deep" life, Artaud signaled another principal conflict in the introduction to la Conquête du Mexique: the forces for individuality versus those of fate or society. Montezuma is the double-character embodiment of these forces.
In this short scenario, Artaud did not develop this theme greatly, although there are frequent allusions to it.

The language of theater here, that is, the stimuli used to establish these goals (as well as the deeper, unnamed ones), is a good illustration of the multi-stimulus conglomerate proposed in the theoretical writings. Artaud indicated that dance, lighting, sound, gigantic objects as well as words should directly assault his spectator's nerves to communicate his messages.

Curiously enough, la Conquête du Mexique is the only play of the five which has no specific dialogue indicated. Even la Pierre philosophale has a few lines. There are allusions to discussions in the play, so there surely would have been some speech if the play had ever taken full form. Perhaps Artaud believed this was the only pure example of theater of cruelty after the failure of les Cenci because of la Conquête du Mexique's non-reliance on words (at least in scenario form). One primary fault of les Cenci is its excessive, often predating verbiage.27
Artaud's use of lighting is rooted in the experiments of the earlier plays. Cortez's problems after Montezuma's abdication are communicated by light and sound: "Des lumières, des sons ont l'air de fondre, s'effilent, grossissent et s'écrasent comme des fruits aqueux qui s'aplatiraient sur le sol." (V, 27) As in the overture to Il n'y a plus de firmament, words break down trying to describe this experience, let alone convey the experience themselves. The novelty of the experience Artaud wished to present would, thus, insure not only new reactions to old stimuli but also reactions to new, transformed stimuli (or to aspects of stimuli to which the spectator never before attended).28

Lighting was used for an indirect as well as a direct effect. As he had also done in Il n'y a plus de firmament, Artaud used lighting to create the background, although he used it much more extensively here:

Par ce principe, les villes, les monuments, la campagne, la forêt, les ruines et les cavernes seront évoquées---leur apparitions, dis- paritions, leurs mises en relief ---par l'éclairage. (V, 24-25)

This extensive use of lighting was a very innovative solution to a technical problem. Scenery created by light can be changed much faster; further, the quality of the light or shadows can be varied. So, the director has an efficient and easy method of presenting a rapid succession of
differing stimuli to evoke or elicit differing responses. This "active" illusion would never have been possible with a traditional stage backdrop.29

Sound is used extensively throughout in much the same manner that Artaud used it before. With sound he makes the spectator's body sense the majestic magic of the Aztecs, the tempestuous coming of the Spaniards, the stagnation of the Aztecs (as experienced by Cortez), Montezuma's awesome solemnity, the battles, the funeral, the revolt. The use of sound is not limited to the representational level as it had often been in the past, but is meant to have a deep, metaphysical impact. Artaud intended to reuse the Morse code conception of communication of Il n'y a plus de firmament:

Les façons musicales ou picturales de souligner leurs formes, d'accrocher leurs aspérités seront construites dans l'esprit d'une mélodie secrète, invisible au spectateur, et qui correspond à l'inspiration d'une poésie surchargée de souffles et de suggestions. (V, 25)

Consequently, throughout the play deep, metaphysical truths, not necessarily those announced in the introduction, are communicated by sound.

The imagery in la Conquête du Mexique would have a direct, immediate impact upon the whole being of the spectator. Unlike the earlier plays, very few of the images are symbolic, and the few that are can be interpreted by
the mind very quickly (e.g., the backdrop of little ships near the larger Cortez and men, the ships carrying off the spoils of war.) The imagery, which itself is cruel or occurs amidst cruelty, is novel and conducive to multiple responses. For example, in the third act while the war is going on, Montezuma performs the sacred rituals to evoke the gods: "Montezuma coupe l'espace vrai, le fend en deux comme un sexe de femme pour en faire jaillir l'invisible." (V, 26) Magic and ritual, sexuality, religion, duality/unity, the invisible and unknown truth are all brought to bear here upon the involved spectator, the victim of the chaos created by cruelty. Artaud surely hoped his spectator could experience in this convergence of metaphysical forces what he himself had experienced.

The mosaic battle imagery in the third act combines both cruelty and metaphysical stimuli:

...comme la révolte éclate, l'espace scénique est comme gavé d'une mosaique criailante où soit des hommes, soit des troupes compactes aux unités collées membre à membre se heurtent frénétiquement. L'espace est pavé en hauteur de gestes tournoyants, de visages horribles, d'yeux râlants, de poings fermés, de crinières, de cuirasses, et de tous les étages de la scène, des membres, des cuirasses, des têtes, des ventres tombent comme de la grêle dont le bombardement touche la terre avec de surnaturelles explosions. (V, 27)

Each of these stimuli is meant to have an immediate effect, to make the palms sweat, the heart beat faster, the adrenal
glands release epinephrine, and so on. There is no need for language. Interestingly enough, Artaud must rely here on the efficacy of cultural conditioning and not try to destroy it. The fright response to many of these cruel stimuli has been conditioned by society. In the Orient, for example, terror is not necessarily indicated the same ways. Artaud could expect this mosaic (of visual stimuli but also of "emotion") to bring about a whole body experience of the decadence of European civilization, of Christianity, of the Western way of life. The aim would not be to accept their specific way of life but to overcome or reject decadent Western life.\(^{30}\)

Undoubtedly Artaud meant this imagery to evoke even deeper metaphysical experiences. From this drastically reduced form, one can hardly begin to guess at the ideas he was alluding to. In *Les Cenci* the complex, central images of this sort are surrounded by a complex web of geometrical movement, words, lighting, and sound which further bring out the metaphysical significance latent in the imagery. This supplemental stimulation lacking, one can only point to the author's intent. Based upon those stimuli which have been furnished, it is possible to compile a partial listing following the play's outline of responses Artaud wished to facilitate in his spectator.
The first two acts of *la Conquête du Mexique* employ a new technique for Artaud, the juxtaposition of two people's perceptions of the same scene. Cortez's distorted, heavy vision of the Aztecs is in sharp relief with their own. It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that Artaud is trying to make the spectator realize the decadence of his own life through the eyes of Cortez. However, this is really far too intellectual an answer, contrary to the whole thrust of Artaud's theater. A behavioral analysis indicates that this is a complex case of respondent conditioning and why no such intellectualization is needed.

In the first scene of splendor, the director would pick out exemplary or novel aspects of Aztec civilization which he hopes the public will admire. They constitute the conditioned stimuli (CS). The producer then pairs them with the unconditioned stimuli, the light and sound (and, presumably, other stimuli, if the play takes full form), which themselves are already known to elicit favorable, unconditioned reactions (e.g., bodily sensations of wonder, mystery, awe, pleasure, and so on.) As a result of the pairings, these elements come to elicit the same type of reactions (CR). The same process occurs with Cortez present, but in reverse. Because Cortez cannot "see" the splendor, different stimuli or stimulus aspects are presented; they are paired with light and sound.
stimuli which elicit feelings of heaviness, stagnation, and so on. By his presence Cortez, too, becomes respondent-ly associated with this heaviness and stagnation. From this point on in the play, the spectator should always have this reaction to him, at least weakly. It cannot be emphasized enough that no thought is necessary for this process, although some may accompany it. The feelings of stagnation or awe are real bodily sensations, like those one might experience at a concert. Consequently, at the end of this two-scene juxtaposition Artaud has communicated a "gut-level" grasp of European decadence by acting directly on the body without relying on words or intellectualization. Artaud hoped the people in the audience would react differently in their own lives as a result of this concrete experience.

Cruelty happens in this first act almost from the beginning. The calm, poetic portrayal of the Aztecs' existence is quickly interrupted by the cruel imagery of chaos and impending doom:

Silence sur toutes ses luttes secrètes, stagnation apparente et surtout magie, magie d'un spectacle immobile, inouï, avec des villes comme des murailles de lumière, des palais sur des canaux d'eau stagnante, une pesante mélodie. (V, 25)

These cruel stimuli begin the process of creating (via respondent behavior) physiological disorder within the spectator; this disorder will continue throughout the play.
and "liberate" his behavior. Additionally, the cruel stimuli here enter into a new respondent association. Cortez and his men suddenly appear near the end of this cruel chaos, after it has built up a substantial reaction in the public. This new pairing lends to Cortez and the Spaniards the ability to elicit to some extent the same "fright" responses that the cruelty had. Their later appearances with other cruel stimuli then add to the assault on the spectator.

After the solemn, awesome appearance of Montezuma late in the second act, the cruelty recommences and reaches even higher intensity. All is in revolt, in disorder. The cruelty of the third act is not limited to the gruesome depiction of the physical battle at the end of the act. Montezuma's mental agony, which becomes an intense, cruel experience, is first communicated to the spectator. However, Artaud accomplished this with a very frightening series of actions rather than words. Suddenly, against a chaotic background of heads and throats and cracked melodies, Montezuma multiplies. Artaud has multiple hands coming out from his robes and staring eyes painted all over his body like multiple consciences. Around him swarm the signs of the Zodiac, which have become ferocious personifications of human passions.
At this point the spectator, his own body a churning sea of wild physiological responses would most closely approximate the intensity of a drug experience. The splitting of Montezuma, the multiple body parts and strange sounds become not only comprehensible but meaningful, even in the deepest, metaphysical sense. The situation of Montezuma must have been paralleled in Artaud's own life. The conflicting forces of fate, of individual destiny, and of socially accepted truths versus the search for real truth converge here upon a single point, a man, who fragments in response. The spectator participates in this convergence of forces and "feels" the predicament, which was Artaud's predicament and everyone else's. However, without the stimulation and the liberation of the cruelty process, these insights would not be possible.

The battle between the Indians and Spanish continues into the fourth act, where Artaud presents another powerful image, Indian-Spanish couples: "Des couples étranges apparaissent, l'Espagnol sur l'Indienne, horriblement grossis, boursouflés et noirs, et basculent comme des tombereaux qui montreraient leur ventre." (V, 27-28) The combination is so antithetical that it stands as a visual oxymoron. This superficially grotesque image is horrifying at all levels. All of the respondents previously associated with the Indians and with the Spaniards come into violent
contact within the spectator. It is an excellent example of what Artaud termed a hieroglyphic stimulus. Due to excellent preparation, at all levels, intellectually, emotionally, physically, spiritually, the spectator is rocked by the conflict of the cultures. Already disordered by cruelty, he must react most intensely at this point. This cruelest of juxtapositions would surely be the source of many novel truths, for it associates and intimately connects the most disparate of concepts, experiences, and feelings.

Scenes depicting the general decadence and superficiality of the conquerors follow. Order and discipline fall victim to greed. From the treasures a concrete trouble seems to arise. Cortez multiplies (to show his loss of leadership) and the men desert freely. The forces of battle are diverted to the enjoyment of luxury, and, as a result, come all kinds of sicknesses and miasmes. Through Cortez and his men Artaud wanted to have the spectator experience the results of a shallow spirituality. He showed his public what would happen to them, too, if they clung to their superficial, Western ways.

The very last scene is the revolt of the conquered Aztecs during the funeral of Montezuma. The movement of revolt grows by sound. At first it is a "piétinement, un murmure," then the sound of a scorpion's mandibles.32, and
finally the fury of a storm. It is as if this inner life of the Aztecs cannot be forever suppressed, that it must explode. With each rising explosion of sound Artaud, in a parallel action, would draw out more and more the spectator's own responses, which have been subdued in the previous section like the Aztecs'.

This final passage is rich in allusions to the sea:

Et comme un raz de marée, comme l'éclatement brusque d'un orage, comme le fouettement de la pluie sur la mer, la révolte qui emporte toute la foule par pans avec le corps de Montezuma mort, ballotté sur les têtes comme un navire. Et les spasmes brusques de la bataille, l'écume des têtes des Espagnols traqués qui s'écrasent comme du sang sur les murailles verdissantes.

Unfortunately, in this text it is a poetry of words and not of images, for it is difficult to conceive exactly of how Artaud intended to translate this metaphor into action. The chaos of the storm in its furious frenzy would be joined with the rhythmic movements of waves. Montezuma, the dead ruler who is the source of this outbreak of life, would be tossed about like a ship at sea. All these forces come together here, but without the fuller notation of a completed play one cannot understand exactly how Artaud wanted this coherent set of sea images to support the broad idea of the inevitable explosion of the subdued inner life.
The imagery of *la Conquête du Mexique* would collectively work, then, to disorient the public, to liberate them from their usual modes of response, and to strengthen new responses. For example, the symbols and stimulus associations of Christianity lose importance as the public becomes attuned to those of the Aztec religion (and ultimately, to all others'). Social, hierarchical structures become more subjective, as does so-called reality. A man leaving this play, like a once-drugged man, might well behave as if his former, day-to-day life were only a facet of life or a very limited form of life. If so, Artaud has achieved his goal, has communicated his vision. He has freed the spectator to respond to non-traditional stimuli without recourse to drugs.

In overview, three general issues arise which are of concern not only for this play but also for *les Cenci* and for the general way in which Artaud implemented his theories. First, Artaud said he was working with forces not people; this is a basic distinction. Second, the question of the time setting of this "up-to-date" play comes up. Third, one is puzzled as to how Artaud will notate these plays for reproduction.

Artaud was very conscious that he was working with forces which could act upon people. His job as director was to shape and direct these forces, that is, to control
them in order to establish certain responses or possibilities of response. Of course, people are important, but like other stimuli on stage, only to the extent that they convey this force: "Les hommes viendront à leur place, avec leurs passions et leur psychologie personnelle, mais pris comme l'harmonisation de certaines forces...." (V, 21)
The guidance of forces was all important. Artaud said that:

Théâtralement, le problème est de déterminer et d'harmoniser ces lignes de force, de les concentrer et d'en extraire de suggestives mélodies. (V, 24)

This is Artaud's concise statement of what can today be called Artaud's basic behavioral orientation. Realizing in La Conquête du Mexique that all the stimuli which would occur on stage cause a reaction, that they would hold a force, he envisaged his main problem to be the organization of these stimuli into strong, complementary systems to control his public and to communicate to them.

The theme of La Conquête du Mexique may have been chosen for its "actualité" as Artaud claims in the introduction, but the play itself is timeless. Although it centers upon Cortez's conquest of the Aztec Indians, which really happened in 1519, the spirit of the play is modern. Cortez does not especially seem like a sixteenth century European, but more a contemporary, as do Montezuma and the Indians.
In accord with what Artaud had suggested in *Le Théâtre et son double*, he chose "universal" or "timeless" stimuli for this play. Consequently, the spectator is immediately and fully involved; he cannot isolate himself comfortably from the stage action. What was happening "then" is happening "now."

A final problem Artaud faced was that of reproduction. He lacked a system of notation for recording his theatrical production. Boldly, he announced in the preface to *La Conquête du Mexique* that all this would be taken care of:

Ces images, ce mouvement, ces danses, ces rites, ces musiques, ces mélodies tronquées, ces dialogues qui tournent court, seront soigneusement notés et décrits autant qu'il se peut avec des mots et principalement dans les parties non dialoguées du spectacle, le principe étant d'arriver à noter ou à chiffrer, comme sur un papier musicale, ce qui ne se décrit pas avec des mots. (V, 24)

The real truth is that Artaud had no such system and never would. Such a system of notation does not even exist today. The students of dance have evolved a fairly elaborate system for annotating movement in space, which permits recording and comparing individual performances of a work. It is, however, very time consuming and difficult. Modern technology has produced excellent sound reproduction systems, but nothing yet can reproduce the three dimensional qualities of light. The same problems recur with almost all the facets of Artaud's theatrical language. The problems of faithfully
recording a multi-media event are staggering. Yet they constitute the "text" for Artaud, and without such recording the play is forever lost.

Indeed, this lack of a "text" is a major drawback to Artaud's theater. Without it, there are no means of comparison for the original director, later directors, or students of theater. When Artaud writes of light in atypical terms, what does he mean? The notation of words is so imprecise that probably only Artaud himself could recreate exactly what he intended. Since this theater is built upon exact stimuli establishing responses, any original play will be forever lost with the death of the last participant (and even he must have an excellent memory). This is a serious drawback, for Artaud never intended this process of theater to be so ephemeral.

In summary, la Conquête du Mexique employs the major processes of the Théâtre de la Cruauté even in this abbreviated form. The approach is physical, not mental, and cruelty is used to facilitate the process. New, unusual stimulus combinations and stimulus dimensions provide avenues to new truths and new patterns of behavior. Within les Cenci Artaud will give fuller form to the basic processes of changing behavior theatrically, but the first formulation remains in la Conquête du Mexique.
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CHAPTER 8

LES CENCI

Les Cenci (IV, 183-271; Documentation; IV, 325-339; V, 45-60) is the best known of Artaud's dramatic works and the only one which exists today in full form. This first production of the Théâtre de la Cruauté opened on May 6, 1935, in the Théâtre des Folies-Wagram but closed permanently only seventeen days later. It was a financial and emotional disaster for Artaud, who had invested enormous amounts of personal money and energy in the project. To date, the play has had but several revivals primarily by universities. The text of the play, though, has enjoyed wide publication. It has been reprinted in several editions along with the text of Le Théâtre et son double and has been translated into English for an Evergreen paperback edition.¹

The plot of Les Cenci is based on the real story of a villainous sixteenth century count, Francesco Cenci, and his family. The story itself has been the subject of a vast number of literary works: plays by Custine, Niccolini, and Skowacki, a récit by Dumas, and novels by Prokosch, Bertolotti, Dalbono, Guerrazi and Ricci, to name only a few.² Artaud based his play upon the story presented in F. Rabbe's³ 1887 translation of Percy Bysshe Shelley's 1819 play "The Cenci"⁴ and upon Stendhal's translation⁵ of excerpts from the Vatican archives' files about the case.
The story is built around paternal tyranny, incestuous rape, and assassination in sixteenth century Rome. Francesco Cenci, an immensely wealthy sixteenth century Italian count, had seven children by his first wife. He was remarried, to Lucretia Petroni, who herself was quite wealthy. For crimes of sodomy, Cenci was imprisoned three times and only secured his release by bribing with great sums of money men in favor with the Pope. Cenci ruled his own household as a vile tyrant. He perpetrated cruel indignities on his children and delighted in their suffering. At one point he sent his sons off to college, but when they got there he refused to support them. They were forced to return to Rome by begging.

Cenci lusted for his sixteen year old daughter, Beatrice, whose beauty was so much acclaimed (and which Stendhal mentions frequently.) He continually attempted to engage in intercourse with her, even to the point of trying it in the same bed where Lucretia lay. Finally he succeeded. All were scandalized. Beatrice wrote to the Pope, but the missive was either lost or ignored. Taking matters into their own hands, she and the others plotted his murder. Their first attempt, an ambush en route to the castle, failed. The group then decided to have two vassals, Marzo and Olympio, kill him in his sleep by hammering a nail through his eye and through his throat.
The bloody crime was discovered and eventually traced back to Beatrice, who confessed after Lucretia broke down under torture. The conspirators were sentenced to die, but the Pope stayed the execution due to appeals. He was about to be persuaded to be lenient when he learned of another (less deserved) parricide. Wishing to crush this kind of behavior on the part of the young, he ordered all save Bernardo publicly decapitated.

The play begins with Camillo and the count discussing Cenci's relationship with the Pope. Bettina Knapp feels that the point of the first scene of Les Cenci is to generate a feeling of metaphysical anguish in the spectator. It is hard to agree, given Artaud's predilection for bodily-induced anguish. Although he surely uses some horror and a few metaphysical symbols, the scene stands principally as an introduction, a preface to the main text of the play. It follows Shelley's text very closely, in places exactly. Words predominate; images, even verbal images, are few. The scene works to create a general background and character for Count Cenci and to establish an initial respondent relationship between Cenci and evil for the unfamiliar spectator. Moreover, the dialogue briefly exposes the principles of Artaud's theater to those unfamiliar with them.

Count Cenci's evil nature is immediately apparent in the first act. He is a murderer, an anarchist, an atheist who would conspire against the Pope. He proudly terms
himself a monster, capable of even the most heinous of crimes: "... je suis un vrai monstre; car tous les crimes que j'imagine, tu sais que je peux les réaliser." (IV, 190)

As is evident in the photographs of the original production, Cenci’s costume strengthened the respondent relationship of Cenci and evil. The musculature of the abdomen was outlined with broad white lines to give it a taught, strained, sinister look. Artaud’s deeply inset, haunting eyes also strengthened the relationship as did his use of the complex, new system of declamation and breathing.

Cenci proclaims he has completely freed himself from social control: "J'obéis à ma loi qui ne me donne pas le vertige...." (IV, 191) However, he is no existential hero. Cenci is instead a personified force of nature: "Je me crois et je suis une force de la nature. Pour moi il n'y a ni vie, ni mort, ni dieu, ni inceste, ni repentir, ni crime." (IV, 191) Occasionally in his dreams he even believes himself to be destiny. Cenci, in short, has that kind of unbridled freedom to live which Artaud seeks to bring out in all men (though, of course, not in this evil form)7. Having rejected the whole social system of life and death, religion, family, taboos and laws, Cenci becomes a conduit for untamed force; the forces of evil are burning within him. In behavioral terms, the least probable responses, or those most severely punished by society, are now far more likely to be emitted. Cenci, in effect, becomes
a mirror for the audience. The possibilities inherent in Cenci's chaotic existence in many ways parallel those of the drug experience or of the spectator assaulted with cruelty.

In the middle of a soliloquy at the end of this first scene Artaud has Cenci comment (indirectly) about the difference between Artaud's own theater and contemporary theater. (This speech is unique to Artaud's text.) The two conceptions of theater are as different as real life and traditional theater:

> Ce qui distingue les forfaits de la vie de ceux du théâtre, c'est que dans la vie on fait plus et on dit moins, et qu'au théâtre on parle beaucoup pour faire une toute petite chose. Eh bien, moi, je rétablirai l'équilibre et je le rétablirai au détriment de la vie. J'aguerai dans mon abondante famille.

(IV, 192)

For those who might have missed the program notes, Artaud once again (almost in a propagandistic way) proclaims that action, not words, will be at the heart of his theater and that he will restore the balance between theater and life. Shortly hereafter Cenci goes on to boast of a plan of action that is Artaud's own: "Je torturerai l'âme en profitant du corps; et quand ce sera fait autant qu'un homme vivant peut le faire, qu'on vienne accuser mon cabotinage et mon goût du théâtre si on le peut. Je veux dire, si on l'ose."

(IV, 193) Thus, the horror of the performance will be real,
not a theatrical representation; no one will be able to accuse Artaud of play acting. Ironically enough, this denunciation of the word's predominance is conveyed within a rather lengthy verbal tirade.

Words, in fact, are the basis of most of the cruelty in the first scene, such as it exists. The content of the speeches themselves build up cruelty, but so do the choice and positioning of the words. As in the Shelley text, almost the first word of the play, meurtre, startles the public. It introduces a whole string of similar cruel action words strewn throughout the first scene: Peste, la guerre, torture, crime, monstre, inceste. They seem to maintain in their rhythmic repetition a gradually escalating reaction of horror, though the horror is never great.

The major cruel act in this scene is Cenci's striking of a gong with a sword to call the servant Andrea. Undoubtedly Artaud meant this to be a very harsh, jarring sound. (The stage directions call for a "grand coup.") The sound, like many others later in the performance, serves as an unconditioned stimulus to evoke fright responses. It greatly intensifies the effect built up until this point. Moreover, a discussion of the proposed encounter with Beatrice at midnight quickly follows the harsh sound, and it probably established a weak, respondent link. Even though no mention has been made of Beatrice until this time, now
when she appears with Cenci the reader will feel more uneasy than if the gong had never struck. The public may well never be able to identify this response on their part, because it typifies the effects of the secret soul language of which Artaud spoke in *La Conquête du Mexique*.

The two other important acts/images of this scene which are innovations of Artaud are not so much cruel as they are metaphysical. The first is the continuing backdrop of the deep, spiral gallery against which the scene is set. Knapp points out that this gallery lends the illusion of limitless depth and height and continually draws the audience into the metaphysical:

> The circular motion forces the audience to lose all perspective and balance, ushering it, gently at first, into a bizarrely exciting world. The spectator then becomes aware of the fact that mythical forces or powers are at work, that "gravitation" is operating and that objects and people are forever being refashioned and transformed in this.

Artaud believe this kind of motion, "gravitation," had a direct effect on the nerves and uses it throughout the play. (V, 59)

The other important image is Cenci's confiding of his secret plans for the destruction of his family to the air. ("Air, je te confie mes pensées." IV, 193) Cenci does the exact opposite in Shelley's version. ("O, thou most silent air that shalt not hear/ What now I think!..."
The act has deep, metaphysical significance. Besides pushing the public once again into the infinite by its very motion, the breath is an act of unification with nature. Cenci, the air, and nature thus form a continuing alliance. The latent acts and the environment commingle in an invisible oneness. Durr reports that many drug users experience this truth, that they are an inseparable part of nature and of the cosmos. This act is the initial instance where Artaud tries to communicate this truth to the audience. (The attempt probably fails in most cases because at this point the effects of the cruel stimuli would not yet have affected most spectators sufficiently. The breath, if interpreted, would have symbolic import in most cases.)

Character development and establishment of the plot continue as the main goal in scene two. The audience sees Beatrice for the first time and learns of the priest Orsino's illicit love for her. In the beginning of a very long speech Beatrice says, "Il faut agir," but she goes on and on talking. The monologue (IV, 197) is extremely well written and had it been in alexandrin verse, the speech might easily have been mistaken for a text of Racine. However, this classic prose does little to stoke the fires of physical response.

Dramatic devices and two images deserve brief comment before passing on to the real action of the third scene. Artaud directed this scene be set in moonlight. Immediately
the audience fright reaction should, at least momentarily, decrease. The setting evokes the traditional romance associated with the moon, and provides a short respite before the frenzy of the third scene. The souffle, too, reappears in this scene. Orsino notes: "Il souffle par ici, aujourd'hui, un singulier vent du mysticisme." (IV, 197) It is Cenci's breath, mingled with the air, which blows; this reference verbally reinforces the alliance's universality and oneness. The other image, that of Cenci praying on bended knee for the death of his sons, occurs near the end of the scene. Although verbal, it functions to plunge the audience back into the horror reactions established in the first scene and to prepare them for the intense sensual assault in the beginning of the third scene.

A deluge of diverse stimuli overwhelms the spectator in the third scene to both completely disorient him and plunge him into the metaphysical. This scene is one of three which stay roughly within the confines of Shelley's version and yet which are completely different in their impact because of changes Artaud made. (Stendhal makes no mention of the banquet scene in his account.)

Shelley's banquet takes place in a magnificent hall into which the principals enter (Act I, scene 3). Artaud has the principals already assembled with a large group of guests when the curtain rises. The scene is actually a barbaric parody of Veronese's 1573 painting "The Marriage
Feast at Cana." The sight of Cenci and Beatrice together evokes some terror responses in the public because of the respondent conditioning begun in the first act. The amplitude of the terror responses is increased by reaction to a background of heavy, purple curtains flapping in the wind and falling back in heavy folds. Artaud believed the effect would be direct and physical on the spectator. He truly believed as a result of his extensive cultural surveys that certain colors and primitive rhythms evoked specific effects (cf. V, 309); in behavioral terms, he thought he had found patterns or systems of unconditioned respondents. Balthus, his costume designer, knew these associations, too, according to Artaud (V, 300). For example, Artaud said that green was the color of death, while yellow was the color of bad death (V, 309). Here the purple color elicits fright as does the heavy motion of the curtains. The muffled bells of Rome then peal out, in rhythm with the dizzying frenzy of the scene. Color, action, and sound join together, then, to establish physiological chaos in the spectator's body by means of respondent conditioning.

The auxiliary "terror" process, described in the main paradigm, facilitates the metaphysical conversion, the main behavioral process. Motion is meant to draw the spectator into the infinite. The thick, heavy folds of the curtain form waves that flow into the beyond; from
time to time a thick, heavy sound spreads across the stage, also seeking to flow into the beyond, but it rebounds sharply off some invisible boundary. These motions may not have the same effect on the reader of this study, because he is not alarmed, not "drugged"; he has not been liberated from his Western training to see these things.

A web of images and feelings is created here which is the potential basis of new truth: The evil Count, his innocent daughter, the imminent incest, the purple, the wave-like motion, the juxtaposition of a scene from Cana which bursts into a wild orgy, church bells, the guests' voices rising and falling to meld with the bells', a thick, heavy sound superimposed on all this. Faster than the mind can string these happenings together or make rational sense of them, the body directly experiences them. Indeed, there is no time for the mind to decipher all this, because the images are presented so rapidly, and the play immediately moves on. In fact, most spectators (and not readers of the text) would probably have a difficult time giving any verbal description of what Artaud is communicating in this experience; Artaud is establishing contingency-shaped behavior, not rule-shaped behavior. The spectator has seen old things (e.g., a Cana scene) and old connections (father and daughter) differently because of his terrified condition. He has also experienced new actions (e.g., voices and bells
melding) and may very well leave the theater and act differently on the basis of having experienced these truths. There is no need to intellectualize the process (although even Artaud does not spurn the intellect entirely, as long as it is not the first medium of communication.) (Cf. IV, 46)

The dialogue which runs from this opening setting until the "communion" act midway in this third scene closely follows Shelley's, though in greatly abridged form. Artaud chooses, however, to add to and accentuate the actions; almost the whole plot movement can be followed by simply observing everything save the content of the dialogue. Cenci speaks in a slightly inebriated way, there is a cold draft, and a guest speaks in a stifled voice. Something ominous has been announced. (Cenci will make real his myth.) The guests scrutinize each other intensely, suspiciously. Beatrice, in extreme agitation, starts to rise, but her mother holds her down. The fear builds. (Beatrice suspects bad news about her brother.) Letters are produced, and the menacing eye of the Count sweeps across the room. Lucretia faints into Beatrice's arms (as in Shelley's play). The Count waves the letters above his head in glee. (He announces the death of his sons.) Taken together, these actions have the double role of maintaining the high intensity of emotional response attained at the beginning of the scene and, in some cases, of mirroring the spectator's
own responses to the situation (e.g., the escape behavior
of Lucretia's swoon.) They do not have a very deep,
metaphysical side, but serve as neutral fillers before the
next metaphysical jolt.

One of the most incredibly horrifying and deep actions
follows in Artaud's text. Count Cenci picks up a goblet
(which was shaped to look like a human skull in his pro-
duction) and drinks his sons' blood:

CENCI, élévant une coupe de vin.---Ce
vin n'est pas une bouffonnerie.
Le prêtre boit son Dieu à la messe.
Qui donc peut m'empêcher de croire
que je bois le sang de mes fils?
(IV, 204)

He drinks, and all the guests, noisily and in great confu-
sion, try to escape. Suddenly there is a silence, and the
wild frenzy is frozen into a tableau. Andrea is ordered
to pass the goblet around, and one of the guests knocks
it flying to the floor.

The inspiration for the scene is taken from Shelley.
His Cenci, however, only suggests the parallel and does
not drink any wine at this point:

Could I believe thou wert their mingled blood,
Then I would taste thee like a sacrament.
... But thou art
Superfluous; I have drunken deep joy,
And I will taste no other wine to-night. 12

The chilling horror of this act is dual in origin.
At a physical, human level, this is pure cannibalism; it
is compounded by the fact that the cannibal is a father
drinking his own sons' blood. One of the strongest socially conditioned stimuli eliciting nausea and unbelievable horror for Western man is cannibalism. People will eat almost anything or die of starvation before eating another human's flesh, the taboo is so strong. This very intense horror is compounded by the blasphemy of the act. When Cenci picks up the goblet, he drinks the wine/blood like the priest at Mass. This is great sacrilege. Such a black parody of the holiest of Christian rites elicits disbelief and all kinds of bodily alarm among believers. (Its effect is probably not completely lost upon any man who once believed in the rite, for even he would weakly feel at least a momentary sense of revolt against the wrongness of the action.)

The action itself is so cruel that it releases all sorts of new or low probability responses. With respect to religion, the nature of the Catholic rite (what the priest really does, the depth of its meaning) is called into question. It is one thing to read in the catechism that the wine is mystically transformed into blood, but no one believes it to be blood. This act puts that all back into question. Is it really blood that the faithful drink; why do they, and why would God want them to drink blood as Cenci does? With respect to society and the family, the act attacks the staid social foundations. The relationship between children and a parent and between humans in general is suddenly less clear. The facade of social relations is
broken as Cenci invites the guest to drink the blood. One begins to wonder if the whole social structure of Western society and family is not a worthless impediment to a quest for truth. With respect to the reunification of multiples, the act indeed does it and is a preparation for further reunification. By drinking his innocent sons' blood, Cenci reunites evil and good and takes the first ritualistic step toward reunion with good via Beatrice.

While this discussion is intellectual, the reader must again remember that the experience is primarily a bodily one. The above brief outline only suggests in an indirect verbal way what the senses of the body may be coming to. There may indeed be many thoughts afterwards, but here the juxtaposition of cruel, unusual stimuli convey the message directly. The frozen tableau immediately after the act allows the body some time to assimilate the stimuli before the intense drama continues. (See Figure 10.)

Artaud took great pains to precisely block the movements of the actors immediately after the communion scene. The text in the Oeuvres complètes is quite detailed; Roger Blin, one of the original actors, has furnished an even more detailed remembrance of the complex blocking of the scene.\(^{13}\) It is at this point that one can most easily detect a wide split between the ongoing superficial text, carried through by the dialogue, and the deeper, metaphysical text, communicated by the actions of the actors. It is almost as if the two are completely unrelated. The
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Figure 10
dialogue continues in roughly the same fashion that Shelley has indicated, but the spectator, still reeling from the metaphysical and physical assault of the communion, does not respond to the speeches but to the "universal gravitation" movements of the actors, a secret language.

The guests come back from all sides and are panic-filled. Their steps are uneven. For the actual performance, the sounds of an amplified metronome oscillating at various speeds was recorded and played back at varying intensities to increase the violence of the action. Each going his own way, the guests then individually engage in mock battles with ghosts. Beatrice keeps them from leaving and, running, makes a great circle around them. She stops before Cenci. Cenci threatens to strike Beatrice, the crowd collectively reacts in horror, and Beatrice again circles them all. Knapp suggests that the rectilinear motion of the guests represents man's passing through the world; Beatrice's circles represent the cosmos. In short, it is the eternal versus the ephemeral.

The experiences of drug users reported by Durr and Nahal suggest a less symbolic intellectual meaning. Comparing the reports of experiences of these drug users, one can see a recurrent theme in les Cenci. The guests' chaotic movements reflect the duality or multiplicity of the world while Beatrice's frantic motions to encapsulate this divergence suggest a movement towards unity. This multiplicity/unity theme was already brought out in the
communion act. It is, of course, the fundamental idea of this theater, *le Théâtre et son double*, where real life is the mysterious union of apparent life and the deeper life. Artaud further develops the metaphysical implications of this new truth in this complex series of motions which Artaud believes has a direct meaning to the now traumatized spectator. Much like today's drugged reader of the so-called marijuana comic books, the spectator can respond to the stimuli which communicate this multiplicity/unity conflict much easier and differently than a reader. The effects of the earlier, cumulative cruel stimuli facilitate the emission of these formerly low probability or novel responses, as is depicted in the basic schematic.

This unification movement of all multiples and doubles, especially of good and evil, reappears most forcefully and completely in the last part of this scene. Lucretia and all the guests have left. Beatrice and her father stare at each other for a long time. Because of a now long history of association with good and evil, the two now physically symbolize these abstractions and elicit appropriate responses in the spectator. This long stare begins a succession of events meant to drive the level of terror responses even higher. Cenci goes to the table and pours himself a glass of wine. However, this is no longer a neutral act; because of the conditioning in the
communion act, this pouring of wine elicits the same response as that of pouring a cup of blood. The subsequent environmental stimuli support and augment these responses. After Cenci has poured the wine, suddenly several lights go out and through four speakers located around the hall, the spectator finds himself at the center of the loud, muffled, sepulchral sound of the bells of the great cathedral of Amiens. The assault suddenly ceases, and a calm pervades the scene, the bodily tension maintained only by the sound of a viola vibrating very high above. By the use of conditioned and unconditioned cruel respondents, Artaud further liberates the spectator to witness in a new, bodily way what will come next.

Evil humbly, emotionally calls out to good, "Béatrice", and beauty and innocence answers, "Mon père." Here, at the level of word, the reunion begins; at the most primitive level, by speaking the other's name, each becomes a part of the other. The fundamental biological relationship of daughter and father, highlighted by these words, recalls the original union of both the characters and of the concepts they embody and is a fleeting justification for
their imminent reunion. After a mild warning from Beatrice to leave, which is ignored, Cenci asks her to bring him a glass of wine. (In Shelley's version, Beatrice has left, and Andrea brings him a glass of Greek wine; there is no reason to believe that this is the same wine used earlier.)

In another act meant to both elicit violent respondent behavior in the audience and provide the stimuli for a deep, metaphysical experience, Beatrice willingly brings him the wine, the blood of her brothers, and thereby moves further into the union. After she has given it to him, Cenci moves as if to begin sexual advances (stroking her hair) and to complete the reintegration through incest. The vivid horror of this union and the myriad responses (novel and hidden) which must result from this unlikely association of father, daughter, and sex are reminiscent of the Spaniard-Indian juxtaposition of La Conquête du Mexique.

However, at this point the attempted union fails; Beatrice violently jerks away from Cenci. Andrea tries to stop her flight, but Cenci orders Andrea to let her go, for she cannot escape the charm that is working. Andrea's attempt to block the intense force of Beatrice's departure is the last of five such attempts to bar a force: the sound in the introduction, Cenci's barring the guests' departure, Lucretia's holding back Beatrice's attempt to rise before the news of her brothers' death, and Lucretia's attempt to block Cenci's path towards Beatrice. Collectively, these
instances suggest non-verbally that great forces are at work and that they are being contained. Even as Cenci finally allows escape, the spectator knows that the fusion of the forces is inevitable. The five blocks, none of which is specially emphasized in the text, convey this message and exemplify once more Artaud's secret language of the soul.

As an indication that the quest for union continues and to maintain the horror responses engendered in the last scene, Artaud has the curtain of Act II raised to show a bed at center stage. Curiously enough, instead of Beatrice and her father, the public finds Lucretia and Bernardo there discussing the fact that Bernardo is not her child. The image is tranquil enough, although for some it may be still another metaphysical stimulus setting.20 It seems that after the initial menace of the bed, Artaud meant this segment to be a short respite for the audience. He seems to console them through the words of Lucretia (unique to this text) that this torture is an integral part of rebirth: "Pour une femme digne du nom de femme, Bernardo, toute grande douleur morale est comme un nouvel enfantement."

(IV, 213)

The respite is brief indeed, as Beatrice violently breaks into the bedroom, an action which recalls the violent entry of rape. Outside, high above, is heard the sound of birds' cries and the amplified sound of Cenci's footprint.
The birds' shrill voices again act as respondents to elicit fear responses; moreover, their presence may indicate all of nature is concerned and participating in this process. The sound of the footstep is surely another cruel element of the "language of theater" intended to menace the spectator. Its placement high overhead and association with the high voices of birds immediately and directly communicates to Western man the inevitability of the rape and shrouds it in the mystery that veils all contact with the heavens.

Beatrice's anxiety is physically communicated (communicated as is a disease) by her actions. She wrings her hands, begins to wail loudly, and probably engages in rhythmic breathing and special modes of declamation. In a speech not found in Shelley's text, Beatrice's words reinforce verbally for the first time what the public already knows non-verbally: All the opposites spring from one source and must return: "Je dois le haïr et je ne peux pas. Son image vivante est en moi comme un crime que je porterais." (IV, 214)

Before Cenci enters, Artaud gives Beatrice a short speech about the indignities she has had to suffer:

Est-il une chose qu'il ne puisse oser?
Tout ce que j'ai supporté n'est rien à côté de ce qu'il s'apprête à me faire. Il m'a nourri de mets empestés. Il m'a fait jour après jour assister au lent martyr de mes frères, et tu sais que je n'ai pas protesté. Mais maintenant... maintenant.... (IV, 215)
The speech is greatly abridged from Shelley's text, which is much more detailed about the sufferings. A comparison of the two proves informative of the difference between common horror and Artaud's metaphysical horror:

Oh! He has trampled me
Under his feet, and made the blood stream down
My pallid cheeks. And he has given us all
Ditch water, and the fever-stricken flesh
Of buffaloes, and bade us eat or starve,
And we have eaten.—He has made me look
On my beloved Bernardo, when the rust
Of heavy chains has gangrened his sweet limbs,
And I have never yet despaired— but now!²²

As in many instances, Artaud considerably minimizes the horror of the account Shelley gave. One might expect that Artaud would keep all the horror of the original account intact and simply add to it. However, such an expectation neglects Artaud's repeated declarations that cruelty must include a metaphysical dimension. It is on precisely this point that Shelley and Artaud differ (as do Artaud and all since who see the Théâtre de la Cruauté as the legitimate historical source of any kind of excessive stage violence.) In Shelley's play Cenci's atrocities are recounted in all their gory detail because their emotional effect is their end. Reaction alone, not coupled with action, is more important; the cruelty is never a means to transform the spectator, but only to increase his rage at Cenci and render the pathetic workings of fate even more tragic.

By this time in the play Artaud has already established a sufficiently strong respondent association with verbal
and non-verbal stimuli between Cenci and evil; there is no need to belabor it. As the basic behavioral schematic indicates, cruelty is an auxiliary process and not a main goal in itself. Reactions to this lengthy, verbal exposition of Cenci's cruelty would not serve as the basis for any metaphysical responding to acts in the immediate future.

It may be in the end that Shelley's play is much crueler than Artaud's. Although Artaud's public may have undergone some very harrowing experiences, all were tinged with mystical knowledge, and at the end cruelty is clearly a device. The success of the play depends upon each man's new insights and capabilities. Shelley's spectators, on the other hand, are left to wallow throughout the play in their horror. Shelley paints a black, depressing picture of man's soul, and at the end of the play there is no relief. Justice is not triumphant. The success of the play is a function of the audience's delight in their horror and pity at Beatrice's fate.

When Cenci finally enters (in Artaud's play) there is no need for words. Cenci and Beatrice trade a series of ah's, each at a different tone, each to convey a distinctly different message to the spectator's body through the modulation of sound alone. (Cf. note 18, IV, 399) The last "ah" is the decision to reattempt the union. Again, efforts to escape reinforce the knowledge of the event's inevitability.
Most of the remainder of this scene is taken up by a discussion between Cenci and his wife. Much of what they say was invented by Artaud. The two touch on a variety of topics such as family, society, and tyranny; however, no concrete stimuli illustrate this intellectual badinage. It is noteworthy for this analysis only insofar as it supports the general goals Artaud announced for this play.

In the very last part of this scene Artaud plainly makes the interplay of light and darkness a counterdrama to that of Beatrice and her father. Until this point Artaud has kept their struggle in the background, figuratively and literally. In scene two Beatrice's encounter with Orsino was in the dark, but lit by the moon. In the last scene (scene 3) a guest called for a light to lead him from and through darkness. Torches go out when Cenci takes some wine at the end of the scene. This scene takes place at twilight ("Le jour est sur le point de tomber." IV, 213) All these instances of light/darkness opposition were undoubtedly planned to have their effect on the spectator.

In the discussion of la Conquête du Mexique several of these effects are detailed. However, in this final segment the light/darkness interplay is no longer subtle; it takes on an additional, strong metaphysical significance. In this end segment night has just fallen. The Count, alone, deliberately moves from darkness to a spot still lit. He then actually addresses the darkness, with which he has
been identified throughout the play and indicates that his mission is superior even to his identification with the night:

\[\text{Et toi, nuit, toi qui grandis tout, entre là (Il se frappe le milieu de la poitrine.) avec les formes démesurées de tous les crimes qu'on imagine. Tu ne peux pas me chasser de moi. L'acte que je porte est plus grand que toi. (IV, 222)}\]

As this passage and its variants found in other manuscripts indicate (Cf. note 37, IV, 400), the conflict between night and day parallels that of good and evil; Cenci will reconcile the two. Again, this is a novel idea for most of the public. Henceforth in the play, whenever the spectator sees a light/darkness opposition it may provide additional metaphysical knowledge.

The second scene of this act offers little for constructive comment. Although a full seven pages long in the \textit{Oeuvres Complètes}, the scene consists almost entirely of dialogue between Camillo, Orsino, and Cenci's son Giacomo, introduced here for the first time. As the three strike a pact to rid the world of Cenci, the plot advances but nothing else does. Artaud has considerably shortened, sharpened, and enlivened the lengthy discourses of the corresponding scene from Shelley (also Act II, scene 2). However, whatever terror was built up in the preceding scenes must surely be dissipated in this verbiage. Although the characters speak of violent actions, they do not act; they do not even use intense verbal
imagery. As the reader will discover in a later discussion of the play's weaknesses, Artaud's compromises for the masses sometimes cripple the basic processes at work in his theater.26

As in Shelley's text, the third act begins with Beatrice's bursting in to tell Lucretia that she has been raped. Unexpectedly enough, Artaud does not show the actual rape nor does he even use a French word for rape.27 After the repeated scenes of intercourse found in la Pierre philosophale, it is difficult to support any supposition that Artaud disliked such scenes and therefore chose not to include one. One can only surmise that Artaud chose to keep this play more or less an adaptation, at least structurally, and therefore followed Shelley's lead.

Beatrice sobs out the news that the union has been successful. No armor, no castles, no armies, no breastplates could stop what was to happen. She has been completely subsumed:

Tout est atteint. Tout. Le corps est sale, mais c'est l'âme qui est polluée. Il n'y a plus une parcelle de moi-même où je puisse me réfugier. (IV, 234)

A completely different variant for the beginning of this scene given in the notes of the Oeuvres complètes (Note 2, IV, 404-405) further supports the reality of the metaphysical union. Here, Beatrice is blind, she sees only darkness, which has come from Cenci:
Rendez-moi mes yeux si vous le pouvez.

LUCRETIA lui met doucement la main sur les yeux. — Vos yeux. Que vous est-il arrivé?

BEATRICE— Je n'y vois plus.

Darkness and light have merged. Only a little later in this same variant Lucretia physically recognizes the union. Beatrice cries out:

Vous restez là, toute droite, immobile, et je roule dans le vertige qui est en train de tout emporter.

Lucretia, se tordant les mains, décrit un cercle derrière Beatrice et vient se mettre de l'autre côté.

Beatrice, who earlier in the banquet scene described a circle around Cenci and the guests, is now within the circle. She joins Cenci at the center around which all else (symbolized by Lucretia) swirls. Lucretia's action keeps the force personified as Beatrice within the circle and is a first step towards her own eventual reintegration into the center (as Beatrice's circling was.)

The beginning Artaud does give to this scene, unlike the variant, emphasizes the impotency and futility of the Christian religion and demonstrates the shallowness of its rituals. This demonstration is similar to the one announced in the introduction to *La Conquête du Mexique*, but the denunciation of Christianity is much more detailed, and Artaud does not contrast its superficiality with the profundity of any older, pagan religion. When Lucretia learns
that Cenci has defiled Beatrice, she crosses the stage making the sign of the cross four times and cries out, "Mon Dieu!" precisely four times. Shortly thereafter Beatrice sobs and sighs four times, and the two of them form a tableau reminiscent of Mary Magdalene at the foot of the cross. This series of actions physically depicts the failure of Christianity to prevent or deal with the problem. Exorcism (the sign of the cross) does not work, and Lucretia calls out God's name quite in vain. He does not answer. Christian rituals are ineffective in this realm of profound, ritualistic metaphysical movements. The Mary Magdalene tableau is traditionally one of Christian despair mixed with a touch of hope. But Lucretia draws away from Beatrice after she strikes this pose, much as God has drawn away from her.

More importantly, Artaud uses the number four as a direct stimulus meant to convey the worthlessness of Western religion. One might be tempted to argue that Artaud had fairly good knowledge of the Kabbal and that, like some medieval writers, he created a deep, intricate structure for the inner recesses of the mind to decode. This sort of interpretation, however, would go against the whole grain of his thought. More probably, the metaphysical truth of the number is conveyed by its odd, jarring quality. Three is a natural number; people, especially French
people, are used to things occurring in threes. Moreover, Catholic religious beliefs (e.g., the Trinity) and rites are based on sequences of three or multiples of three (e.g., offering are properly incensed in a three part movement, each part having three parts.) When suddenly familiar religious practices start occurring in fours, the spectator immediately must sense a certain "wrongness" about the event. Whether he can verbalize about the source of the wrongness is irrelevant; he simply identifies the whole stimulus setting as being wrong because certain elements are aberrant. The "rightness" of triplets and "wrongness" of quadruples constitute another example of Artaud's attempts to reach universal stimuli or deeply hidden patterns in man. The "wrongness" of the quadruple nature of these actions, coupled with the other futile religious actions mentioned above, combine to communicate a direct, devastating indictment of Christianity's usefulness to the spectator.

The scene continues with Orsino's entrance, and after some discussion they all decide that actions, not legal justice, is their only recourse. All are huddled in a corner, a visual sign of the concentration of their power, ready to burst and fan out. Emphasis falls in these discussions on the word acte. No concrete verb is furnished at this point, the generic simply being repeated:
By making the assassins mute, Artaud further strengthens the theme of the supremacy of action against words. Beatrice's and Lucretia's reactions to the plan are, at least textually, admission that words, like Christianity, are useless when dealing with the deep, dark forces of real life, which Cenci's actions represent. They "say":

BEATRICE: !!!!!!!!!!
LUCRETIA: !!!!!!!!!!

The second, short scene of this act follows the first without interruption, though the time is now dusk. Artaud totally invented this scene, for the corresponding actions in Shelley's text happen off stage and are only reported to Giaccomo by Orsino. There is almost no dialogue here: almost everything is communicated in Artaud's "language of theater."

The whole scene is one of great turbulence and fright. The time (dusk) and the lightning against the darkness like the spiral staircase earlier, form a continual setting of stimuli suggesting the ongoing difficulties of this metaphysical union. Loud thunderclaps serve both as unconditioned stimuli which elicit fright responses and as operant signs that the situation is explosive. Violent wind adds to the
fright and contributes an eerie, mysterious dimension to the setting. Although the storm setting originated in Shelley, Artaud exaggerated it to his ends of bodily disorientation as in le Jet de sang. The storm recalls the raw power of the painting 'Lot's Daughters."

Orsino tells the assassins, who are fighting against a furious wind, to shout out in union with the storm:

"Vous avez compris. C'est nous la tempête. C'est pourquoi ne craignez pas de crier." (IV, 243) Their identification with the storm is indeed unexpected and novel; the spectator, again "freed" by the cruelty, may respond in a multitude of ways. Storms have been associated with and communicated the evil of Cenci. They are a demonstration of raw, unleashed force, just as the assassins are. Earlier, Cenci breathed his secrets into the air, which the storm now swirls around. These associations are only a few that may appear as the assassins try to blend their voices with the storm. (See Figure 11.) Of course, they cannot actually shout, for they are mute; this situation adds a further metaphysical dimension to the act. Very soon thereafter the elements of clock, time, and destiny are added to this network of stimuli. Three thunderclaps echo out (as if to announce the time) and armed men who resemble the figures on the Strasbourg cathedral clock appear and move slowly about. Jerky footsteps sound out, and one by one
"The Assassins and Storm"

Figure 11
Lucretia, Bernardo, Beatrice, and Cenci appear, walking at an extremely slow pace. Nature, uncontrolled forces, time, destiny, light, darkness, violence, murder all come together as if they were the pieces of a kaleidoscope, and the intensely disturbed patron feels and sees a variety of patterns, ever-changing and ever-new, through this experiential kaleidoscope.

At this point Giaccomo expresses a fear that may indeed be Artaud's own: "J'ai peur qu'à force de trop bien jouer ils ne sachent plus rien faire de vrai." (IV, 244)

The remark may apply to an author/director's legitimate fears about his future actors' abilities to communicate what he wants. At another level, Artaud may be voicing his own fears about overloading the audience with experiences; the amount and intensity of experience may be so high that the public will be incapable of handling it or may reject the whole enterprise as the mad ravings of someone who can no longer "faire de vrai." At still another level, the remark may reflect Artaud's fears that this production may produce too esoteric a response and that the audience may derive no benefits applicable to the "vrai," deep life he wants them to discover.

The stylized assassination attempt follows. From another set of stimuli which functions at the dual level of cruelty and metaphysics, Cenci receives a warning. His name is repeated (four times) in a rhythmic pattern:
Because of repeated associations with evil throughout the play, his name is now a very powerful conditioned stimuli. The movement aloft, the feeling of flight, the renewed association with birds, the clock-like rhythm of the name strengthen his identification with the mysterious and the mystical. Nature or the powers beyond have become his ally and favor his union with Beatrice; their warning preserves what has been accomplished at the physical level and prevents its destruction by outside forces.

Artaud gives the attempted murder a dream-like quality. The assassins become pure action; in order to destroy the alliance, they assume a form of gravitational movement similar to Beatrice's earlier movement (preceding the incest):

*Immédiatement on voit les formes des assassins qui jaillissent comme des toupies et se croisent dans un éclair. En même temps, on entend deux coups énormes de pistolet.* (IV, 245)
The lightning at the moment they shout is the physical representation of the force of good trying to break open the union from the outside. It fails, however, as all disappears and as Giacomo announces by tone of voice and by word: "RATE!" (IV, 245)

This scene is perhaps Artaud's theater of language at its original best. Although the reintegration interpretation has been suggested throughout, the number of other possible effects the stimuli may have or reactions they may evoke is indeed great. The body is in a state of alarm. A dream-like interplay of loud noise, flashes of light, violent wind, rhythmic motions and sounds, swirling motion, and great emotion on stage surround the spectator. To the extent that each is liberated, we may find a vast range of other "truths" communicated. This is, of course, in accord with Artaud's goal not to tell deep, metaphysical truths but to put his audience in contact with them.32

The actual murder occurs in the first scene of the fourth act, which corresponds to the first three scenes of the same act in Shelley's play. This killing, however, is very anticlimactic and seems given only to remain faithful to the story and to move the plot along. The account of the actions follows almost exactly Shelley's or Stendhal's version, the two differing only on minor points. After Cenci has fallen into a deep sleep (because of a drugged drink given him by Lucretia), Beatrice charges the two assassins
to kill Cenci with daggers. He talks in his sleep, though, and the two are scared away. Infuriated, Beatrice berates them and sends them back. They return splattered with blood, and Beatrice gives them money and a golden chasuble in recompense.33

Although the evidence of Artaud's theories in practice is not as pronounced as in the preceding scene, there are some examples. Allusions to fate, birth, dreams, freedom, death, and torture, ideas which by now must be a constant preoccupation of the spectator, begin the scene. When Beatrice wraps the assassins in their cloaks as mummies, the action as well as the effect (of the repeated circles) are reflective of the universal gravitation process which draws all into the metaphysical. Cenci's death wail is another "hieroglyphic" stimulus which leads the spectator into the beyond. Cenci's final appearance, at the end of this scene, shows the manner of his death: a nail hammered through the eye. The sight is terrifying enough, but gradually increasing fanfares augment the horror. The picture is a complex, extremely potent blend of conditioned and unconditioned stimuli. The sight of Cenci has become a conditioned stimulus for fright responses; the bloody vision of a man with a nail in his eye and the loud noise of the trumpets are both strong conditioned stimuli eliciting fright. Added together, they induce another harrowing experience, which ushers in the metaphysical movements of the next scene.
The second scene of the fourth act, introduced by the fanfare ending of the first scene, recommences the metaphysical drama in full force. It essentially corresponds to part of Act IV, scene 4 of Shelley's text, but the actions called for are much different. The scene opens with a continuation of the intense fanfare, a cruel and metaphysical stimulus, coupled with an intense light projected on a white sheet, which has fallen in front of the backdrop. The whole beginning of this scene is an interplay of purity versus corruption, good versus evil, and again, light versus darkness. The light/darkness conflict again comes to the forefront, as it had in Act II, scene 1, as the scene progresses.

Lucretia, one of the conspirators, is gradually pushed back by the light:

Lucretia, qui avançait du côté de la fanfare, recule effarée devant une aveuglante et terrible lumière qui gagne peu à peu tout le décor.

(IV, 256)

The theme is visually reiterated and emphasized by the concurrent entry of Beatrice, Bernardo, and Lucretia on one side of the stage and, at the opposite side, of Camillo and his soldiers, in a procession of lights that crosses the stage. Camillo's movement is surely meant to have a metaphysical meaning, for Artaud writes that he "pénétre par le côté opposé" and that, once arrived, he clearly divides himself from Beatrice and the others:
There begins at this point the most complex series of movements in the play, a spectacle which Artaud might very well have termed an example of a secret language of dance. He did cite many of these geometrical configurations as patterns of "universal gravitation." (V, 59) They are most carefully planned and described. In the above quote, for instance, a variant manuscript gives a slightly different direction:

"CAMILLO, l'index pointé en avant, fait de la main droite un geste..." (Ms) Il y avait d'ailleurs primitivement "droite" sur le registre de scène, corrigé au crayon par "gauche." (Note 6, IV, 410)

Thus, Artaud was very conscious in practice (as well as in theory) of each stimulus and its effect. By choosing stimuli for their known properties, reducing stimulus variation, and controlling the order of their presentation as he so evidently tried to do in this scene, Artaud could well hope to elicit the responses he desired.

A succession of circles and attempts to penetrate the circle dominates the scene. When Camillo leaves to find Cenci in his bedchamber, the soldiers form a semi-circle, as if to surround the women. Lucretia walks as if she were sleepwalking into the center where she is joined by the defiant Beatrice. (IV, 257) Lucretia correctly observes shortly later, "Ils commencent à tracer le cercle où ils
vont nous emprisonner." (IV, 258) Camillo tries to penetrate the circle at the mental level by asking about the rape. Beatrice states, "Monseigneur, je ne reconnais à personne le droit de s'introduire dans le secret de mes pensées." (IV, 260) But Camillo responds, "Il y a ici un secret que je dois percer." (IV, 261) Bernardo, on the other hand, tries to physically penetrate the circle, but he is unsuccessful:

Bernardo se précipite à l'intérieur du cercle, se serre contre Beatrice. Camillo entre au milieu des soldats et, prenant Bernardo par la tête, il le tire doucement dehors. Le cercle des soldats se referme. (IV, 260)

Since the definitive beginning of Act III, scene 1 did not contain the encirclement of Beatrice by Lucretia, this is the first time where Beatrice takes her rightful place in the center of the circle. The movement of this scene is the inverse of that in the banquet scene. Here Beatrice has become the evil one and is encircled by the good. However, instead of the evil person trying to break out to join with the good, the good (both Camillo and Bernardo) try to penetrate into the center with the evil person. Unity of purpose for both forces is reflected by this use of inverse doubles.

Bernardo's efforts to rejoin Beatrice reach such a frenzy that Lucretia identifies him as Cenci:

Il se jette frénétiquement sur les soldats et les frappe.

LUCRETIA-- Mon Dieu! mais c'est Cenci lui-même. Tais-toi, Cenci. (IV, 262)
This is not simple association but equation, just as the wine was transformed into blood. The violence of Bernardo's attacks and of the name "Cenci", uttered by Lucretia, force the spectators to perceive the equation bodily. The metaphysical meaning of this transformed stimulus is indeed manifold. Bernardo, until now quite innocent, suddenly becomes the depth of evil. He joins Beatrice as another member of the family who combines both good and evil within one person. Like Beatrice, he too compels competing responses in the audience, fueling a conflict from which truths may be drawn. At the same time he evokes and elicits responses appropriate to Bernardo (because of the continuity of response to his physical appearance) and responses appropriate to Cenci (because of his actions and being called "Cenci.") The whole situation of Beatrice's entrapment, itself an inverse, suddenly mutates again. Beatrice reverts for this moment to her original state of goodness while the guards now protect her from the evil advances of Cenci. In this third exposition of the impeded reunion the good finds itself not encircling the bad (as in the banquet) or trying to penetrate into the center to be with the bad (as earlier in this scene) but at the center of attempts to be penetrated by bad. In this sense it is a stylized rape.

The visual symbol recalls and reiterates for the public its earlier experiences with the union of good and evil. It further calls into question the notion of family,
relationships between siblings, male and female interactions, as well as the questions of eternity and life and death. (After all, Cenci has been murdered and yet lives.)

With the last few lines of this scene Artaud widens its meaning to encompass the need to reunite soul and body and, ultimately, all doubles:


Les soldats le repoussent.

C'est mon âme qui est sacrificée. C'est mon âme qui est sacrificée... C'est mon âme qui est sacrificée...

Et il hurle désespérément ces paroles pendant que le rideau tombe.

Rideau. (IV, 262)

The inspiration for these lines comes from a much later speech of Bernardo in Shelley's text.


The frantic urgency and repetition of Artaud's text, though, give it a much more mystical meaning.37 This is no longer the cerebral metaphor, the enlightened figure of speech meant to sway the audience with deep pity; it is, instead, the haunting, visceral cry of the body trying to unite with its soul, ready to be destroyed with the soul rather than live on in part. At one level the evil Cenci calls out to the pure Beatrice, the body calling to the soul. At another level the evil/good Bernardo calls out to the evil/good Beatrice. At still another level, Artaud himself, a victim
of his body, calls out for salvation. At a final level, the public cries out that their bodily and spiritual sides become one, that the theater rejoin its double.

The circular motion and penetration movements are carried over into the final scene of the play, where the public is given one last jolt of cruelty to carry them through. Beatrice, as Stendhal reports, undergoes the dreaded *tortura capillorum*, a torture so severe that Stendhal only alludes to its effects and directs the reader to another treatise for detailed information. Here the torture is somewhat more stylized as Beatrice is suspended by the hair from the spoke of a wheel rotating in mid-air on an invisible axis. This cruel hair torture is complemented by frequent screams, groans, turning winches, grinding wheels, themselves very strongly conditioned to elicit fright responses. Hayman reports that Artaud planned to recapture the horror of the punishment in the actual performance by removing the box upon which Iya Abdy (Beatrice) was to stand. Suspecting such a move for the sake of more vivid response, Abdy declined to use the box, and the wheel was lowered so she could walk on the floor.  

As Beatrice moves about in a circle beneath a wheel (itself a circle, because it has no visible axis), Bernardo traces a circle around her. Even though she is no longer at the center, he is still unable to join her. No clear identification of the characters with good and evil exists
here, but after the last scene none is needed; they are now simply two irreconcilable forces that cannot cease their efforts to recombine. As Bernardo says, the memory of the missing half abides: "... je peux te dire qu'une âme comme la tienne, jamais mon âme ne pourra l'oublier." (IV, 264) Their one final attempt at union fails. As Beatrice encircles Bernardo with her arms and kisses him, he tips backwards, as if repelled by some fundamental incompatibility.

The middle of this scene is again mostly necessary verbiage, which moves the superficial plot to its conclusion. Camillo eventually forces Beatrice to sign her death sentence, and here the basic story line finishes. The metaphysical experience is not yet finished.

The final part of this scene and of the play is a ritualistic, religious procession into the beyond where all will be united. However, this is no Christian ceremony; like the truth experiences in *la Conquête du Mexique*, truth in *Les Cenci* springs from the deeper, older springs of pagan religions. Here the group forms a procession, the soldiers with bowed heads in the lead, and marches to an Incan rhythm in seven part time. The music and procession put Beatrice in a setting where the spectator identifies her as a sacrificial offering as well as part of a deeper, metaphysical rite which they cannot verbally identify but which they physically recognize because of the music's source in universal rhythm.
Finally, in this last scene, Beatrice verbalizes what the spectator has experienced bodily through the language of theater throughout the play:

BEATRICE— Tout meurt, parce que le monde brûle, incertain entre le mal et le bien.

Un temps.

Ni Dieu, ni l'homme, ni aucun des pouvoirs qui dominent ce que l'on appelle notre destin, n'ont choisi entre le mal et le bien. (IV, 269-270)

Evil and good must coexist; they are equals and must be reconciled. At this realization the music gets much louder and a desperate human voice melds into it, a weak demonstration of cruelty as well as a non-verbal demonstration of the blending of the divine and the human, the spiritual and the carnal.

Until Beatrice's very last speech, the two women then engage in an antiphonal exchange, somewhat reminiscent of the beginning of le Jet de sang. The words are unimportant for the meaning of the action, which reemphasizes the ritualistic, metaphysical immolation; however, they are a splendid example of prose poetry. Moreover, they demonstrate that Artaud did not shun conventional words because he was not a master of them (indeed, the sheer bulk and beauty of the Oeuvres complètes argue against that notion) but because he felt they allowed only limited, stereotypical responses.

Beatrice, in the last lines of the play, utters the verbal declaration of a truth already known. The reintegration will take place in the beyond:
The Incan music and slow disappearance of the procession to the side as the curtain falls reinforce this certitude of reunion in the other world, where good will resemble evil. 41

Within this last scene Artaud provides a Western equivalent of the Balinese ritual dances he saw at the Colonial Exposition. The movements, decor, lighting, sounds, all contribute to the ritual. Like the Balinese dances, there is a superficial story as well as the deeper mysteries into which one is drawn. While the deepest meanings of their rites may be apparent only to the oldest of the Bali, here they are most accessible to those most fully terrified and freed. The stimuli which provide the experience, while parallel to those of the Balinese dance, are not the same; different stimuli were chosen because they evoked the desired responses more reliably. Thus, at the end, Artaud does not present a Balinese rite of immolation, but a religious procession calqued on the Catholic model to provide the same experience within a different cultural framework.
As the procession disappears into the infinite, it is clear that Artaud has achieved a certain kind of triumph, a limited success. In this first production of the Théâtre de la Cruauté he has had to compromise his ideals and present a production which interacts with the audience that was, not the audience that could be. Had he not, the audience might well have totally rejected his efforts out of hand. Artaud thus really faced the implicit task of creating an audience which would respond to his theater as well as the theater which would communicate to them. Hence, many times words carry a direct, instructional message to the audience or interrupt the build up of emotional responses to further the story line.

Artaud has here achieved, to a certain degree, what he set out to do. Through repeated presentations of cruelty, which induce physical reactions, he has placed his public in a state where conventional social control is minimized. They are, thus, "freer" to make responses they would not ordinarily make, novel or low probability responses. By means of a succession of polysensual stimuli which at once advance the superficial story and provide experiences which are new to most of Western society or impeded by it, Artaud facilitates the communication of hidden truths.

As for the spectator, what effect does this play have on him after he has left the theater? One may first expect a greater sensitivity to the underlying or fundamental
patterns and rhythms of life—the biological clock, the similarities between the movements of living things, colors and sounds, for example. The result of this new sensitivity may be increased aptitude for dealing with life, or for escaping the pressures, or simply enjoying novel sensations. When the spectator again confronts evil or good, his mind may react in the same, old ways, but his bodily reactions may be different. Evil might not instantly elicit fear responses, or it may not be responded to as in the past.

With a new awareness that doubles (including good and evil) may once have been linked and may not always be dichotomous, the spectator may react differently. (One can only imagine how different life would be if evil were not so evil but only a variant of what good is, or vice versa.) Certainly the spectator would react differently to his family and to his society, both of which are depicted quite differently here and in regards to both of which the spectator should have learned new "truths." Finally, the spectator may have different reactions to the basic rituals of his daily life, especially religion. After seeing Cenci drink his sons' blood, the audience could not approach communion in the same way as before.

The fact of the matter is, though, that this play in 1935 was a great failure, both for the public and Artaud. It seems only reasonable to dismiss Artaud's own assessment of his failure as disappointed idealism. His claim that
la Conquête du Mexique was pure theater of cruelty (as opposed to les Cenci) owes its validity only to the unfinished state of la Conquête du Mexique. Had la Conquête du Mexique been completed in addition to or instead of les Cenci, the compromises Artaud would have to make for a neophyte audience would assure it of a similar condemnation.

The single, overriding reason for the failure is quite simple and tragic: Artaud tried to do too much all by himself. As has already been noted several times, he insisted that the director should have complete control of the behavioral change process, that he should control every stimulus and response because of his intimate knowledge of their relationship. But he went much farther in actual practice, insisting that he control almost every single aspect of the production: "JE NE VEUX PAS que dans un spectacle monté par moi il y ait même un clin d'oeil qui ne m'appartienne."

So, Artaud found and negotiated for the theater, he raised the money, he chose the actors, he adapted (wrote), directed, and produced the text, and he even acted in a principal role.

It is no wonder, then, that something went wrong; in truth, it is a major tribute to the virulence of the concept that so much went right. The theater Artaud ended up with, an abandoned music hall, was unsuitable for the productions he envisioned. As Andre Franck describes it, the Folies-Wagram was a large, cavernous music hall, surrounded by a
promenoir and entered through a narrow, corridor-like foyer. It was hardly appropriate for intimate participation of audience and actors and had severe acoustical problems. The acoustics were in fact so bad that Lucien Dubec, Candide's critic, complained:

Le texte que, Dieu merci, l'on entend guère est souligné par des bruits épouvantables. M. Antonin Artaud est convaincu qu'il renove ainsi l'art dramatique. Ne lui faisons pas de peine.43

The choice of actors was a disaster. Artaud said in a draft of the program that he had sought "des personnalités, ...des êtres dont m'a séduit la vitalité énergique, quel que fût leur passé d'acteurs." (V, 51) Although his decision to play Cenci himself may ultimately have preserved the theoretical purity of his plans for that character, even Artaud admitted that he could not bring his vision to the stage. He was too exhausted from all the other work. (V, 260) The choices for Beatrice and Lucretia were concessions to pragmatism rather than artistic triumphs. Both Iya Abdy (Beatrice), a recently widowed, wealthy Russian and Cecile Schramme (Lucretia) contributed large amounts to the Cenci fund. Although Artaud never publicly complained about them and was always careful to praise their great acting ability (e.g., cf. V, 302), the critics' reception of them was less than warm. They especially criticized Lady Abdy, whose thick Russian accent and inaudible delivery severely hampered any effects Beatrice's part might have had on the audience.44
However, not all of the failure can be attributed to poor stimulus quality. Since he had little money himself and little outside monetary or artistic support, Artaud did not have the very necessary chances to experiment. Shortly before the Théâtre de la Cruauté was founded, Artaud had tried to establish the Théâtre de la NRF, with Gide, Valéry and Paulhan on the board of directors. They not only refused, but publicly dissociated themselves and asked him to stop using their names and to use another title for his theater. Without support, Artaud had to have all the basic formulations completely worked out, in final form, in his head. Consequently, he could not confront the many problems inherent in the practical realization of a behavioral change strategy before the actual test production.

Artaud seems to have never really appraised his actual (as opposed to theoretical) audience, its composition, and response patterns. First, as Esslin points out, the audience was too large. For this production to work, the audience had to be physically proximate enough to the stimuli for the stimuli to have the magnitude necessary to eclipse all irrelevant stimuli. Furthermore, Artaud mistakenly directs his stimuli almost exclusively to the individual members of the audience and formally ignores group response. In a large audience, group response may generate a significant amount of stimuli which compete for control of the individual's response and weaken stimulus control for staged stimuli.
Second, one wonders if Artaud did not seriously overestimate his audience's ability to behave in the desired ways. As was mentioned above, he was aware that they could not immediately respond to "pure" theater of cruelty, and he did make many concessions with this in mind. However, it does not appear that he made enough. Although Artaud's theater does not really spring from a theoretical void (as most of his ideas were already being experimented with elsewhere), it does for the public used to the traditional play. Traditional audiences are not used to experiencing plays physically rather than intellectually; their inability to suspend rational attempts to understand the play with their minds undoubtedly competed with or overshadowed their physical responses. Furthermore, an individual unaccustomed to a metaphysical body experience rather than an intellectual experience might very well reject the experience or the validity of its truths as foolishness or as esoterically titillating but useless.

Third, the very practical problem of fatigue arises. Pronko claims that participatory theater does not tire the spectator as much as listening and concentrating for two hours. Perhaps this is true in some cases, but certainly not at the high intensity Artaud worked to create. When the body is subject to such prolonged, total physiological alarm (rising blood pressure, epinephrine, spasms, and so on), it depletes its energy sources rather quickly. If
the high level of response is continuously maintained through repeated stimulus presentations, the subject may not rest until the very end of the production. The problem arises, though, when intense scenes are interspersed with scenes of dialogue. Fatigue sets in, the body starts to recover, and then the subject is jolted again. Because of the let down period, the body is slower to react than if it had maintained a consistent level of response. Some of the communication then escapes him. This fatigue problem seems to have stemmed primarily from a temporary need to give the expectant audience a somewhat traditional plot; given time and experiment, Artaud would have undoubtedly minimized the intervals between cruel stimulus presentations by eliminating superficial dialogue.

At a more theoretical level, one must raise the question of Artaud's own expertise: How good was his knowledge of the so-called universal rhythms, patterns, color responses (in short, the unconditioned responses) he sought to elicit? He did, indeed, read widely about many cultures and religions and gleaned many of these patterns from these readings. Yet it seems unlikely that he knew so much that he could predict the response to every stimulus he chose. This is not a case of harmless exaggeration, either, for the theater is based upon this kind of rigorous control; pretending to know such relationships effectively weakens the entire program of behavior change, for it allows behavior the director does not desire to occur and compete with ongoing responses.
Finally, one must question Artaud's own knowledge of physiology and human behavior. Although the drug experience and the terror experience have many reactions in common (as mentioned earlier), they are not identical. It is not clear that a drugged man reacts to given stimuli at all times in the same ways a frightened man does. Presumably Artaud based his knowledge of the functional relationship of stimulus and (metaphysical) response on his own drug experiences. He makes a leap of faith by believing that the reactions will be identical across the spectrum. As in the previous case, the director's control may thus be weakened and the change process undermined.

In sum, *les Cenci* was quite a success when measured against the obstacles Artaud had to overcome. Most contemporary critics are far too severe in summarily rejecting it as little more than a traditional play and a poor example of his theories. In fact, the play employs most of his theories, although diluted so as not to alienate his audience, for whom all this was radically new. The failure stems primarily, directly or indirectly, from Artaud's lack of monetary and artistic support, not the inability to translate theory into practice.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 8


3- The notes to the Oeuvres complètes (IV, 390) list the French translation as that of F. Rabbe (1887). An extensive search yielded only Tola Dorian's translation of 1883: Percy B. Shelley, Les Cenci, drame de Shelley, (Paris: A. Lemerre, 1883).


6- Knapp, p. 117.

7- As was mentioned earlier, Artaud was very sensitive to claims that he felt others should act violently. Cf. Chapter 3 of this study.

8- Knapp, p. 114.

9- Shelley, p. 12.
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11- Cf. Chapter 6 of this study.

12- Shelley, p. 18.

13- Blin's account is reproduced in Virmaux, pp. 280-298.

14- Knapp, p. 119.

15- Ibid.

16- See note 8, supra.

17- Ibid.

18- See the earlier reference to marijuana comic books in the notes to Chapter 7 of this study. (Note 12)

19- This reference to the charm's working is taken directly from Shelley. However, in that text Cenci sends Beatrice away; she does not flee.

20- The pair, of course, is the exact opposite of the Cenci-Beatrice union. Moreover, Lucretia shows great love for Bernardo in contrast to Cenci's hatred. Exhibiting parental versus sexual love, Lucretia rocks Bernardo.

21- Cf. Chapter 3 of this study.


23- As further evidence of cruelty's fundamentally secondary character, one need only note that Artaud did not immediately name his enterprise Théâtre de la Cruauté. Many other names were possibilities (e.g., Théâtre de l'Épreuve, de l'Asolu, Alchimique, Métaphysique, du Devenir (V, 142-153) and only after much deliberation did he choose this name.

24- Artaud said that les Cenci was an attack on the "antiquated notions" of "Society, order, Justice, Religion, family, and Country." (V, 241)
25- See the discussion of light/darkness in the discussion of _la Conquête du Mexique_ in Chapter 7.

26- Cf. the end of this chapter.

27- He uses the verb "polluer."

28- There are strong indications apart from this text that four is an important element here. In the variant scene given in the notes Beatrice goes down the stairs four steps at a time. Later in this scene Orsino counsels them that they must remain together, "four in the act."

29- Hayman has in fact taken the position that Artaud is a very medieval writer. Cf. Hayman, pp. 79-80 ff.

30- Cf. Eleanor Bulatkin, _Structural Arithmetic Metaphor in the Oxford "Roland"_ (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1972), pp. 3-22. In a private communication, Bulatkin suggested that the number four here may represent the four elements and, thus, matter versus the spiritual.

31- Cf. Note 6, IV, 407, for the more detailed instructions of another manuscript.

32- Cf. Chapter 5 (The Director) of this study.

33- In Shelley's text, the assassins strangle Cenci so as not to leave any blood. They then throw him out the window in order to make it seem that he has slipped and fallen. Stendhal has the assassins kill Artaud with the nail through the eye, and through the throat and Cenci is, again, thrown out the window. The matter of the cloak is interesting. Each seems to identify it differently. For Shelley, it belonged to Beatrice's grandfather and was a symbol of prosperity. Stendhal identifies it simply as one of Cenci's own. For Artaud, the cloak also furnishes overtones of religious corruption, for he makes it look like a chasuble.

34- The underlining is my own.

35- The underlining is my own.

36- Shelley, p. 82.

37- This is another good example of Artaud's variance of certain stimulus conditions to achieve quite a different response in the spectator.
38- Hayman, p. 98. An account and picture of the torture are given in the pictures in the middle of Virmaux's book.

39- This idea that the separated parts each carry the memory or imprint of the other half and that they will reunite is found, for example, in Hugo's 1854 poem "Ce que dit la Bouche d'ombre," (in Les Contemplations). Here he explains the reasons for evil's existence and that all matter is gradually moving up the ladder to reintegration with God, or good. The concept is also found in the Chinese conception of ying/yang and in the Christian tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

40- This is the only Incan reference in the play, and its use is representative of pagan religion in general, not of the Incan religion.

41- The emphasis Artaud puts on the ritualistic way in which Beatrice meets her death finds its roots in most accounts of her death. Stendhal, like so many others, spends a great (and disproportionate) amount of time and space to recreate in detail the religious nature of her death. He mentions the prayers she said before death, when she confessed, how the procession to the execution was formed and processed, and so on. The purpose was to demonstrate the Catholic piety of this martyr. Artaud's quite opposed end was to denounce the Church and bring to the spectator's attention the real, underlying metaphysical truths (which happen to be at the heart of pagan religion). The technique was, thus, the same, but the ends quite different.

42- Esslin, Artaud, p. 40.

43- Gouhier, p. 122.

44- Esslin, Artaud, p. 42.

45- It is a tribute to his artistic genius that he made the transition from so complex a theory to reality as well as he did.

46- Esslin, Artaud, p. 92.
47- A very mundane example of this is a person's repeatedly coughing during the banquet scene. The probability of this activity increases with audience size. A more complex example is varying audience reaction to stimuli. While 98% of the public may find the storm terrifying, the other 2% may laugh. As audience size increases, so does the total magnitude of the response, although the percentage may remain constant. This is a problem for all directors, but it must especially be confronted by Artaud, for whom success comes only with total participation of the person.


49- See Chapter 6 of this study.
PART IV:

CONCLUSION
One of the almost inescapable burdens of every critic or commentator of Artaud is to somehow explain why Artaud, the man and the theories, has recently been so important and influential. In most cases, the rationales are adequate, but less than satisfying. The man has been and is immensely popular and influential, yet there are no easy reasons to point to for this success.

As Virmaux points out, Artaud really originated very little of the theatrical innovations associated with his theater. He did not start the total spectacle, nor the theater in the round, nor the process of deemphasis of words. In far more practical ways, others were reshaping the theater by devaluation of the word and redefinition of the scope of theatrical language: Dulín, Copeau, Baty, Pitoeff, in France, Craig in Ireland and Appia in Switzerland, Stanislavsky and Meyerhold in Russia, Brecht, Piscator in Germany, Reinhart in Sweden.

Despite the non-originality of his ideas, there is some measure of greatness in Artaud; yet the reasons for it are still vague. Virmaux suggests Artaud's contribution lies in a sort of mystical suffering and salvation:

La véritable originalité historique d'Artaud n'est pas dans son œuvre. Pas non plus dans sa vie; elle réside plutôt dans une sorte de lien nécessaire entre sa souffrance et sa revendication.
Sellin feels the deep goal of his theater was the

...piercing of civilization... to get to the elemental culture, to cease to observe our acts and rather be led by them, for Artaud "envisioned a theater which did not numb us with ideas for the intellect, but stirred us to feeling by stirring up pain." 5

Surely a large part of his popularity today, as Sontag points out 6, lies in the fact that he had espoused so many of the trends of the sixties: drugs, mysticism, interest in the Orient, social revolution, the devaluation of logic and language. In the end one must point to the fact that Artaud was a success at what he set out to do. He found through his theater a way of life, the consummate act of living, one which he practiced and one which still has influence today. Artaud uncovered the great myths of theater and took them to the limits of the possible. In so doing he became a martyr to the mythical and was imprisoned as one of society's madmen.

This study has not sought to dispute with such claims nor to discredit them. Rather, the aim has been to demonstrate, by means of an analysis based on modern psychology, that from within the lengthy writings on theater which are often vague, lofty, and visionary, there emerges a very concrete, well-developed, revolutionary plan for a revitalized theater. In addition to ascribing Artaud's success to the influence of his metaphysical visions and theories, one can now point to a very novel, pragmatic method for spreading non-intellectual knowledge.
Among the first to recognize the difference between bodily-learned truth (shaped by contingencies) and mentally-learned truth (governed by rules), Artaud thought he could communicate the knowledge he had gained bodily while taking drugs, while enduring severe pain, and while experiencing foreign cultures. His goal was clearly therapeutic: to restore a sick culture to health. He tried to replicate the disorientation produced by drugs and pain as a first step. The cruelty he used to accomplish this undid the effects of socialization and encouraged people to act in new, forgotten, or forbidden ways. Furthermore, Artaud thought theater must expose people, not in a didactic manner, but experientially, to new, sensually-learned truths by the controlled use of very diverse, concrete, physical stimuli. His esteem for foreign cultures and religions sprang both from his belief that they already possessed many of these truths and that their rites provided means of demonstrating the knowledge. Rather than translate these cultures wholly, he adapted their polysensual techniques in order to allow Western man to respond and ultimately be rewarded in ways most appropriate to his environment.

What Artaud did was neither insane nor hopelessly idealistic, for it found its foundations in later, legitimate science. Because of the research of modern psychologists, especially B. F. Skinner, the outline of a behavioral change plan in Artaud's work is quite clear. Artaud's
plan essentially follows basic principles established by modern psychology for changing behavior. After assessing the problem and defining the target behavior, Artaud first weakens or extinguishes the undesired responses by changing the physiological state of the organism. Then, by presenting multiple stimuli, each having the potential of evoking multiple, related responses, the director tries to bring forth new or weak responses and strengthen them by reinforcement. This reinforcement consists of immediate changes in the subjects' environment as well as adding behaviors to their repertoire which may secure greater or more useful reinforcement for them at a later time. The entire process constitutes a means of changing behavior defined as maladaptive within a theatrical setting. As such, Artaud's work stands as one of the first formulations and uses of a large-scale system of applied behavioral therapy.

The severest reproaches that a modern day behavioral psychologist could make against Artaud's theater as a system of change lie in the area of reinforcement. The exact kind of reinforcement for exhibiting behavior and the stimulus dimensions of the reinforcer are ill-defined. Thus, the director has little control over either the quality of the reinforcer or its magnitude. A more serious problem, though is the delay between behavior and reward. A well documented fact of behavioral psychology is that delays in reinforcement, especially long ones, tend to reduce future responding to
the stimuli involved (i.e., reduce stimulus control). While some reinforcement does occur within Artaud's theatrical setting immediately after behavior, it is likely that the principal reinforcement comes quite a bit later, in the course of living. The link between response and reinforcement may, then, be very weak and the spectator may never increase his ability to engage in metaphysical behavior at the theater or may simply never return to the theater. There is the additional problem that the reinforcer may not be great enough to outweigh the certain strong conditioned and unconditioned punishing effects of the cruel stimuli. In such a case, the probability of occurrence of the target behavior diminishes. For these reasons, Artaud's method of change might be criticized today on rigid methodological grounds.

Artaud's work (in retrospect) not only derives its own measure of psychological validity from Skinner's work, but, on the other hand, just as importantly lends validity to Skinner's work. Much of Skinner's experimentation was done with infra-human species and is still being confirmed today with humans. Artaud had already designed and attempted to implement many of the same systems for human beings. Moreover, independently, Artaud devised a system of therapy (albeit not as concise or scientific) similar to those drawn from Skinner's work today. The fact that these two separate minds from separate generations and cultures deduced many
of the same principles lends further credibility to Skinner's later explanation of human behavior.

At best, the technique of behavioral analysis has not only elucidated Artaud's dramaturgy further for the reader but will also encourage him to ponder other topics or authors amenable to a behavioral analysis. Certainly, those writers who are essentially monist (or not strongly dualist) in orientation would benefit from this kind of study. Beckett, Rabelais, and Proust, for example, all heavily stress the interdependence of body and mind as well as the importance of external physical stimuli upon the body. A behavioral analysis could serve as an easily grasped structure for understanding these factors.

Skinnerian behavioral analyses could readily include analyses of those who deal with the problems of language. One would exclude almost all who used words solely as a vehicle of communication of ideas. A mentalist psychology can more profitably deal with them. However, for a large group of authors, words communicate ideas not only because of the objects they denote but also because of their vast connotations. A behavioral analysis might pinpoint why and how a Racine can write *feu* or a Pascal write *mystère* and conjure up a whole wealth of meaning. Often, it is the case that words do not open up like a fan into myriad meanings but instead a whole complex facet of life is
summed up by just one word or expression; a behavioral analysis, by investigating the surrounding linguistic environment and history of the author and public, may show how or why a particular expression words its "magic." One might just discover more fully what *le mot juste* of Flaubert was exactly and study the mechanisms which underpin his technique.

In much the same way as the "expanded connotation" authors have weakened the link between the word and its object, Ferdinand de Saussure's later day literary and linguistic followers have tried to restructure contemporary language. Given Skinner's analysis of the development and maintenance of everyday language⁹, their polemic becomes much more understandable, as does Artaud's own. A detailed Skinnerian study would show the advantages and disadvantages of the efforts to restructure conventional communication in this century.

Any performed literature is a vast territory open to exploration with behavioral methods. Epic poetry, songs (e.g., *aubades*), recited poetry and speeches, as well as theater, fall into this realm. In all of them there is overt interplay between audience and creator. The audience responds to what the author has done, and then changes are made, either in the current production or in the author's later work. This is basically the operant behavior paradigm. A very valuable overview history of the theater might be written by concentrating on the key elements upon which this analysis
of Artaud centers (the environment, the S-R relationship, the $S^R$ or $S^P$'s, etc.). It would be interesting to see which methods were the most successful in influencing people to behave or believe a certain way.

The actual analysis of Artaud's case suggests three other literary topics which could be investigated and more fully explicated by the techniques of behavioral analysis.

First, behavioral analysis might profitably be extended to the mystical writers, the seers, and the visionaries of literature. St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Theresa, Pascal, and many others\(^\text{10}\) fall into this group. Like Artaud, they describe ideas, events, or experiences outside the normal realm. Their mystical behavior is often contingency-shaped rather than rule-governed. Their truths come from attending to atypical stimuli. A behavioral analysis which traces the development of these ideas or describes those uncustornary stimuli or stimulus aspects which control the mystical responses may provide a surer footing for the student trying to understand the mystic or the dynamics of mysticism.

Likewise, other writers who tried to communicate their experiences in literary form after taking drugs might benefit from this type of treatment. One thinks immediately of Baudelaire and Rimbaud, but they are only the beginning of a long list: Verlaine, Lautréamont, Nerval, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Mallarmé, and many others, especially those
artists of nineteenth century Europe, where taking drugs was very fashionable as well as medically recommended. While they are often classified as seers or mystics, and would be analyzed in an almost identical manner, their use of drugs remains a significant distinguishing variable. Some typical effects of drugs are known, including how they alter response probability and stimulus control, and more and more effects are being reported. The investigation of these writers would, then, include a search for similar effects.

Finally, there is the subject of cruelty itself. Artaud's use of cruelty is markedly different from the norm; it is part of a curative process rather than a destructive process. While it is in line with modern sensibility to shock the observer in order to get his attention, the process need not remain at this superficial level. Some who use cruelty on stage, in film, or in print may be using cruelty for its liberating properties as Artaud did. The techniques of behavioral analysis might help one uncover and understand such uses as authentic attempts at behavioral change.

Artaud sought to cure a culture and himself with his theater, and thus move civilization along one step further. Skinner defines cultures as a very potent force:

As a set of contingencies of reinforcement maintained by a group, possibly formulated in rules or laws, it has a clear cut
physical status, a continuing existence beyond the lives of the members of the group, a changing pattern as practices are added, discarded, or modified, and, above all, power. A culture so defined controls the behavior of the members of the group that practices it. (AB, 223)

Furthermore, Skinner says that a successful society reinforces behavior which maintains the society. (CRF, 41) Artaud makes the very poignant case that this very maintenance activity may bring instead the death of a culture. His life and words are a warning to society to listen to its "madmen", the prophets who have successfully thwarted its control, for they may indeed be the ones who can restore a culture to life.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1- His popularity is attested to, for example, by repeated references to him in the New York Times Arts and Leisure section. Two recent examples were: Richard Gilman, "Out Goes Absurdism--In Comes the New Naturalism," The New York Times, 19 March 1978, Section 2, pp. 6, 36; Edward Herbst, "Sacred Art on Tour--Benefits and Hazards," The New York Times, 12 February 1978, Section 2, p. 36. Another proof of his popularity is Marowitz's new play, "Artaud at Rodez", based in part on his article of the same name.

2- Virmaux, p. 170.

3- Marc-Vigier, p. 21. Cf. also chapter 2 of this study.

4- Virmaux, p. 171.

5- Sellin, p. 105.

6- Sontag, p. lviii

7- Millenson, pp. 364-365.


10- See Chapter 1 of Bays' The Orphic Vision for a fuller listing.
APPENDIX
GLOSSARY OF BEHAVIORAL TERMS

I. Abbreviations used for Behavioral Terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Conditioned Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Conditioned Stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr(R)</td>
<td>Response Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Discriminative Stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S*</td>
<td>Punisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Reinforcer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Unconditioned Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCS</td>
<td>Unconditioned Stimulus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Definitions of Terms used in the Text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Rate</td>
<td>Frequency of response prior to manipulation; &quot;natural&quot; response rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned Punisher</td>
<td>Stimulus which has the properties of punishers only after paired presentation with that punisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned Reinforcer</td>
<td>Stimulus which has the properties of reinforcer only after paired presentation with that reinforcer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned Stimulus</td>
<td>A stimulus which, after pairings with an unconditioned stimulus, elicits a conditioned response when it is presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioned Response</td>
<td>A response which is elicited by a conditioned stimulus after pairings of the unconditioned and conditioned stimuli. Usually the conditioned response is similar to, if not indistinguishable from, the unconditioned response, though the two are not the same, strictly speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning</td>
<td>(Operant) Strengthening operant behavior by making its emission by the subject more probable or frequent. (Respondent) Increasing the magnitude of the response elicited by conditioned stimulus and shortening the time between stimulus and response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequate</td>
<td>To provide consequences contingent upon behavior. This general term may indicate either punishment or reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency-shaped Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior which is shaped by the environment without any intervening verbal instructions. This type of behavior is often characterized as &quot;natural.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Situation wherein subject responds in the presence of one stimulus or stimulus set and not in the presence of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminative Stimulus</td>
<td>Stimulus in the presence of which a given response is reinforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction</td>
<td>Withholding of reinforcement for responses previously reinforced with a resultant decrease in response probability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operant Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior which changes in frequency when a given consequence is made contingent upon the emission of certain behaviors. Operant behavior usually involves striped muscles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punisher</td>
<td>Stimulus or event presented at the time of response emission with a resultant decrease in response probability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflex</td>
<td>See &quot;Unconditioned Response.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcer</td>
<td>Stimulus or event presented at the time of response emission with a resultant increase in response probability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior which changes in magnitude because of repeated pairings of the unconditioned and conditioned stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response (operant)</td>
<td>A single instance of operant behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Probability</td>
<td>Probability that behavior will be emitted under designated stimulus conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule-governed Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior which is shaped or controlled by forms of verbal behavior, such as rules, laws, instructions, proverbs, adages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus</td>
<td>An object or event which has an effect or potential effect on one (or more) of the bodily senses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus Generalization</td>
<td>Situation where responding occurs to stimuli different from the previously conditioned stimulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tact</td>
<td>&quot;A verbal operant in which a response of given form is evoked (or at least strengthened) by a particular object or event or property of an object or event.&quot; (VB, 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditioned Response</td>
<td>A response which is elicited by an unconditioned stimulus when it is presented. No prior conditioning history is relevant, as this response is typical to any member of the species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditioned Stimulus</td>
<td>A stimulus which elicits a response (reflex) usually involving the smooth muscles or glands. No prior conditioning history is relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Behavior</td>
<td>Behavior of a &quot;speaker&quot; to which the &quot;listener&quot; responds in ways &quot;conditioned precisely in order to reinforce the behavior of the 'speaker.&quot; (VB, 224-226)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Works by Antonin Artaud.


Since the works are not arranged in chronological order in these volumes, the following listing of major writings may prove helpful.

1913-1923: Premières Proses (I*)
            Premiers Poèmes (I*)

1921-1932: Textes surréalistes et lettres (I*, III)

1923: Tric-Trac du Ciel (I)
      Bilboquet issues (I)

1924-1935: Poèmes (I*)

1924: Correspondance avec Rivière (I)
      "L'Evolution du Décor" (I)

1925: la Revue Surréaliste (editor, I)
      L'Ombilic des Limbes (I)
      Les Pèse-Nègres (I)
      Fragments d'un Journal d'Enfer (I)
      "Les 18 Secondes" (III)

1926: "Le Théâtre Alfred Jarry" and related writings (II)
      "Le Théâtre Alfred Jarry, Première saison: 1926-1927" (II)

1927: "Manifeste pour un théâtre avorté" (II)
      "La Coquille et le Clergyman" and other screenplays (III)
      "A la grande nuit ou le bluff surréaliste" (I)
      L'Art et la Mort (I*)
1930: "La Révolte du Boucher" (III)

1931: La Pierre philosophale (II)
     "Sur le Théâtre Balinais" (IV)
     Le Moine (adaptation) (VI)

1932: Il n'y a plus de firmament (II)
     "La Mise en scène et la Métaphysique" (IV)
     "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté: Premier Manifeste" (IV)

1933: "Le Théâtre et la Peste" (IV)
     La Conquête du Mexique (IV, V)
     "En finir avec les chef-d'oeuvres" (IV)

1934: "Appel à la jeunesse" (VIII)
     "Héliogabale ou l'Anarchiste couronne" (VII)

1935: Les Cenci (IV, V)
     "Un Athlétisme affectif" (IV)
     "Théâtre oriental et théâtre occidental" (IV)
     "Le Mexique et la civilisation" (VIII)

1936: Articles for El Nacional Revolucionario (VIII)
     "Le Théâtre de séraphin" (IV)

1936-1948: Les Tarahumaras (IX)

1937: Nouvelles Révélations de l'Être (VII)

1938: Le Théâtre et son Double (IV)

1943-1946: Lettres de Rodez (IX, X, XI)

1946: "Préambule" (to Oeuvres Complètes) (I*)
     Ci-git précédé de la Culture Indienne (XII)

1947: Van Gogh, le suicide de la société (XIII)
     Le Retour d'Artaud, le «Omo» (XII)
     Pour en finir avec le jugement de Dieu (XIII)
     "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté" (XIII)


II. Selected List of Works about Artaud (those used in this study and related works).

A. Books


B. Articles.


Kristeva, Julia. "Le sujet en procès." Tel Quel, No. 52 (Winter, 1972), 12-30.


----------. "Artaud's Use of Shelley's The Cenci: The Experiment in the 'Théâtre de la Cruauté.'" Revue de la Littérature Comparée, 46 (1972), 128-34.


----------. "La Dramaturgie d'Antonin Artaud." Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature, 9, No. 2 (1971), 171-90.


"Le Mythe d'Artaud." (Review) Times Literary Supplement, 8 May 1969, 489.


----------. "L'état Artaud." Tel Quel, No. 52 (Winter, 1972), 3-11.


---------. "Entendre/Voir/Lire." Tel Quel, No. 39, 31-63.

III. Behavioral Psychology Texts (those used in this study and related works.)


IV. Other Useful Works.


