

*Martynas PETRIKAS*  
*Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania*

## TO ENGAGE OR TO BE ENGAGED: AMONG DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES OF THEATRE IN LITHUANIA AND POLAND<sup>1</sup>

**Key words:** theatre in Lithuania, theatre in Poland, Enlightenment, Romanticism, engaged theatre, engaging theatre.

### INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to discuss and to compare several aspects of two ethe in neighbouring theatre cultures of Lithuania and Poland. As Lithuanian and Polish theatre histories are not only already established but also were opened to a process of revision and reformulation, usually gravitating from basal documentary scholarship towards broad realms of cultural history, this altogether provides with reference and inspiration to undertake an intriguing task to compare the bedrocks of theatre concepts in both countries. Moreover, it altogether invites for a possible redefinition of their similarities and differences as the cultures of two countries that until 1795 were part of joint Commonwealth in the eye of numerous commentators are regarded as naturally overlapping, interweaving and complementing each other.

This was exactly the case of narrative on Polish Romanticism and Adam Mickiewicz as its fundamental figure. Mickiewicz's residence and activities in Vilnius made not only the present Lithuanian capital into one of the "cradles" of Romanticism; it also coloured the imaginary development of Lithuanian culture of XIXth century with all the shades of romantic mentality and pursuits, sometimes extending Lithuanian version of Romanticism well into beginning of the next century.

The uneasiness with sometimes nonchalant usage of the term "Romanticism" in Lithuanian cultural history was signaled as late as in 2000 in a dedicated

conference hosted by Institute of Art and Culture in Vilnius. Among the papers, presented at the conference, explicitly framed as "Romanticisms after the Romanticism", historian Eligijus Raila's argument at the beginning and the background of Lithuanian Romanticism deserves a special attention. Exploring individuality and attitude to religion – key issues in Romanticist mentality, Raila argued that ideology of Enlightenment dominated in the Lithuanian intellectual field until 1863 (the year of January Uprising) whereas as such Lithuanian version of Romanticism should be regarded as a continuation of Enlightenment paradigm as well as a reaction to it<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, this article addresses two issues. First, I would like to discuss and compare two conceptions of theatre, the one that brings us back to the Romanticist world-view and another that is rooted in Rationalist tradition of equaling theatre to the tool for improvement of its audiences. Secondly, I would like to show how these different yet sometimes overlapping conceptions informed the formation and development of theatre in Poland and in Lithuania, producing particular sets of ideas of a) what theatre is in relation to the society and b) what theatre is expected to do.

My argument, hereby, is based on the difference between *engaged* and *engaging* theatre. Polish theatre scholar Paweł Mościcki in his 2008 book *Politics of Theatre. Essays on Engaging Art*, dwelling on Jean-Paul Sartre, Antonin Artaud, Bertholt Brecht and above all Jacques Rancière and Alain Badiou, draws

a line of difference between *engaged* and *engaging* theatre as the former equals a display of social antagonisms on the stage to participation in social sphere, whereas the latter questions the very essence of social divisions<sup>3</sup>. Following Rancière's conception of political Mościcki argues that the *engaging* theatre is a foremost form for evoking a certain type of anthropological shift in the audience, for nurturing audiences' awareness of changeability in the structure of the reality and, above all, the *engaging* theatre has to "change adverse places into livable ones"<sup>4</sup>.

Such a distinction takes to the next one that I have derived from the discussion on popular or mass theatre where the question is usually raised: who makes such a theatre. Is it a theatre *by* the people, or *for* the people? As Patrice Pavis observes, that is an issue of rather political and not aesthetical field<sup>5</sup> and as such it proves very relevant for my discussion on theatre concepts where one could be called a *romantic* appeal for the action and another – a *rational* quest for improving the audience.

The last pair of terms is the *bourgeoisifying* and the *enchancing* effect the theatre is capable to produce. The first instance describes the theatre that nurtures social advancement, i.e. the theatre that functions like a catalyst for an emancipatory process of bourgeois class-formation. Whereas I use the term *enchancing* in a sense to which Ludwig Tieck, Adam Mickiewicz and other Romanticists were used to. *Enchantment* here denotes a transformational power, a part of ritual that performers initiate on stage or indeed among and together with the audience.

#### CASE NO. 1 DEJMEK'S *DZIADY*

On 4 April, 1843 a Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz in his famous lecture XVI from four year course on Slavic literature at Collège de France is now believed having set a theory for a *romantic* tradition in Polish theatre and drama. A departure point for Mickiewicz was an assumption that a truly Slavic drama is yet to be written. Modestly omitting his own seminal drama *Dziady – The Forefathers Eve*, written between 1822 – 1860, he argued that most of currently available Polish plays are too contaminated with foreign influences and as such couldn't possibly

become a channel for revelation and dissemination of specific Slavic spirit<sup>6</sup>.

Metaphysical and mythical aspect in the theatre for Mickiewicz was of crucial importance, as he perceived the stage as a place where revelation in very religious sense happens<sup>7</sup>. At the core of his messianistic theory was a notion that the Slaves have never experienced a revelation of God in their original Pagan religion<sup>8</sup>. Consequently, due to the lack of solid mythology, they have retained the original and sophisms free spiritual strength that might prove vital not only for the preservation of the Slaves themselves, but also for the rest of the Western culture in its present dire state. This strength has only to be evoked *de profundis* of Slavic spirit and Mickiewicz saw the literature and above all drama and the theatre at its aid as a way to do it.

Yet Mickiewicz has not stopped there. In his lecture he also outlined the specifics of such a staging / revelation as well<sup>9</sup>. First, in a very modern way he denounced a hierarchy in basic elements of the theatrical event. A revelational experience had to be based on a self-governing ritual of the masses that attend the event. A performer, comparable to the folk story-teller, had to function here as a catalyst. His function was to channel revelational words of a playwright and to initiate an enchantment that in its turn would establish the sense of togetherness in experiencing the primordial power.

At Collège de France Mickiewicz himself gave a sample of such a sensation. Attendees of his lectures, including Jules Michelet and George Sand, among others left numerous notes on the effects the lecturer was capable to produce. First it was the "actor" himself to quote Michelet with "delicate yet completely wild features of the face partly covered in a wavy beard and hair, speaking in sublime and accentuated manner"<sup>10</sup>. Then Mickiewicz introduced a type of improvised lectures to the French audience. It is believed that he would thoroughly prepare the texts beforehand, but would not take them to the lectures<sup>11</sup>. Finally, to describe the atmosphere of these "communions" or "spiritual feasts", I quote Michelet again: "His eyes full of blood were flashing, and we, the French, were drowning in tears. I had never seen

such lightnings before and I shall remember them forever.”<sup>12</sup>

It altogether brings us to the *enchantment* – a key term in Mickiewicz’s theory. Admittedly Mickiewicz begins with the literary spine of the production as every worthwhile literary work has a divine element in it: “a gentle breath from above”<sup>13</sup>. Yet it is a performer and staging that make transcendence visible and transport the beholders to the supernatural world. Divine presence at the mystery of the performance is to be evoked by a person that mediates and shares the common primordial sensitivities. Mickiewicz is very explicit here: such a performer is comparable to the folk storyteller that tells a story in his own name assuming certain part in the plot<sup>14</sup>. Thus, division between reality and fiction disappears; as it disappears between a performer and his audience. Mickiewicz rejects the conventional theatre building that imposes spatial separation: the production, he foresees, needs an arena and he gives the example of *Cirque Olympique* that actually existed in Paris until 1862<sup>15</sup>.

An elaborate notion of theatrical event obviously had to have its own cause. By the time of Mickiewicz lecture the state of Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth was off the European political map for almost half of a century. Thus an utmost euphoria, reached at the performance, had to lead to the action. Mickiewicz’s far reaching project linked a revelational performance with spreading of primordial Slavic spirit across the Europe and subsequent raise of power capable to fight the supremacy of dehumanized politics embedded in imperial expansion of Prussia, Austria and above all Russia. This altogether was seen not only as a chance for resurrection of Polish statehood, but also as a cure for the whole Western culture.

Thus was the Mickiewicz’s model. Resting on typically Romantic triad of “revelation-inspiration-creation” it emphasized the performative aspect of the theatre and, above all, the spectator as integral part of the theatrical event. Using the modern terminology we could probably speak of a prototype “spectactor” as the performances outlined in Mickiewicz lecture are clearly done *by* everyone attending the event. Furthermore, Mickiewicz delivers a theory of an *engaging*

theatre as it allows experiencing the changeability for each and everyone gathered at the theatre – an almost physical experience that can possibly be translated into terms of the change in the reality.

As Polish scholars Małgorzata Sugiera and Mateusz Borowski note, in the course of the time Mickiewicz theory has not lost any of its appeal. In fact, in Poland it has become a basis and inspiration for so called “theatre of change”, a “performative” theatre sub-field, where emphasis on processual rather than final, on experience rather than artifact is discernible in the works of Jerzy Grotowski, Tadeusz Kantor and Gardzienice Theatre among others<sup>16</sup>. Yet my example comes from a very conventional theatre: the 1967 production of Adam Mickiewicz *Dziady* at *Teatr Narodowy* in Warsaw. I have chosen it to illustrate how the power of tradition can permanently inhabit the expectations of the audience.

The production in point was directed by Kazimierz Dejmek (1924–2002), a head manager of *Teatr Narodowy* at the time. Nothing in Dejmek’s preceding social trajectory could be associated with a subversive aims or ideas. On the contrary, in 1949 Dejmek declared his readiness “to serve and to co-create our political reality”, which won him a large credit at the field of power<sup>17</sup>. His 1967s production of *Dziady* was intended to celebrate 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of October Revolution in Russia, thus Dejmek spoke of “progressive” version of famous classic: “Being a materialist I shifted Authors Christianity and Mysticism from devotional sphere into folk rituals alongside emphasizing revolutionary and patriotic features of the drama.”<sup>18</sup>

Yet the government officials were suspicious from the outset. The rumor spread, and public interest in Dejmek’s *Dziady* rose steeply. In the course of performance the audience vividly reacted to the patriotic and anti-Russian verses and Dejmek was accused of making “anti-Soviet” production<sup>19</sup>. Thus by the middle January 1968 the government decided to cancel the production altogether. Everybody knew that fourteenth performance of January 30 is the last one and the packed auditorium erupted with anti-governmental slogans. Upheaval continued on the streets, under the Mickiewicz monument, at the

University of Warsaw and became an overture to the massive political crisis, comparable to that in France the same year. Consequently, Dejmek was expelled from the Communist Party and from *Teatr Narodowy* altogether.

In his seminal book *Teatra Polskie. Historie* Dariusz Kosiński takes Dejmek's *Dziady* as an evidence of longevity and power of Romanticist tradition that exploded in Polish audiences: "what bursted and claimed its rights in 1967 and 1968 at *Teatr Narodowy* was a previously suppressed Romanticist theatre paradigm, a paradigm that calls not for representation and admiration of theatre art, but for its usage"<sup>20</sup>. Thus, the grain of *engaging* to action rooted in Mickiewicz theory and solidified in Polish audience expectations on what theatre is called for cut across initial aims and goals of Dejmek's *Dziady* and actually called for a change in the structure of the reality.

#### CASE NO. 2 VAITKUS' *DZIADY*

The idea of theatre that would use Lithuanian language on stage started to evolve by the very end of the XIXth century. Its architects for a departure point chose a simple notion: the theatre in mostly illiterate rural regions of Lithuania could hold back intensive rusification, foster the rural communities and bring in a bit of enlightenment. Besides, as public gatherings (especially in urban milieu) the performances were to contribute to social contacts possibly resulting in formation of Lithuanian families – a crucial aspect for Lithuanian bourgeois class formation<sup>21</sup>.

The initiatory texts, what circulated in at that time illegal Lithuanian press shared the common belief that educated few have to bring the idea of gathering to make and watch the play to the people. The systematic approach was applied. First the plea for a Lithuanian drama was announced, and then readily produced texts gradually spread throughout the Lithuanian villages mostly with a help of students who were coming for summer vacations from their studies in Saint Petersburg, Warsaw or Cracow. The idea proved to be successful as these secret gatherings (that were illegal and punishable under the Russian law) by the turn of the centuries grew into considerable numbers.

Thus there was a launch of Lithuanian theatre and a cornerstone of its ethos – theatre is made for the people to improve them. "Gifted authors and actors are so capable to imitate everything that they can steer one's heart in every direction <...> These emotions are glorious as they soften hearts, guide towards the truth and kindness, in short – they beautify and educate the human." – stated Lithuanian press in 1879<sup>22</sup>. In the course of the time the patterns of improvement were changing rapidly yet in every case the theatre retained the status of authority that told its audience how to live and behave. For the Lithuanian theatre the aim of bourgeoisification of its audiences was its engagement too. First it was promotion of native language, then in the early XXth century theatre was reminding of the glorious moments in Lithuanian history to foster patriotism and ideas of national resurrection, whereas after the WWI and during the First Independence these were giving a way for establishing the bourgeois values.

Thus the theatre audience was expected to listen attentively and passively adopt the ideas that were expressed on stage, in the same manner as it happens in a classroom. It comes as a little surprise that the majority of Friedrich Schiller dramas were staged at the State Theatre in Kaunas – major theatre company in Interwar Lithuania. Schiller in his aesthetical writings gave a strong background here, arguing that it is a stage where "the thoughtful and the worthier section of the people diffuse the light of wisdom over the masses"<sup>23</sup>. Besides, a stage defined in such way, in Schiller's opinion was capable to turn people into *a nation*.

The superiority of the stage embedded in a concept that equals theatre to moral institution had yet another aspect, namely the aesthetic one. In the course of time a fraction of Lithuanian theatre field was gradually developing the notion of theatre as an autonomous form of art. This was usually done by every younger generation of writers, directors and actors, who claimed that theatre imposes its own rules and is capable to change the society by perfecting its aesthetic sense. Even today the Statute of Lithuanian National Drama Theatre states: "it is an institution for creating and disseminating a professional theatre art of the highest aesthetical quality"<sup>24</sup>.

Curiously it is the Soviet regime that provoked Lithuanian theatre makers to remember the emancipating power of the theatre in the second half of the XXth century. This time, not the direct notations (these were the domain of the official Soviet aesthetics), but artistic innovation and creativity were turned too. As Christopher Innes and Maria Shevtsova observe “The theatricality of political and social criticism <...> became a hallmark of the Eastern European directors who acquired, or were granted, the role of spokesperson for their nations <...> It is important to note that theatricality as a form of double-talk, which became a necessity under communism, metamorphosed after communism into a highly elaborated aesthetics in which critical perspectives were deeply embedded. Indeed, they were often buried deeply enough in the plethora of startling conceits, tumbling visual and aural images, and movement and dance, which, at first sight, looked fully incongruous, to make them seem totally enigmatic.”<sup>25</sup>

Two items in this longish quote deserve special attention. The status of “a spokesperson” that directors were granted or were taking upon themselves implies the same hierarchical relationship with their audiences. Whereas “the plethora of startling conceits” and “tumbling images” disguising the political agenda is a key phrase as it exposes an aesthetical exclusivity that circumvent not only the eye of censor, but also that of the layperson. The Lithuanian *engaged* theatre of the late Soviet period invented a kind of semi-opaque mode of communication known as *metaphorical theatre*: very demanding and challenging because of aesthetic refinement in the eye of censors it could pass for a disinterested artistic imagination, while, ideally, the audience was expected to find a critical diagnosis of surrounding reality in it. Yet, as Edgaras Klivis observes, it is the common knowledge of possible intervention of a censor as well as the superior status of theatre artists as the heralds of the truth or the liberty, made the *metaphorical theatre* effective and possibly subversive<sup>26</sup>.

Parts of *Dziady* were translated into Lithuanian and first published in 1899, yet the first production of Mickiewicz’s drama took place almost a century later on April 13, 1990 and was directed by Jonas Vaitkus at Lithuanian State Drama Theatre in

Vilnius. Both the date and the name of the director are of utmost importance here. First, the opening night coincided with the USSR’s ultimatum requesting to revoke the Declaration of Independent Lithuania in two days, and thus to reestablish Lithuanian SSR. Secondly, director Vaitkus was broadly known for its fierce anti-Soviet stance. Thirdly, in 1990 April 13 was a Good Friday – a commemoration of crucifixion of Jesus Christ and his death in Catholic culture.

Thus it would be difficult to find a more responsive emotional canvas for an opening of production where mysticism and ritual centres on the main theme of suffering and possible change. Yet Vaitkus’ *Dziady* proved to be an elaborated highly emotional and picturesque testimony of human suffering that by no means called for an immediate action. Lithuanian theatre critic Gražina Mareckaitė described several interesting discrepancies between Mickiewicz drama and performance: “the difference here is such as between vision and construction <...> This is not a spontaneous creative work of a poet. The director, emphasizing construction of the production, intentionally does not allow forgetting: we are at the theatre and observe how this production is made.”<sup>27</sup> Another, Lithuanian-Polish theatre critic Alwida Bajor noted that the production despite its emotional impact was inspiring the “subsequent contemplation” as if its effect would come with some delay<sup>28</sup>. Moreover, asked about members of audience which were seen leaving before the production ended, Vaitkus stated, that it is a “normal” occurrence<sup>29</sup>, thus showing that immediate “usage” and above all togetherness or “community” to use Mickiewicz’s wording are not among his aims: the theatre is made for the people, who are entitled either to accept and contemplate or to reject it.

## CONCLUSION

Dejmek’s and Vaitkus’ *Dziady* were separated not only by the more than two decades, different cultural and political contexts and subsequent reverberations in the society. More importantly they were products of different ethe and ideas on how theatre produces its effects in the social field. On the one hand one

can observe the *collaboration*, which implies a lack of hierarchy between the stage and the auditorium, on another – a certain type of *prometheism* where theatre artists assume a mission towards their public presumably in need of one. These expectations and objectives the theatre is associated with as their roots have different approaches to togetherness and improvement yet their common ground lies in the same pursuit for a change. Despite the obvious differences in how *engaging* and *engaged* theatre functions the meeting point here is a constant belief in a political mission of stage. Evoking community, providing an “anthropological shift” or assuming position of a mentor are in fact two strategies for promotion of the change in reality, whereas their differences reveal how differently the development of particular national culture can shape theatre theory and practice within.

#### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The research presented in this article is made possible by the Postdoctoral fellowship, funded by European Union Structural Funds project “Postdoctoral Fellowship Implementation in Lithuania”.
- <sup>2</sup> Raila, Eligijus. *Apšvieta versus Romantizmas. Lietuviškasis savitumas*. In: *Romantizmai po romantizmo* / Ed. by Giedrė Jankevičiūtė. Vilnius: Kultūros ir meno institutas, 2000, p. 17.
- <sup>3</sup> Mościcki, Paweł. *Polityka teatru. Eseje o sztuce angażującej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 2008, p. 23–24.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 9.
- <sup>5</sup> See the discussion on mass theatre in Pavis, Patrice. *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- <sup>6</sup> Mickiewicz, Adam. *Dzieła. Tom XI. Literatura Słowiańska. Kurs III i IV* / Ed. by Leon Płoszewski. Kraków: Drukarnia Narodowa, 1953, p. 112.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 110.
- <sup>8</sup> Dybizbański, Marek. *Mityczny teatr* Lekcji XVI. In: *Prelekcje paryskie Adama Mickiewicza wobec tradycji polskiej i europejskiej. Próba nowego spojrzenia* / Ed. by Maria Kalinowska et al. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2011, p. 215–216.
- <sup>9</sup> Mickiewicz, Adam. *Dzieła. Tom XI. Literatura Słowiańska. Kurs III i IV* / Ed. by Leon Płoszewski. Kraków: Drukarnia Narodowa, 1953, p. 113–115.
- <sup>10</sup> „Figure fine, mais toute sauvage, perdu dans la flots de barbe et des cheveux, parole élançée, saccadée...” Michelet, Jules. *Légendes démocratiques du Nord* / Éd. par M. Cadot. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1968, p. 286.
- <sup>11</sup> Axer, Jerzy. *Mickiewicz jako aktor prawdy*. In: *Prelekcje paryskie Adama Mickiewicza wobec tradycji polskiej i europejskiej. Próba nowego spojrzenia* / Ed. by Maria Kalinowska et al. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2011, p. 204.
- <sup>12</sup> „De sublimes éclairs s'échappaient de ses yeux sanglants, et nous Français, nous étions noyés de larmes. Je n'avais jamais vu pareils éclairs, et ceux-ci resteront toujours.” Letter by Jules Michelet printed in: Mickiewicz, Ladislas. *Inauguration du monument d'Adam Mickiewicz à Montmorency*. Paris: Librairie du Luxembourg, 1867, p. 41.
- <sup>13</sup> Mickiewicz, Adam. *Dzieła. Tom XI. Literatura Słowiańska. Kurs III i IV* / Ed. by Leon Płoszewski. Kraków: Drukarnia Narodowa, 1953, p. 110.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid, p. 115.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 114.
- <sup>16</sup> Sugiera, Małgorzata, Borowski, Mateusz. *Porządkować czy problematyzować* (introduction to Polish edition of Erica Fisher-Lichte's *Theaterwissenschaft. Eine Einführung in die Grundlagen des Faches*) Instytut im. Jerzego Grotowskiego. Wrocław, 2012, p. 10–11.
- <sup>17</sup> Filip, Magdalena. *Kazimierz Dejmek w raportach SB*. In: *Artyści a Służba Bezpieczeństwa. Aparat bezpieczeństwa wobec środowisk twórczych* / Ed. by Robert Klementowski and Sebastian Ligarski. Wrocław: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2008, p. 198.
- <sup>18</sup> Kwiatkowski, Jaromir. *Dejmek. Bohater mimo woli*. In: *Uważam Rze*. <http://www.e-teatr.pl/pl/artykuly/152134.html> Accessed 2013-09-15.
- <sup>19</sup> Filip, Magdalena. *Kazimierz Dejmek w raportach SB*. In: *Artyści a Służba Bezpieczeństwa. Aparat bezpieczeństwa wobec środowisk twórczych* / Ed. by Robert Klementowski and Sebastian Ligarski. Wrocław: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2008, p. 199.
- <sup>20</sup> Kosiński, Dariusz. *Teatra Polskie. Historie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN / Instytut Teatralny, 2010, p. 270.
- <sup>21</sup> Q. D. ir K. [Vincas Kudirka]. *Tėvyniški varpai*. In: *Varpas*. 1891, no. 2, p. 22.
- <sup>22</sup> Vaiszgantas [Juozas Tumas]. *Apie “komedią” ir “teatrą”*. In: *Tėvynės sargas*. 1897, no. 8, p. 27.
- <sup>23</sup> Schiller, Friedrich. *The Stage as a Moral Institution*. In: *Aesthetical and Philosophical Essays*. [http://www.gutenberg.org/files/6798/6798-h/6798-h.htm#link2H\\_4\\_0003](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/6798/6798-h/6798-h.htm#link2H_4_0003) Accessed 2013-09-15.
- <sup>24</sup> *Lietuvos nacionalinio dramos teatro nuostatai (Statute of Lithuanian National Drama Theatre)*. <http://www.teatras.lt/lt/teatras/teatro-nuostatai/> Accessed 2013-09-15.
- <sup>25</sup> Innes, Christopher, Shevtsova, Maria. *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Directing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 112.
- <sup>26</sup> Klivis, Edgaras. *Ardomasis prisitaikymas: cenzūra ir pasipriešinimo jai būdai sovietinio laikotarpio Lietuvos teatre*. In: *Menotyra*. 2010, no. 2, p. 126–131.
- <sup>27</sup> Mareckaitė, Gražina. *Romantizmo idėjos lietuvių teatre*. Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 2004, p. 193.
- <sup>28</sup> *Z režyserem Jonasem Vaitkusem tuž po prapremierze “Dziadów” rozmawia Alwida Bajor*. In: *Monograficzny przegląd spektakli i filmów Jonasa Vaitkusa* / Ed. by Anna Błaszczak. Toruń: Teatr im. Wilama Horzycy w Toruniu. 1990, p. 7–8.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid, p. 8.

*Martynas PETRIKAS*  
*Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Kaunas*

## ANGAŽUOTI AR ANGAŽUOTIS: LIETUVOS IR LENKIJOS TEATRO PANAŠUMAI IR SKIRTUMAI

**Reikšminiai žodžiai:** lietuvių teatras, lenkų teatras, Apšvieta, Romantizmas, angažuotas teatras, angažuojantis teatras.

### Santrauka

Straipsnyje apžvelgiama Apšvietos ir Romantizmo teorijų sklaida Lietuvos ir Lenkijos teatro tradicijose. Kitiškai palyginamos tendencijos teatrą tapatinti su žiūrovų auklėjimu ir teatrą sieti bendru su naujos tikrovės kūrimu. Šie, kartais persipinantys, tikslai Lietuvoje ir Lenkijoje suformavo savitas teatro sampratos ir su teatro veikla siejamų lūkesčių koncepcijas, kurias skiria teatro *angažuotumo* ir gebėjimo *angažuoti* sureikšminimas. Nors abiem atvejais svarbiausia siekiama išlikti paskatinti pokytį teatrą supančioje tikrovėje, skirtinga abiejų valstybių kultūros raida sąlygojo ir priemonių šiam pokyčiui išgauti skirtingumus. Straipsnyje pateikiamas tyrimas buvo įgyvendintas autoriui bendradarbiaujant su Vytauto Didžiojo universitetu, finansuojant Lietuvos mokslo tarybai pagal projektą „Podoktorantūros (post doc) stažuotių įgyvendinimas Lietuvoje“ (sutarties nr. 004/27).

*Gauta 2013-09-15*

*Parengta spaudai 2013-10-03*