

Stage Figures in Tadeusz Kantor's Theatre as an Element of Building of Image¹

Paweł Stangret

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University

ps.stangret@gmail.com

Keywords:

History. Maria Stangret. Theatre of Death. Tadeusz Kantor.

Abstract:

Tadeusz Kantor has written a lot of texts that provide context for his performances. In these writings he suggests directions for the interpretation of his theatre. One of the elements of building the discourse of his own art is referring to history, undertaking historical reflection in his writings and media statements. This is connected with introducing historical figures to the stage. During the «Theatre of Death» period, characters drawn from tradition and history were played by the artist's wife, Maria Stangret. Referring to history was part of the creation of the artistic image. He was an avant-garde artist - still writing manifestos (he was aware of the archaic nature of this gesture). On the other hand, an artist deeply rooted in tradition and history.

Figuras escénicas en el teatro de Tadeusz Kantor como elemento de construcción de imagen

Palabras clave:

Historia. Maria Stangret. Teatro de la muerte. Tadeusz Kantor.

Resumen:

Tadeusz Kantor escribió muchos textos que proporcionan contexto para sus actuaciones. En estos escritos sugiere orientaciones para la interpretación de su teatro. Uno de los elementos de la construcción del discurso de su propio arte es la referencia a la historia, realizando una reflexión histórica en sus escritos y comunicados. Esto está relacionado con la introducción de personajes históricos en el escenario. Durante el período del «Teatro de la Muerte», la esposa del artista, Maria Stangret, interpretó a personajes extraídos de la tradición y la historia. La referencia a la historia fue parte de la creación de la imagen artística. Era un artista de vanguardia, todavía escribía manifiestos (era consciente de la naturaleza arcaica de este gesto). Por otro lado, un artista profundamente arraigado en la tradición y la historia.

¹ This article is the result of researches funded by the National Science Center as part of the project: *Artist as a Text. Identity Creation of the Director as Commentary to the Performance*, nr UMO-2014/13/D/HS2/02842.

Tadeusz Kantor very often described himself as an avant-garde artist. He spoke of himself as the heir to the movements that initiated new art. Kantor, persuading avant-garde character of his work, wrote many texts. The author has placed his performances in the context of his own manifestos, theoretical deliberations, essays and scores of spectacles, Cricotages and happening. It is worth noting that he used literary genres that allowed him to write in the first person, «from himself», in his own name. This coincides with the image of the private, intimate, personal character of his art. However, in these texts (and here we should also add a lot of media statements –interviews, documented meetings with the audience, etc.), he reflects on the tradition that shaped him. His texts are often written «in defense of» tradition –among others, Stanisław Wyspiański, the heritage of Romanticism, but also the avant-garde from the first half of the 20th century.

The texts comment on the performances by referring to tradition. This is a way of self-creation, based on the cultural code (Wyspiański, Witkacy, Brecht, Mickiewicz, etc.). Suggesting intertextual relations has a persuasive character. It does not so much explain individual stage solutions as it creates a certain identity. Thus not only two texts are updated, but above all the cultural narrative associated with the prototext (its meaning, function in culture and role in the theatre tradition). Not only it is updated, but mainly the way of thinking about theatre. At once it was refreshing the problems of history and discourse of figures from the past. Such wide area of problems noticed in Kantor's writings refers to the problem of tradition, common, national tradition –and, of course– to the ways of talking about it.

On the example of historical figures played by Maria Stangret, I wanted to show the artist's reception and transfer of tradition, as well as the ways of creating it in the context of identity discourse. It is based on the fact that the director's texts mainly contain threads that build his artistic and personal tradition, public, or more precisely: the identity being made public. Thus, Kantor shows himself as an artist aware of his own history and his



place in it. It should be added that the artist does it in the period of his success, when his art found audiences almost all over the world. This is very characteristic of Kantor's art: the tension between individuality, individual, personal experience, and universality, the possibility to perceive also outside the context of a familiar tradition. These issues are also important for the poetics of the work. A dichotomy of the originality of the creative language with a simultaneous possibility to read it. This is important in the case of Tadeusz Kantor, an artist who has worked so hard on self-commentary, on creating a discourse on his own work. The case of this artist perfectly shows the characteristic feature of avant-garde art in general. It is about the relation between the work of art and self-commentary.

Tadeusz Kantor, according to his theory, transformed personal experience into a work of art. This is important, especially when creating historical figures. In Kantor's performances, they were not introduced on the basis of an iconic similarity. In this sense, they differed from circulating images. This would be the specificity of his «heresy» (that's the term of the artist himself). But what was the purpose of these deformations? There is no doubt that the use of the image he has created is at the same time a change in the perception not only of this character, but also in his discourse. The departure from the usual interpretations of history caused that e.g. *Wiadomo Kto* (Knowing Who) from the performance was accused of breaking the community code. However, this image is firmly established in tradition and, contrary to appearances, shows the artist's contribution to the general cultural debate.

«The aim of historical writing is to confuse rather than to spread out», said Hayden White [2009: 11]. By introducing modified images on stage, Kantor forces the viewer to reflect on history and memory, to launch the discourses of these characters. It is also worth adding that these characters (apart from Rabinek) explain themselves only in the visual narration of the performance. They do not in any way belong to the logic of the world of the performance. Why does in *Wielopole, Wielopole* Kantor



introduce a character from later times into the staffage of World War I? Similarly, Józef Piłsudski does not correspond with the play about Wit Stwosz and his artistic heritage.

The obvious arbitrariness of such decisions is dictated by the logic of the artist's individual memory. Kantor acts here in a similar way to medieval chroniclers, for whom the very value of the written word and the gesture of writing down forced readers to reflect on the past and its value [Germek, 1978]. However, the privacy of history in the performances of the Theatre of Death has another purpose. The indiscriminate experience, the personal way of remembering stands in opposition to official historiography, is a breakthrough in scientifically proven «knowledge» about the past. Kantor is in line with the trends of the time in the way of writing about history. However, such a private look at the past has its consequences in the form of the disappearance of history as a whole, community discourse [Ankersmit, 2004]. Kantor breaks down official languages in order to show his interpretation. At the same time, with this gesture, he shows that he is very firmly embedded in this history. This was important, especially in communist Poland, when history was subject to many abuses by politicians. Katarzyna Fazan noticed that used by Kantor military terminology and metaphors was feature of his personality [Fazan, 2019]. He was confrontable person and artist, and Fazan calls this attitude, being «against to» political strategy. Of course this style of confrontation was important in social area, but also in poetics of his work.

So, as I mentioned, there were two elements important in Tadeusz Kantor's theatrical activity. One of them was the use of characters and motifs taken from tradition –either literary or historical. Examples include the figure of Stanisław Wyspiański introduced in Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz's *Szewcy* (*The Shoemakers*), or the inclusion of Witkacy and Bruno Schulz in the list of characters («Participants of séance») in *The Dead Class*. Another important characteristic of the artist's activity was the written (usually *ex-post*) scores for the performances. These two elements



were particularly intense in the last period of his work, during the creation of the Theatre of Death.

These scores are neither an explanation of the performance nor a record of it. It also wasn't textual kind of documentation of spectacles (director didn't trust to the audiovisual records). Kantor, in a specific delimitation of the text (scores are some kind of poetic treatises),² wrote a literary version of the stage work. That is why the description of characters is so important. Sometimes there are differences from the stage production. I would like to focus on the three roles he assigned to his wife, Maria Stangret, in these plays, and above all, what results from the descriptions of these characters in the scores. An important cause for dealing with this subject is that all the characters played by Maria Stangret are characters drawn from tradition, either history or literature. The subject of my article will be the roles of an actress in *Dead Class*, *Wielopole*, *Wielopole*, and *Let the Artists Die*.

It will also be important to analyze the relationship between the role's stage productions and its descriptions in the scores. Thanks to this it will turn out that Kantor's comments were part of his communication strategy. Thus, references to tradition in these artistic projects will become visible. At the same time, a comparison of two languages of creating artistic reality –theatrical and literary– will show, how Kantor influenced the ways his art should be interpreted.

The Dead Class, the first performance of the Theatre of Death from 1975 is based on a text from *Tumor Mózgowicz* by Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz. Kantor, of course, does not stage the drama, but, by of the his main idea, conducts two actions. «Next to the action of the text, there must be an action of stage» [Kantor, 2005: 58]. In this performance it is more important to combine two types of characters. Kantor's figures are mixed with the characters of the Witkiewicz's drama, «they have been programmed by it» [Kantor, 2004: 92]. Maybe it's another reminiscence –a

² See: P. Stangret, 2014.



memory of a school staging. However, this is impossible to define in terms of realistic, «life». It is worth mentioning that this term (and its negative meaning) Kantor took over from Witkacy's theories. Historical value of this character, historicity of it is effect of arbitrary decision of artist, who forces the receiver to read this figure as element of common history. Mixing the known character and figure from Kantor's imagination is interesting to see, how director shaped his communication. Completely new, strange, original *Kobieta z Mechaniczną Kołyską* (Woman with Mechanical Cradle) is possible to be read on the base of common code –taken from the history of literature. New stage aesthetic is reachable for audience –and this feedback was always important for Kantor.

I have already mentioned that Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz is one of the «Participants of the séance», which in the theatrical practice (to be precise, in the convention of communicating the performance) means, that he is included in the list of characters. The important question is in what sense Witkacy is present in the list of characters. Of course, it is not because his text was used. Fragments of the drama, individual sentences, mixed dialogs between characters, the total incompatibility of the world presented and the staging, in a word, a fully post-dramatic treatment of the dramatic prototext [Lehmann, 2006] best proves that the author of *Tumor Mózgowicz* is not only mentioned here as the author of the drama. So, why does Kantor distinguish him so much? Why is Witkacy even invited to the performance? Of course it is all in the literary, metatextual level (without the score of guide for the spectacle, it is impossible to know about Witkacy's presence).

It seems significant that recaling of Witkacy is a message addressed to the audience – apart from purely scenic means, by a literary text. After all, the score opens with a summary of the play, which is in no way reflected on the level of the performance. Kantor therefore recalls Witkacy as a kind of patron, as an author important to him, as another reminiscence of the dead past. In a word, Kantor here recalls Witkacy as the author –but not of a specific (stage deformed) drama (prototext), but as the creator of a



peculiar dramatic aesthetic, and above all, the director here refers to the legend of Witkacy. This can be well seen in the construction of the characters, especially *Kobiety z Mechaniczną Kołyską –Rozhumatyny* (Women with Mechanical Cradle – Rozhulantyna), because this is full name of this character.

Kantor presents it in a description which is a paraphrase of Witkacy's literary style. In this way, he refers to Witkacy's legend, to the legendary reception of his female characters as vamps. Paradoxically, he strips the heroine of the sexuality, typical of the drama's characters by a writer. Kantor adds to her rich past. She is an old lady, a victim of a school joke of putting her on a gynecological chair. In the reality of the theatre (which Kantor has very often postulated) the birth actually took place. Instead of a child, there are wooden balls, whose knocking in the cradle-coffin is one of the main elements rhythmizing the performance. At the same time, the grotesque infanticide from the drama is shown here through an allusion to the tragedy of Jewish mothers murdering children during the Holocaust (probably in necessity to keep silence while in hiding). She transformed to the symbol of Jewish tragedy.

The piled up grotesque of the performance is the means by which Kantor operates to evoke the impression of horror. This is where Kantor's «playing with Witkacy» is hidden, as the director cuts himself off from the modernist tradition of the staging vamps. This whole complicated characteristic of *Rozhulantyna* cannot, of course, be used as an interpretation of the characters from the drama. The above information is given to the reader of the score (in this case it was created much later than the premiere). In the stage layer, however, it is visible that this character is the one leading the stage action. Thus Witkacy's drama, or more precisely the construction of this character, becomes another reminiscence, a dead memory. However, she is not a character from a grotesque drama. Kantor shows how much the literary tradition can become material, how through memories and analogies it can equate with historical figures.



In his next performance Kantor assigned three roles for his wife. Here you can already see the complexity of the whole theatrical structure. Maria Stangret played the role of Ciotka Mańka (Auntie Mańka –one of the family members), as well as a character named Wiadomo kto (Knowing Who) and Rabinek (Rabbi). While in the whole structure of *Wielopole, Wielopole*, it is easy to place one of the aunts and the rabbi from his hometown, the introduction of the third character makes one wonder. Another important fact is that the figure of Wiadomo Kto appears in the next play *Let the artists Die* from 1985. The role of the other two characters is also important for the whole construction of the performance.

Ciotka Mańka, a devotee, notoriously quoting descriptions of the Passion of Christ, as well as the Apocalypse, gives an impression of being completely immersed in her religious fanaticism, although within the aesthetics of «The Reality of the Lowest Rank», one has to say about her madness. However, it plays an important role in the structure of the performance. The quotations from the Bible rhythmize the performance and at the same time mark out its individual parts. It is also important that it is Ciotka Mańka who becomes the main leader of suffering of Matka Helka (Mother Helka). It is she who takes over Pilate's role –for the figure set on Golgotha (made from the kitchen stool).

For the construction of *Wielopole, Wielopole* is also important that quotations from the Bible mix with elements of the Catholic liturgy of Holy Thursday and Good Friday. «Ominous» [Kantor, 2004: 246] –as the score says– giving the next hours is the best example of this. Kantor introduces this element very precisely. Ciotka Mańka quotes Pilate, while at the same time organizing Mother's Christological slaughter, becomes a narrator in reading the Passion of Christ during Good Friday's ritual. Raised in the rectory, Kantor knew the Catholic liturgy perfectly well and admitted to his fascination with it many times.



The «Cricot mass»³ presented in this way –as the artist often said– puts Kantor's memory even more in the reality of his own childhood. At the same time, through a familiar code, it becomes easier to be read by the audience. The liturgical frame of the staging proves that recalling the «dear abs» is a ritual, which in turn means that it is cyclical, that it is not a one-off screening. Moreover, the ritual assumes a community character. Therefore history enters the «Room of Imagination». In talking about history is also tension between common and individual interpretation.

An important construction element of the show is the army. The unified man, uniformed, became one of the main theoretical base (written in the commentaries) in the creation of this spectacle. At the same time, the army also has an important stage function. The collective character directly refers to the tradition of avant-garde theatre. Above all, it refers to Witkacy's deliberations –the collective figure of *Czterdziestu Mandelbaumów* (Forty Mandelbaums) z *Nadoboniś i koczkodanów* (*Lovelies and Dowdies*)– Kantor processed in his staging in 1973. On the other hand, it is a reference to the biomechanical practices of Vsevolod Meyerhold, who was fascinated by human geometric figures during parades –at least that is how it results from the reception of the Russian in Kantor's theoretical writings (in his last, not-ended spectacle *Dziś są moje urodziny*⁴ director placed in the stage character of Meyerhold, who read his authentic letter to Stalin in Russian).

When writing about history in the Theatre of Death, it is a paradox. It is analogous to the basic dichotomy for *Wielopole, Wielopole*. It is the problem of individuality and universality. On the one hand, Kantor creates a performance about his hometown, a «hole near Rzeszów», as he described it, on the other hand, it is obvious that it may be understood by New York,⁵ but on the other hand his spectacle had universal meaning. It is similar with the soldiers on stage. On the one hand, it is a very accurate reproduction of a

³ Tadeusz Kantor very often described his theatre as a blasphemous, cricot mass, cricot ritual.

⁴ *Today is my Birthday* from 1990.

⁵ Kantor's utterance in movie *Kantor. The Inspired Tyrant* by Tadeusz Białko (1997).



family photograph depicting Marian Kantor-Mirski (father of Tadeusz) from the time of the fighting on the front of World War I. The precision of the costumes is very important here, the details of the uniform of the particular regiment where the artist's father served have been saved.⁶ Thus, one can see here a very Kantor's theatrical means, when the stage reality, through personal experience, becomes real, reproduced (the problem of the replica as a dummy is another theoretical base of the performance). At the same time, such a situation is introduced into a universal context –it is open to meanings, it becomes a symbol, a metaphor, a very strong carrier of meaning.

Despite the costumes which clearly indicate the historical period of World War I, it is worth asking the question of what kind of soldiers perform in the play. Embedding the performance in the liturgy of the Paschal Triduum has another important function. Soldiers from the First World War become at the same time the army taking part in the crucifixion. Thus, the iconography and aesthetics of Roman soldiers crucifying Christ is recalled. Here reference is made to the iconography of the cross, which should be «supplemented» by the image of the army. At the same time, mixing the aesthetics, Kantor shows the cruelty of the army as its timeless characteristic.

It is worth noting that Kantor here avoids the aesthetics of the army. He is not interested in the tension between aesthetics and ethics. He rather shows the army as stigmatized with the paradox of inflicting death and dying. The farewell scene of the frontal leaves has been directly quoted from the last century iconography. The soldiers leaving in the wagon are juxtaposed with the naked bodies of the victims covered with ground. Similarly, *Adaś*, who is mobilized after the crucifixion –soldier is a «kind of man», who bears the traces of his death. At the same time, he becomes cruel– both in the Roman and the 20th century armies.

⁶ Justyna Michalik-Tomala noticed that it is the only situation in Kantor's theatre, such preciously costumes. It was uniforms of II Brygada Legionów Polskich (The II Brigade of Polish Legions) from 1914. See: J. Michalik-Tomala, 2019.



In this context, the figure of Wiadomo kto appears on stage. «This gentleman» –these are the terms from the score, «in a well-known uniform» is Heinrich Himmler. It is precisely emphasized in the text of the score, that it is Ciotka Mańka who cover-dresses as the SS commander. Visually, there is no similarity in this form. Kantor does not recall the image of Himmler here. This figure is quite hidden, it is not obvious, when it comes to recalling World War II. However, the Nazi's name itself is mentioned only in the *Director's Notes* attached to the score. It is deeply hidden from the viewer, it's reachable only for the reader of Kantor's writings.

The important are tasks of Wiadomo kto on stage. After entering, this character takes part in a grotesque etude with Wujowie (Uncles). Wanting to honor a high military dignitary, they want to sit him in a chair between them. However, by moving the chairs all the time, they block his access to the seat. When he finally sits down (not on the chair, because the awkwardness of the Uncles completely destroys the military ceremonial, but between the chairs), he is in silent. The Uncles say: «to sprawa Mańki» (*this is Mańka's thing*), and then like him/her slaughterers, the Uncles make a selection –they choose between the Książdz's (*Priest's*) dummy and the actor playing this character between «false and real». They are mistaken, as a result of it, he is sentenced to execution (the soldiers beat him with bayonets one by one). The army is called here by the knockers, which are in the hands of «ten pan» (*this gentleman*) and Uncles. Like in the liturgy of Holy Thursday, this is an introduction to the torment. Wiadomo kto will appear once again and carry out the «last drill» by issuing gibberish commands (but German sounding) ending in «hau, hau» (*woof, woof*). According to the score, this is a reference to the Old-Roman records, according to which the Huns used a language resembling dog barking.

There are two questions. Why did Kantor reach for Himler's character and why is it that Ciotka Mańka dresses up as him? Kantor writes that Ciotka Mańka «dressed up in a uniform we know from somewhere. But we won't name a uniform or a person. It would be too easy and would only



serve the imagination of fools» [Kantor, 2004: 246]. By doing so, Kantor wants to avoid unambiguous identification. He shows horror, a concrete historical figure, while at the same time universalizing it, depriving it of concreteness. Clearly, Kantor wants to avoid iconography of World War II here. He has also written this character into the literal display, giving room for interpretation. What is important is that Kantor avoids the aesthetics of World War II –he used a German uniform in 1944 in the *Powrót Odysa* (*The Return of Odysseus*) and will use it later in *Nigdy tu już nie powrócę* (*I shall Never Return*) in 1988. He cuts himself off from an already existing fascination with fascism (also in pop-culture) [Sontag, 1980].

The grotesque performance is further enhanced by another disguise of Ciotka Mańka («Ciotka Mańka likes to dress up») [Kantor, 2004: 263], when she enters the stage as Rabinek. As the score points out, «the children's fun wasn't completely planed» [Kantor, 2004: 247]. The mixed roles of the executioner and the victim, just by Ciotka Mańka's disguises, create a ritual and became frames of repeatability.

In the next performance *Niech szczeną artyści* (*Let the Artists Die*) Kantor uses a character called Wiadomo Kto. This is Marshal Józef Piłsudski. Director will also cast Maria Stangret in this role. Once again, the figure entering on the horse's skeleton does not make sense on an visual, iconic similarity. The uniform, the horse are attributes of a national hero. The horse's skeleton is also a paraphrase. Kantor refers to the stained-glass window, designed by Stanisław Wyspiański, depicting King Casimir the Great as a skeleton in royal armor and with royal insignia of power. Thus, the artist realizes his idea of exaltation through humiliation. It is worth asking the question to whom such a quotation is addressed. On the one hand, it is a very concrete embedding of the image (the performance also quotes a photo from Piłsudski's funeral) in the historical reality, and what is more, it is a very concrete, very Polish sense, which the artist has been using. On the other hand, Kantor knew his performance will have world-wide tour, will be shown in other countries (premiere was in Nuremberg).



This tension is visible exactly when one takes into account the artist's statements about his own performance. Kantor was aware that his performances will be seen all over the world. The division between Polish and foreign audiences becomes evident here. In this context, Kantor's statement addressed to Japanese viewers of his performances seems symptomatic.

That was the year 1920. And that was the year when Poland gained its freedom. The perpetrator of that freedom was Marshal Piłsudski. He was a national hero who was «forbidden» by the communists after World War II. I was still making this spectacle at the time when it was... Piłsudski was banned.⁷

In suggesting a very precise embedding in historical concreteness, Kantor *de facto* uses an abbreviation that is readable only to a Polish who is familiar with history. In fact, the war of 1920 (actually from 1919-1921) had a different meaning in the formation of the Marshal's legend than the actual regaining of freedom of Poland in 1918. Why Kantor did such (evident for Polish) mixing the facts or mistakes? Of course, on the basic level it is reminiscence from artist's childhood, when in Wielopole were military parades after won war.

The Kantor's explanations are not only intended to introduce foreigners to the nuances of Polish history. The author clearly creates an appropriate, correct understanding of it, filtered out by his own interpretation. It is clear that the second viewer is a Polish viewer perfectly familiar with the issue of reinterpretation of history. Even during the artist's lifetime, all of his interviews were collected and deposited (after translation) in the Cricoteka archives in Cracow. Important is, what Kantor refers to. Firstly, he reaches for the «forbidden» (during the premiere of the play, but not during the interview) of the theme of the Battle of Warsaw (from 1920), and in fact to the whole legend and cult of Piłsudski (the figure of Wiadomo Kto in the play enters the stage with a musical illustration of the *First*

⁷ Tadeusz Kantor's utterance during press conference in Tokyo in 1990. Transl. P.S.



Brigade March) – the anthem of Piłsudski's regiment). The facts presented by Kantor are not precise. The author rather creates his version of history and his place in it. *Post factum* defines his political commitment.

Let the Artists Die were created in 1985 in Nuremberg. Kantor then referred to two historical figures (Józef Piłsudski and Wit Stwosz).⁸ These circumstances show that the engagement, «opposition» or rebellious character of the performance is much more strongly created in the statement than in the performance.

However, the most important thing for the Polish audience is the way of constructing meaning. What is Kantor talking about? The performance, created in 1985, is interpreted by the artist in language referring to the oppressive nature of power. In fact, Piłsudski in the last decade of the Polish People's Republic was not as strongly censored as in the Stalinist times (it is enough to recall that the Mint issued a 50000 coin in 1988 with the Marshal's image). The fact that Kantor refers to the historical policy of a much earlier period is due to two reasons. The first one is for biographical reasons (the beginning of *Cricot 2* and the resumption of the *Grupa Krakowska* on the wave of thaw, after the death of Józef Stalin).

The second aspect is to refer to the concept of avant-garde and engagement of art, created in the times of the «true avant-garde» – as he called it. Kantor has often used this term, and at the same time he has repeatedly polemicized with Maria Jarema, a «communist». (that's his term) on the social engagement of modern art. One can see how Kantor is strongly shaped by that period and those artists. It was then that his aesthetic and social concept was shaped, it was Kantor's answer to one of the main avant-garde problems.

What does Kantor need historical figures for? He refers to the former avant-garde on the one hand. On the other hand, he uses historical figures to make them symbols on stage. The lack of iconic similarity and the tension between unitary marking and universality cause historical figures to

⁸ About the political provocation in the play: Lt: P. Stangret, 2015.



function as the metonymic symbols. Kantor shows his commitment to tradition. Therefore, he can interpret it in his own way, as someone from within.

The use of a symbol is at the same time a manifesto of the artist's idea of a «closed work».⁹ Thus, he gives himself a convenient position to criticize his contemporary art. Kantor's avant-garde is based on the continuation of old patterns, while at the same time showing the way to overcome fashionable trends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANKERSMIT, F., *Postmodernistyczna prywatyzacja historii*, przeł. M. Zapędowska, [w:] tegoż, *Narracja, reprezentacja, doświadczenie*, pod red. E. Domańskiej, Kraków 2004.
- FAZAN, K., *Kantor: Nie/Obecność*, Kraków 2019.
- GEREMEK, B., *Fabula, konwencja i źródło. Utwór literacki w badaniu kultury średniowiecznej*, [w:] *Dzieło literackie jako źródło historyczne*, pod red. Z. Stefanowskiej i J. Sławińskiego, Warszawa 1978.
- KANTOR, T., *The Dead Class, The Score (Umarła klasa. Partytura)*, [in:] T. Kantor, *Pisma*, vol. II, Kraków 2004, transl. P.S.
- _____, *Wielopole, Wielopole, The Score*, [in:] T. Kantor, *Pisma*, vol. II., Kraków 2004, transl. P.S.
- _____, *Action (Akcja)*, [in:] T. Kantor, *Pisma*, vol. I, Kraków 2005, transl. P.S.
- LEHMANN, H. T., *Postdramatic Theatre*, transl. K. Jürs-Munby, London-New York, 2006.
- MICHALIK-TOMALA, J., *NIE MOŻNA BEZKARNIE WAŻYĆ SIĘ POWTARZAĆ CZEGOŚ, CO BYŁO JUŻ RAZ W ŻYCIU. CZAS*

⁹ T. Kantor, *Jestem przeciwko dziełu otwartemu (I'm Against Opened Work of Art)*, manuscript in Kantor's family archive.



ZAMAĆCONY SIĘ MŚCI. Rzec o spektaklu «Wielopole, Wielopole»

Tadeusza Kantora, «Didaskalia», nr 153, październik 2019.

SONTAG, S., *Fascinating Fascism*, [in:] S. Sontag, *Under the Sign of Saturn*,
New York 1980.

STANGRET, P., *Tadeusz Kantor pisarz. «Lekcje mediolańskie» jako tekst
literacki*, Warszawa 2014.

___, *Metonimia wspólnoty narodowej - przypadek Tadeusz Kantor i duet
Demirski/Strzępka*, [in:] *Teatr historii lokalnych w Europie
Środkowej*, edited by E. Wąchocka, D. Fox, A. Głowacka, Katowice
2015.

WHITE, H., *Proza historyczna*, przeł. R. Borysławski i in., pod red. E.
Domańskiej, Kraków 2009.

