Dagmar Inštitorisová

Visuality in Peter Scherhaufer's European Events*

1. *Introduction*

Within the framework of Czech and Slovak theater culture in the second half of the 20th century in the then Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (hereinafter Czechoslovakia), the theatrical projects – especially in the public space – were first carried out from a theoretical and practical perspective by the Goose on a String Theater (1967; hereafter GOST)[1] in Brno (today's Czech Republic, hereinafter CZ). This was caused by the fact that the basic poetics of theater was based on different principles than the aesthetics of the time – it was based on irregularity. The members of the creative team expressed its essence from the very beginning of the foundation of GOST in various formal documents, which related not only to the creation of the theater, but also to its programmatic principles. In 1971, for example, they declared that "DNP wants to be primarily an environment for experimental theater productions, and is therefore looking for new theater possibilities both in the field of dramaturgy and stage design as well as in the field of organization of theater work" (Oslzlý *et al.* 2017: 10). In the same year, a new version of the *Programmatic Principles* was published, in which the concept of irregularity was outlined more deeply in the form of irregular dramaturgy. Since then, it has been constantly elaborated both on the theoretical and practical level, but also in the area of directing, scenographic, acting and organizational work of the theater (Scherhaufer 1996f: 4). First of all, it was focused on establishing the theater and cultural center as a free association of professionals who are interested in other forms of theatrical expression. However, it was also important to understand the dramaturgical shifts as "the use of regular and irregular texts, adaptations, literary works, scenarios, montages and dramatizations" (Osl-

---

[1] It was first established under the name Goose on a String Group or Mahen's Nonce Theater, which operated in the House of Arts (Procházkova Hall) in Brno from March 15, 1968 under the name "GOST". In 1969-1990, it was forcibly renamed to Theater on a String, hereinafter DNP) due to the alleged defamation of the name of the then president Gustáv Husák (1913-1991). During the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops, people added the letter "k" to its name "husa" (goose), which gave rise to its anti-national name husák on a string.

Dagmar Inštitorisová (Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra) – dagmar.institorisova@gmail.com
The author declares that there is no conflict of interest

zlý 1999). For example, in 1981 Petr Oslzlý[2] , the GOST dramaturgist, justified the legitimacy of irregularity by the need for a montage, which allows us to work with a variety of materials, a laboratory to borderline experimental approach to the topic, variability of spatial composition (Oslzlý 1982: 2-6), an endeavor to achieve the so-called borderline shapes (Oslzlý 2007: 105-112) and the fact that "its meaning is the shifting values, which place the topic in the center of a creative theatrical search" (Oslzlý 1982: 2). For example, in 1996 the director of the theater P. Scherhaufer[3] added that the logic of a creative theater was naturally directed towards the creation of joint projects not only with several directors within the same theater, but also with other theater groups with similar views and theatrical expressions (Scherhaufer 1996f: 4).

2.   *The Basics of Symbolism of the 'Different' Theatrical Visuality*

From the point of view of how visuality is performed and its possible symbolism within the chosen scenographic and staging concepts, Scherhaufer's statement that:

> theatrical creations are aimed to productions – street and outdoor events, events and meetings of borderline theatrical (para-theatrical) nature, scenic creations that connect the individual types of art in a novel way, borderline scenic forms, open staging projects, open rehearsals, etc., acting and directing internships and workshops etc. (Scherhaufer 1996: 4).

The above indicates that the staged shapes were programmatically open to the semantics of public spaces, other art forms and their particular way of creative creation. In addition to the language of theater art, the shapes deliberately used the means from other artistic or aesthetic forms of expression.

Scherhaufer and his colleagues also saw the "different type of visual means", i.e. theatrical visual communication within the stage design, for example, in the preparatory phases of the productions and projects. It was very often based on the visuality of materials of various types – as he stated together with Oslzlý in 1985 when defining the

---

[2]   Prof. Petr Oslzlý (April 26, 1945, Konice, Czech Republic) – university teacher, dramaturgist, screenwriter and actor, graduate of Theater Science and Art History at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno. Since 1972, he worked as a dramaturgist at GOST and participated in most domestic and foreign productions and projects directed by Peter Scherhaufer, developing the concept of irregular dramaturgy.

[3]   Prof. Peter Scherhaufer (June 29, 1942, Bratislava, Slovak Republic [hereinafter SR] – July 31, 1999, Brno, Czech Republic) – university teacher, translator, playwright, directing theorist and historian and theater director, graduate of Drama Directing at JAMU. He is among the most important Slovak and Czech theater artists of the second half of the 20th century, and his work received international acclaim. Scherhaufer's greatest directorial achievements are connected with GOST, which he founded together at the initiative of Bořivoj Srba, a theater dramaturgist and his teacher at JAMU.

essence of a theater project: on the study of pictorial and literary materials, historical artifacts and sources, on the surveys or personal meetings and discussions with both the spectators and experts in various issues, on the trainings/rehearsals, etc. with the intention of their new structuring in the resulting shape and meaning (Scherhaufer, Oslzlý 1985). In accordance with the aforementioned facts, Scherhaufer very often conducted programmatic creations in non-standard theatrical conditions, such as an exhibition hall, street, square, school classroom, theater pit, etc., and significantly worked with open forms of theater such as staged readings, staged sketches, events or happenings. Their interactive nature made space for a 'different' type of contact with the spectator, the basis of which was the authenticity of action. Within this intention, there was a deeper connection between the artistic level of the theatrical language of GOST and the aesthetics of everyday life.

The aforementioned type of theatrical thinking at GOST was manifested not only in the poetics of specific theater productions, but also in the very rich creations of domestic – Czecho-Slovak and international projects – which it often initiated, and in which other professional and amateur theater groups participated in addition to GOST. Not only the international ones (for more details see below), but also the domestic plays were often performed in non-standard interior and exterior theatrical and non-theatrical spaces, such as PROJEKT 85 (1985, GOST, CZ) in which the plays were also performed e.g. in the foyer of the Procházkova Hall in the House of Arts, and some of its parts – productions[4] were performed in the auditorium and the stage was completely eliminated. In the *KEMU CE TREBA '91* project (1991, Prešov, SR) some of the productions[5] were implemented in the streets of Prešov: one as a walk around the building of Jonáš Záborský Theater in Prešov, another in a rehearsal room, etc.; the BOCATIUS '98 – open air environment (1998, Košice, SR) was held in the Main Square of the city of Košice, etc. Thanks to the open staging techniques[6], the primary urban, architectural or interior symbolism was linked with selected themes and theatrical language in the resulting shapes up to the creation of a 'new', i.e. current, archetypal forms.

All members of GOST, including the main organizers for the Scherhaufer's and Oslzlý's theaters, fully used and developed their experience from domestic projects in the implementation of international projects.

---

[4] The project consisted of eight productions, which could be classed as production sketches in terms of form.

[5] The project consisted of seven productions, which included scenic reading, traveling and performance from the point of view of form.

[6] For example, it included improvisations, admitting to the model nature of situations, publication of the procedures in search of the shapes, thanks to which the events seemed more authentic – just like work in progress.

3.   *Pragmatic Analysis of the Visuality of European Events*

<div align="center">

THE HOPE – NADZIEJA (NADĚJE)
(Poland: Oleśnice, Wrocław 1978)

</div>

> Perhaps it is a transfer to the 'gulag' – which stops on its
> way in one of the squares of the city of Wrocław, just as
> transports stopped there during World War II
>
> (Scherhaufer 1996: 7)

The project with the title *THE HOPE – NADZIEJA (NADĚJE)*[7] was the first major international street event on a European scale, and in addition to GOST, it was implemented by five participating theaters from all around Europe and one theater from the USA[8] as part of the International Open Theater Festival in Wrocław, Poland, with the theme of hope. Some of the key elements of the new, i.e. performative visuality, can be traced in it. In terms of composition, it was a linear montage (Kovalčuk, Oslzlý 2011: 44), the parts of which were arranged one behind the other, and mainly united by "a tendency towards a common meaning" (Scherhaufer 1996a: 27). The participants in this paratheatrical project agreed that they consider their involvement in the event – in a symbolic sense – to be a stopover on their creative journey. They decided to implement the chosen form as an unspecified 'transport' (perhaps even to the 'gulag') and the ensembles presented their culture, opinions on the main theme and the agreed form of its interpretation during their stopovers in one of the Wrocław squares (Scherhaufer 1996a: 27). The resulting form was 2.5 hours long and consisted of twelve parts. The basic square-shaped acting area was created by thirty trucks, in which the participating theaters presented their understanding of the stopover: "The tarp was dropped from the cars; there were spotlights in the corners of the cars, which meant their own 'lighting', and you could walk behind the cars" (Pallesitz 2006: 221). The event was "conceived as a stopover of a convoy of trucks transporting prisoners intended

---

7   For higher clarity, the names of all projects are written in capital letters and their parts in small letters. The reason for this is the different nomenclature of names in different archival materials. For example, the project *The hope – Nadzieja (Naděje)* is written in small letters in the bulletin from 1978, the project *VESNA NÁRODŮ* is written in capital letters in the Czech program double sheet from 1979, the project script uses the name written in both small and capital letters, and in the Polish version of the bulletin the name is written in small letters *Wiosna ludów*, the projects *TOGETHER*, *MIR CARAVANE – KARAVANA MIR*, *CESTA DO DELF II.* are written in capital letters, the project *CESTA DO DELF I.* uses the name *Journey to Delphi I* on the cover of the bulletin, but the name JOURNEY TO DELPH is used on the inside, etc.

8   A joint theater event with the theme of hope. Participants: Comuna Baires (Italy), Le Temps Fort (France), Teater 9 (Sweden), Teatr 77 (Poland), Theater on a String (Czechoslovakia), Esperanza (USA), Orchestr Teatra Ósmego dnia (Poland), Katka Manolidaki (Greece), Liliana Duca (Argentina), Pavel Büchler (Czechoslovakia). Premiere Poland: Wrocław 01.10.1978.

for long-term placement in an internment camp. For the deportees, such a stopover is the last hope to leave a message before their complete disappearance" (Kovalčuk, Oslzlý 2011: 44). GOST, led by actor Bolek Polívka, created five improvised clown scenes with the names *Nosy, Zástavy and Barly*[9] (Noses, Banners, Crutches) (Scherhaufer 1996c: 28), which connected and cemented the individual presentations. In the *Crutches* scene, for example, he used Oslzlý's broken leg in a cast: "He also wanted the other actors to grab crutches and a fake cast. One of the cars then chased this group and we were united, as only the Slovaks and Czechs can be, and when everyone was in danger, they threw away their crutches and P. Oslzlý was left there alone with his broken leg" (Pallesitz 2006: 221).

The selected visual codes were based on archetypal situations, as defined by Romanian philosopher and religionist Mircea Eliade (1993) under the concept of "symbolism of the center", and their language was modernized: the 'heroes' of the event were looking for ways out of the chaos and darkness by adopting a positive approach to it – broadcasting the latest 'news' about what happened to them.

VESNA NÁRODŮ – WIOSNA LUDÓW (THE SPRINGTIME OF NATIONS)
(Poland: Łódź 1979; Sweden: Stockholm 1979, CZ: Brno 1980)[10]

> In the history of both nations, the period of revolutionary fermentation before the middle of the 19th century is significant because of the efforts for national and social liberation and self-determination
>
> (Scherhaufer 1996g: 30)

Scherhaufer's and Oslzlý's participation in the event *THE HOPE – NADZIEJ (NADĚJE)* encouraged them to prepare another joint international project – this time a Czech-Slovak-Polish one – with the theme of 1848 under the name *VESNA NÁRODŮ – WIOSNA LUDÓW* (The Springtime of Nations). The Poles were represented by Teatr 77 from Łódź under the direction of director Zdzisław Hejduk. The script was a "consistent montage of historical literature, documents, period songs and excerpts of works of art" (Scherhaufer 1996g: 31), which reflected the events of the so-called Springtime of Nations, and especially the Slavic Congress in Prague (Bąbol 2017: 608). Oslzlý, one of the scriptwriters and dramaturgists of the project, stated: "However, 1848 could also be understood as a special parallel to 1968" (Kovalčuk, Oslzlý 2011: 45). A look into the ancient 150-years-long revolutionary history of both nations sounded as a call to a revolution against the then communist regime in

---

[9]   In the itemized script, the names of clown scenes are written in Slovak. P. Scherhaufer was typical for his bilingual or incorrect Slovak or Czech expressions.

[10]   Joint theatrical performance of the Theater on a String and Teatr 77 (Łódź), directed by Zdzisław Hejduk, Peter Scherhaufer. Premieres: Poland: Łódź, 22.10.1979; Sweden: Stockholm, Teater 99, 16.01.-18.11.1979 under the title *The Springtime of Nations*; CZ: Brno, Procházkova Hall, House of Arts Brno, 26.01.1980.

both countries (Cimerák 2009: 152; also Oslzlý in Nvota 2020: 6: 53-6:55; Oslzlý 2017: 21), and was seen as political theater (Itzin 1979). In the Czech and Slovak context, the rendition of the project in this sense also supported the socio-political connection to the events of the Prague Spring of 1968.

The project consisted of three parts: *Prologue*, *A Kaleidoscope of the Austro-Hungarian Emperor – The Prison of Nations* and *The Slavonic Merenda – Slavonic Congress in Prague – April 29, 1848* (Oslzlý, Scherhaufer 1980: 510-511; also Oslzlý *et al.* 1996: 32-50), in which the Polish and Czecho-Slovak groups each met to varying degree. In the implementation phase, however, the historical materials were only used as a background material for the scenic representation (Scherhaufer 1996: 31), i.e. it was not documentary theater (-mpt-1980: 508). After the world premiere in the art nouveau hall of the Museum of History – in the Poznań Palace in Lodz, the project also had a local premiere at GOST in 1980. In both environments, the project was implemented in non-theatrical and theatrical spaces as an expression of the interconnection of an 'ordinary' and historical/theatrical reality. The description of the scenographic solution from the Brno premiere combines the evocations of the historical visual context of the materials used with the currently understood symbolic expression of the visuality of revolutions, for example the motto of the French Revolution "Equality, Freedom, Brotherhood":

> In the prologue [...] Teatr 77 suggestively plays out the oath of the members of the Mickiewicz's Legion. The second part [...] presents a picture of the rotten Austro-Hungarian Empire. The third sequence evokes the events surrounding the Slavic Congress in Prague. And the conclusion echoes the ideological legacy of the revolutionary traditions of both nations (Žur 1980: 51).

After a certain period of time, the action was interrupted by an impromptu interview of both groups, in which they talked about their intentions and addressed the audience directly ((om) 1980: 2). At the end of the play, both theaters awarded themselves with symbols of cooperation (Scherhaufer 1996g: 50). After the *Prologue*, which was held in the foyer, similar to the one in Lodz, the audience moved to the Procházkova Hall of the House of Arts

> where the actors were surrounded by spectators on three sides and only acted very minimalistically with a limited number of props. Having moved to the first floor and with the audience seated, the act began with a scene depicting the arrival of the defeated Polish revolutionaries in Vyškov. The portable props turn into the tables in a pub, with a few tin pints, and the defeated Poles enter the scene in a cone of light, covered with paper flowers" (Engel 1980: 5).

The contemporaneity of the revolutionary situation was depicted, for example, in the scene in which General Windischgrätz danced with his wife on the negotiating table for the delegates (Závodský 1980: 2), when "the voice of a commentator could be heard from

the televisions located in the corner of the room, evaluating the reasons behind the failure of the 1848 revolutionary movement from the standpoint of Marxist philosophy and historiography" (Engel 1980: 5). The dancing procession, which at that time symbolized the court of the Austro-Hungarian emperor, ruthlessly interrupted the delegates, paid no attention to them and "triumphantly strode onto the table" (Hejduk 2006: 67), thanks to which the audience immediately understood the meaning of the performance. At the end of the project, the traditional encore of the actors was absent. They "quietly" left the scene (Engel 1980: 5).

The chosen visual codes were based on the primary symbolism of the architecture in which the project took place, and the 'known' historical scenes and images were thematically updated using contemporary means of expression.

TOGETHER – LABYRINTH OF THE WORLD AND PARADISE OF THE HEART
(Denmark: Copenhagen 1983)[11]

> International cooperation of people with different cultural, political and aesthetic views can also play an important role in the formation of a deeper understanding between the participating nations and positive communication between them
>
> (Scherhaufer 1996a: 71)

After the end of *THE HOPE – NADZIEJA (NADĚJE)* project, its creative team initiated the creation of another one with a much wider international participation, the preparation of which took three years. The original name was *TOGETHER-RACEM (SPOLEČNĚ)*, with four versions of the script from 1980 to 1983. The project was based on Jan Amos Komenský's philosophical text *Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart* in Ludvík Kundera's screenplay adaptation, the twelve-point declaration of the *Programmatic and Organizational Lines of the Together (Společně) Project*, which was drawn up by Zdzisław Hejduk and was also based on the June premiere of Kundera's script at GOST (June 7, 1983)[12]. It was performed a month later under the name *TOGETHER – LABYRINTH OF THE WORLD AND PARADISE OF THE HEART* during the FOLS International Theater Festival in Copenhagen, Denmark. Originally, the project was to be implemented only with the participation of the groups from the countries where Comenius lived and in cooperation with

---

[11]   Script and artistic direction of the project: Richard Gough, Zdzisław Hejduk, Alexander Jochwed, Petr Oslzlý, Krzysztof Rynkiewicz, Peter Scherhaufer. Participants: GOST (CZ), Cardiff Laboratory Theater (Great Britain), Den Bla Hest – Århus and Group of The Copenhagen International Theater Festival – Folls 4 (Denmark), Teatr 77 – Łódź (Poland). Premiere Denmark: Valseverket Copenhagen, 06.07.-17.07. 1983.

[12]   The production and the project were created in parallel (Note: the author of this study personally saw the production).

UNESCO (Scherhaufer 1981: 27), however, in the end only five countries participated in it. From a formal point of view, it was an environmental (Scherhaufer 1984: 8) staging-event. The aim of the project, the creation of which "had a fundamental effect on the European political situation of the time" (Oslzlý, Jochwed 2017: 345), was an effort to make at least "small holes in the wall that stretched from North to South" (Pedersen, in: Nvota 2020, 20:58-21:05). Its message was that Europe is divided, but should be united by the fall of the Iron Curtain (Oslzlý, in: Nvota 2020: 21:26-21:42).

At P. Scherhaufer's initiative, each group had to present its own idea of one of the chapters of Comenius' book, which it considered inspiring, including the main theme – the labyrinth (Hejduk, in: Nvota 2020: 19:55-20:07; also Hejduk 2006: 73). However, the groups were united by the fact that the logic of the original would be preserved and the main character Pilgrim (Oslzlý)[13] would travel through the "images of the world" as is the case with Comenius: this specifically meant that he would accompany the audience through the individual premises of the factory, and the audience would become the observers and witnesses of the events. Therefore, the Comenius's Pilgrim travels in the scenes such as the *Prologue*, *Birth of the Pilgrim*, *River of the World*, *No Man's Land*, *Apocalypse* and *Paradise* – led by Všadebolus (Ubiquitous) (Miroslav Donutil) and Mámením (Allure) (Alena Ambrová)[14] – through the city that means the whole world (Scherhaufer 1996a: 76). The project was performed in an abandoned Danish sheet metal rolling mill Valseverket on the island of Amager with the participation of 400-500 spectators and it had 22 reruns. The scenic space in the factory was supposed to represent the "'text' of the performance, and the pathway through was supposed to create 'textual' metaphors" (Scherhaufer 1996a: 76). As Hejduk stated:

> The abandoned and decrepit halls, broken windows, leaky roofs, cables hanging from the ceilings and some remains of once functioning equipment, piles of garbage – a landscape after a battle. But this kind of space suited us very well. It was a symbol of the apocalypse that can impact our civilization if we don't wake up in time and suppress the pseudodemiurgical delusions that everything depends on us and we can do anything, if we don't stop living in blindness and "ultimately return to the house of our heart" – as Ján Ámos Komenský wisely advises us" (Hejduk 2006: 72).

In one of the interviews, Scherhaufer explained the staging concept of the project as follows:

> The audience was deliberately divided by Osud into married couples and parents with children. The actors – his helpers – gave the audience stickers of two colors (for easier differentiation). These divided groups – approximately five hundred people – were ush-

---

[13]   The main characters Pilgrim, Kristýna and the Pilgrim's guides (Všudybyl, Mámení, Osud, Smrt) were played by GOST actors.

[14]   P. Scherhafer used the Slovak language versions of the names of both characters, i.e. Všadebol (Ubiquitous) and Mámenie (Allure).

ered into two halls. The Labyrinth of the Western World was played in the first hall and the Labyrinth of the Eastern World in the second (Pallesitz 2006: 222-223).

The entire space was 'ruled' by the officials who checked the audience: they measured, recorded or screened them. The audience was also inexorably divided into East and West by 'passport control' with colored stickers. They did not meet during the event because both 'labyrinths' were performed simultaneously. The audience only got together at the end. The separation of the audience was so strong that some families, lovers or friends would not want to or were afraid of separating. During the 'pilgrimage' of the audience, an opportunity was made in the plot for them to meet, however, when the meeting was just about to happen, dogs were let into the meeting space, which was a shock. Thanks to this move, it was possible to create a strong emotional image of the border between East and West (Oslzlý in: Nvota 2020: 22:23-22:37).

The actions of the characters were largely symbolic and based on the personal or shared experiences of the team members, and at the same time they also linked to the tragic memories of wartime events in members of the audience. For example, in the East part they were building a structure from scaffolding poles only to discover that they had built their own prison (Krivda, in: Nvota 2020: 22:47-22:59; also *Davies et al.* 2017: 233-235). The building was a symbol of the construction of socialism at the time (Radzikowska, in: Nvota 2020: 23:06-23:09). Scherhaufer also worked with his personal memories in the parts dedicated to GOST and transposed them into stage action. For example, his experience of visiting the Auschwitz concentration camp strongly affected the visual concept of the *No Man's Land* part. It was represented by a 100-meters-long hall with large pits after steel machinery. The participants of the project in its preparatory phase threw everything they found in the factory into these pits – thus forming a pit with bicycles, a pit with plastic cups, a pit with chairs of various types and sizes, a pit with tires and old shoes and boots (Scherhaufer 1996a: 78), etc. This part also housed two art objects made by the GOST actors – *The Man of Many Faces* and the *Wall of Silence*. Furthermore, for example, a huge zoo was located in one of the halls where the West section was performed. The zoo was represented by seven actors who were placed in cages and represented seven different characters[15]. They pantomimed the duties of everyday life – sleeping, eating, working, etc., and they repeated these duties, but at the same time they were confronted by the Angel – Light who reminded them that it is possible to leave the cages. The part about Christmas Eve was taking place at that same time at the far side of the factory. Various personalities and persons from Polish history came to the festive table and received the Yalta Agreement as a Christmas present, which was symbolically depicted as a neon model (Jureček 1985: 17:34-20:16; also Kebl 1998, 50:40-52:42).

---

[15] The characters were the following: Pilot, Worker, Neurotic Cleaner, Man with an Umbrella, Voluminous Woman, Woman with Scissors, and Mask-Uniform (Oslzlý 2017: 239-248).

The project had an extremely rich structure and was very carefully prepared from the beginning to the final preparatory stages for its staging in Copenhagen. However, it was important for all the participants that "the idea of cohesion and reciprocity succeeded during the preparation and implementation of the project" (Kunderová 2017: 373).

The selected visual codes combined the primary symbolism of the abandoned and destroyed factory, the theme of wandering in search of the 'light' in an archetypal dimension[16] with wartime memories. The authenticity of expression of the created images was strengthened not only by drawing the audience into the plot, but also by the shared experience and engagement of all those involved in the project.

MIR CARAVANE – CARAVAN MIR[17]
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Moscow – France: Paris 1989)[18]

> My idea was based on the character of the peloton, at the end of which there are two mechanical cars that help those lagging behind and pick up the stragglers
>
> (Scherhaufer 1996c: 117-118)

The project was conceived as a trans-European theater caravan – a traveling theater festival – and was held in the era before the fall of the Iron Curtain[19] based on the initiative of the clown group *Licedeji* from St. Petersburg (Oslzlý 2017b: 24). Its implementation as a festival was considered by DHPN to be a return to the roots of theater in which the theatergoers could recall the comedians, jacqueurs, puppeteers, itinerant musicians, circus performers and bear keepers on an international scale (Oslzlý 1999). Thanks to the festival, GOST fully joined the community of alternative theaters in an international context (Oslzlý, in: Nvota 2020: 35:00-35:18). Eight permanent theater groups participated in the project, traveling for five months from Moscow (Red Square) to Paris where they ended the project with two performances of *Odyssea '89* (The Odyssey) in Jardin de Tuileries in Paris as part of the celebrations of the 200th anniversary of the French Republic.

---

[16]   For example, in the *Apocalypse*, the video installations used the symbols of modern archetypes, which could be traced back to the book of *Revelation* in various constructions, such as a shot of a bird falling steeply down, a large hammer that moves in slow motion and when it disappears, a broken glass flies upward on screen, a German-speaking TV announcer who speaks out of context, etc. (Oslzlý 2017: 92-93).

[17]   The Russian word *mir* means both 'peace' and 'world'.

[18]   International Theater Caravan. Participants: Akademie Ruchu (Poland), GOST (CZ), Cirk Perillos (Spain), Dog Troep (Netherlands), Footsbarn Travelling Theatre (Great Britain), La Compagnie du Hasard (France), Licedeji (Soviet Union), Svoja igra (Soviet Union), Teatr Ósmego dnia (Poland), Teatro Nucleo (Italy). Cities visited: Moscow, Leningrad, Vilnius, Warsaw, Prague, West Berlin, Copenhagen, Basel, Lausanne, Blois, Paris. Implementation: 10.05.-22.09.1989.

[19]   The Berlin Wall was demolished six weeks after the end of the project.

The stopover in Prague on 07.07. and 07.08.1989 was the first international festival of alternative theater in Czechoslovakia.

Each theater had productions in their repertoire that were performed at the individual stops. GOST performed Brecht's *Wedding* directed by Peter Scherhaufer, which was 25 minutes long and had no rejoinders in the street version. The second production was a street version of *Dream World* by screenwriter and theater director Eva Tálská (Kilby 2014: 7:40-10:51 and others), and both were always performed in the language of the guest country[20]. For the Prague stopover, DHPN prepared a special authorial production *Trosečník* by Bolek Polívka.

During some of the stopovers (mainly in the USSR), amateur theater artists joined the caravan, as was the case, for example, some thirty kilometers from St. Petersburg when the representatives of Leningrad amateur groups decided to welcome them on a meadow with a special performance. The artists of the caravan also performed the School of Street Theater from June 5 to June 19, 1989 (Scherhaufer 1990: 23-24) and they were usually joined by professional groups from the relevant country during the stopovers. The participants of the project from the St. Petersburg stopover worked on the *Odyssea '89* production, which was to premiere on July 30, 1989 in West Berlin, but it was not held due to a big storm. It was first performed in Denmark, and the groups played it at every festival they attended. The itemized script was created based on the stage pattern[21], which was first used in Copenhagen in the courtyard of the Museum of Architecture on 13.08.1989. Based on the pattern, an itemized scenario was created, which was first realized in Copenhagen in the courtyard of the Museum of Architecture on 13.08.1989.

---

[20] The 10 main groups traveled 7000 km on their journey, played more than 500 shows, more than 200 artists and technicians participated in the project (of which 160 were artists), and the convoy consisted of 85 cars, trailers and motorhomes (campers) and five tents. GOST traveled in ten Škoda 1203s, which it obtained for free thanks to the Slovak amateur theater actor Pavol Kozák from Závody ťažkého strojárstva in Martin under the pretext of running the cars in.

[21] The stage pattern consisted of the following parts: 1. *Stopover*, 2. *Cavalcade*, 3. *Report*, 4. *Ecological variant*, 5. *Waiting for Odysseus*, 6. *Historic variant*, 7. *First of May*, 8. *Concentration camp* and 9. *One and the same thing*. He once again strengthened the archetypal reverberation of the basic theme by connecting it with the personal experiences of the project actors. For example, in the first part, the groups were asked to act or talk about their journey directly in the cars and trucks, and in the others: ad 2) they had to act out their own versions of *Odyssey* in the allegorical wagons; ad 3) they were asked to act the project journey so far in different parts of the visited cities; ad 4) they were to interpret the situation after the departure of victors from Troy and what remains after such victories; ad 5) they were asked to act the futile waiting for Odysseus and the feelings associated with it; ad 6) Odysseus' adventures were to be performed by means of street theater; ad 7) Odysseus' expedition was supposed to march in front of the tribune of the Gods and depict the stories it had experienced; ad 8) the audience together with the groups were asked to act out their own Odyssean adventures in the happening and ad 9) groups were formed to act their own variant of a particular part of *Odyssey*.

We will present several images that were created with the use of conceptual proce-
dures, which are typical for Scherhaufer's work in the exterior projects in Slovakia and the
Czech Republic. Common and very specific technical, traffic, etc. means were used in a
very simple way in new meaningful positions.

In the first scene of the jointly performed *Odyssey* – the *Ceremonial Farewell of the
Victors from Troy*, actions from the real life of sailors, such as loading the bags, lining up,
scrubbing the floor and saluting, were pantomimed, ceremonial speeches were held in En-
glish and Russian, and champagne toasts were given (Scherhaufer 1996b: 145-149). The
second scene was the *Revenge of the Gods*, during which Odysseus found himself outside a
tall scaffold that was placed on the sea shore and

> massive naval searchlights were lit [...] and amid the terrible noise of sirens and heavy
> metal music, a huge fan started spinning, spewing tons of feathers, paper, confetti and
> everything within its reach onto the ship and the audience. The maliciously laughing
> gods crowned with vine leaves and holding fire hoses (Scherhaufer 1996b: 149) were
> running on the scaffold.

At the same time, other demigods maliciously doused the sailors with buckets of wa-
ter, and their escape was prevented by a dragon with 5-meters-long wings controlled by
one of the gods. It was made out of two fire extinguishers, which were placed on a toothed
excavator grapple and spewed out freezing smoke (Scherhaufer 1996b: 150). GOST played
the part called *Sirens*. The beginning was dedicated to the girls from Circo Perrilos climb-
ing the Škoda cars. When they put on the costumes, their skirts covered the bodies of the
cars and they turned into huge figures – Sirens. Theater actors, such as Aďa Ambrová[22],
represented a winged Siren with a screen instead of the head; Scherhaufer represented the
Hypnos Siren, launching rockets into the sky and smokestacks to the ground. The Sirens
sang loudly and their power was also presented by the howling of the engines, blaring of
the horns, flashing of the lights, slamming of the doors and screeching of the Sirens (Scher-
haufer 1996b: 152-155). When the revolution broke out on the ship, the cars surrounded it,
the horns blared, a huge cloud of white fog appeared [...], which left dead sailors behind"
(Scherhaufer 1990: 18). The cars then left laden with dead mutineers, the ship was almost
empty and the Sirens disappeared triumphantly (Scherhaufer 1996b: 152-155).

The selected visual codes combined the primary symbolism of various types of ur-
ban spaces with the historical theatrical and para-theatrical forms, such as the art of jug-
glers, itinerant comedians, etc., (see above) by mostly visual updating a well-known ancient
Greek myth. At the same time – and similar to the previous projects, a very comprehensi-
ble visual language was created, which in a simple way connected the symbolic level of the
mythical theme with specific civilizational manifestations and achievements[23].

---

[22]   Real name Alena.

[23]   The project had a continuation. In 2010 under the name *Mir Karavan 2010*, it was im-
plemented as a festival tour in Brno, Frankfurt am Main, Villeneuve les Avignon, Namur and
Moscow. It was attended by theaters from France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, Poland and Russia,

JOURNEY TO DELPHI I. – EUROPE, EUROPE!
(Denmark: Århus 1991)[24]

> The element of water and fire can break even the heaviest
> of hearts (Pallesitz 2006: 216)

All organizers – similar to other international projects – were united by the "same belief that the role of artists – independently of the efforts of politicians and other people – is to always emphasize the need for peace and cooperation in Europe; the need for unity" (Hejduk 1996: 189).

The idea of the *JOURNEY TO DELPHI* project was created and gradually formed from 1984, and the project was finally conceived as a production-event. From an ideological standpoint, it was supposed to be an activity that "searches for what unites and not what divides us in Europe (Hejduk, in: Nvota 2020: 37:00-37:05). The project was built on the idea that the groups travel through Europe and look for answers to what the world will look like in the future. (Krivda, in: Nvota 2020: 37:08-37:18). It was originally supposed to take place immediately after the *TOGETHER* project as a 'sea project'. The key groups were to embark on a ship in Copenhagen that would sail around Europe all the way to Delphi. Other groups would join in the respective ports, and they would perform a joint event in Delphi (Scherhaufer 1996d: 191) at the end of the voyage. Due to the organizational and financial demands, its authors decided to "abandon the original idea of traveling by sea and a whole lot of fantastic ideas resulting from that plan" (Oslzlý 1999). As stated by Hejduk, the project participants were ultimately supposed to travel

> along the border that divided Europe into two separate worlds at the time. We agreed that
> we would make a stopover in every country we went through. The theme and form should
> be determined by the host group, i.e. the theater that is based in the relevant stopover coun-
> try. The entire project was to be implemented in several stages (Hejduk 2006: 75).

In the end, *JOURNEY TO DELPHI*:

> (sic.) has reminiscences of the ancient Greeks long and painful pilgrimage to Sibylla,
> who was asked to find the answers to vital questions. Still we bear in mind the old and

---

including *GOST*, which at the time performed Václav Havel's *Prasa* under the direction of the then artistic director Vladimír Morávek. Another caravan was held under the name *Odyssee Karavana* in 2018-2019, in which 14 ensembles participated (Tomanl 2009; Colectivo: 2010; Herrendorf at al. 2018; Popov 2018).

24   International cultural and theater project. Participants: GOST (CZ), Teatr 77 (Poland), Den Blå Hest (Denmark), Kammertheater (Germany), Ruto Killakund (Estonia), La Theatre du Lien (Switzerland), Arvisura (Hungary), Osrodek Theatru Warszatowego (Poland), Freiraum Theater Ensemble (Germany), Moderna Nall Balleten (Sweden), HaDivadlo (CZ). Director: Zdzisław Hejduk (Poland), Knut Hirche (Germany), Peter Jalakas (Estonia), Alexander Jochwed (Denmark), Peter Scherhaufer (CZ). Premiere in Denmark: Århus, 09.06.1991.

relevant KNOW THYSELF. The oracle's answer-no answer is paradoxical, as the answer is to be found within ourselves (Kolektív 1991: 2).

The first stage of the project was implemented in 1991 and the preparations took place in the Danish Århus at the headquarters of the Den blå hest group. The production based on Jochwed's script *Europe, Europe!* premiered here, and this production was always adjusted to the conditions of the respective stopover country (Oslzlý 1999):

> In Germany, the Kammertheater group from Neubrandenburg was the host theater, and the Goose on a String Theater took up the baton in Brno. Polish stopover was made on the way from Neubrandenburg to Brno, consisting of two parts. Its first scene was *Žalm* (Psalm) of Chelmno – a production of Teatr 77 in Chełmno nad Nerem – and the second happening was held in Przehyba, which was realized by the Tarn group Warsztatowa (Hejduk 2006: 76).

The production *Europe, Europe!* was performed in an empty factory that evoked a sense of alienation, a labyrinth and a no man's land[25]. In the courtyard, the spectators were terrorized by a patrol and met a terrifying-looking group of drummers marching on stilts. Not before long, two women appeared: "The young woman symbolized Spring and New Europe, and the old woman symbolized Winter and Old Europe. To the young Europe's question: "Who am I?", the old one provided a classic answer: "Know thyself." And so began the search for the famous 'European identity' (Fuchsová 1996: 196-197). The images of the search for identity were based not only on the ancient Greek myths, but also on the negative aspects of Christian faith and the socialist present. They were combined with simple archetypal images – visions of the need to accept the positive and negative aspects of European history, which must be joined without violence: "In the first hall, an old woman sits on top of a huge pile of stones. Sisyphus is pushing his stone and various religious rituals end with a crusade and photographing the dead and the missing" (Fuchsová 1996: 197). In the next hall there was an endless line of buyers, but they had nothing to buy, and on the far side there was an endless line of butchers processing meat. In other halls, women dressed in black and white were shown, who, just like in Utopia, were singing in the laundry and were nice to each other. The event ended with colorful fireworks, chaos caused by fear, darkness and sudden silence (Fuchsová 1996: 197).

The Polish stopover was planned as a symbolic tribute to the victims of the concentration camps because the event took place in the monastery, which served as a concentration

---

[25]   In the first version, the basic situations were the following: *Borders*, *Drums and Mirrors*, *Holy Mountain*, *Slaughterhouse*, *Ring of Fire* (also known as the *Ring*) *or the Oratorium*, *Laundry*, *Dances*, *Epilogue*, which were also supposed to be an impression-commentary from the travels around Europe and the participants of the project were continuously accompanied by a girl – Primavera. In the *Slaughterhouse* situation, banners such as The truth wins!, NO! etc. were used, in the situation *Ring of Fire*, the names of European cities such as Berlin, Vilnius, Prague, Budapest, etc. were written on the ground (Jochwed 1990-1991: 1-2).

camp during the period of communist totality, and where many children from Czechoslovakia were imprisoned and murdered (Oslzlý 1999). It consisted of three parts: 1. *Meditation*, 2. *The Forest of Phantoms* and 3. *Candlestand*. In the first part, the participants of the event/manifestation were welcomed by a honorary guard – the project actors who took them to a clearing/cemetery with the remains and dust of more than 340,000 victims of the Holocaust. In the second part, the audience led by the girl – Hope was directed to the forest where they met a barefoot philharmonic orchestra, saw a group of gypsies get into a truck and signs of the Holocaust victims on the trees – photos, children's drawings, they also came to a several-meter deep pit with pillars, etc. During the stopover, the texts of psalms – the last one in the final part – were sung by a rabbi, a Catholic priest and an evangelical pastor (Glinkowski, Hejduk 1991: 1). The central architectural object of the event in the final part was

> a specially constructed stage in the shape of the cross of Christ. It was excessively large, tailored to the totalitarian aspirations of the demiurges of the new order. [...] In the final scene, it turns into a gas chamber into which the 'demiurges' throw all the opponents of the ideology they preach (Hejduk, Soldenholf 1996: 200).

The event ended in a symbolic way when "the seven-branched candlestick was lit, with twelve meters high 'candles'" (Scherhaufer 1996: 200). The girl – Hope left after her mission was over (Hejduk, Soldenholf 1996: 2).

The stopover on the Carpathian mountain in Przehyba – the happening *Meeting on a Mountain (Setkání na hoře)*, was held on the border between Poland and Slovakia. It was understood as a place of special intensification of self-reflection and deepening of the bonds between people. However, due to financial problems, the comprehensive event with the participation of actors, visual artists and musicians was ultimately canceled (Glomb 1996: 200-201).

The selected visual codes combined the primary and secondary symbolism of the chosen exterior spaces, which they supported with theatrical means, and they were also an interpretation of the ancient myth of the Greek Pythia.

<div align="center">

JOURNEY TO DELPH II.
(Hungary: Nyíregyháza, Gyula – Slovenia: Ljubljana 1993)[26]

</div>

After two years of preparation, the second phase of the project was held in 1993 with eight participating groups. The Hungarian stopover was held in Gyula, mostly under the walls of the medieval border fortress – the Gothic castle of the Almássy family and their

---

[26]   International theater project. Implementation: GOST (CZ), Den Blå Hest (Denmark), Teatr 77 (Poland), Tetr snów (Poland), Gledališče Ane Monro (Slovenia), Ruto Killakund (Estonia), Kammertheater (Germany), Rudiger Oppermann (Germany), Toby Gough (Great Britain), Moricz Zsigmond (Hungary). Implementation period: Hungary: Nyíregyháza, Gyula 26.06-04.07.1993, Slovenia: Ljubljana 05.07-07.07.1993.

castle – and the Slovenian stopover was organized by the group Gledališče Ane Monroe in Ljubljana (Hejduk 2006: 76; also Hejduk, in: Nvota 2020: 35:45-43 :10). In Gyula, the groups presented themselves with a parade through the city with three artistically conceived cars on the very first day after their arrival. In the following days, parts of the agreed program were played almost every evening either on the streets of the city or in the main acting area, and three plays with the Oracle (the Oracle Plays) were dominant: the "Consecration" play, the "Presentation of Questions" play and the "Waiting Time" play. The groups rehearsed during the day. The entire shape can be considered a typical example of a site-specific theatrical form, in which the architectural and urban realities of the city were very consistently emphasized theatrically.

We will take a closer look mainly at the first play – *Prologue* because its language is characteristic of the other parts as well: it connected the symbolically conceived actions of the actors with universally known signs such as the ground, sail, etc. The play consisted of three parts, and it was interesting that this part and other parts contained a connecting action thanks to which they smoothly merged into the next play:

a)   consecration of the "Pythic space" in front of the castle, in which the Oracle had its symbolic seat,

b)   the "strawmen" play as a variation on the Teatr 77 sequences based on the motif from the *journey to delphi 1*,

c)   and the interconnection of the first part of the trilogy with the next[27].

The course of the first play was planned as follows:

A large straw mannequin was placed in front of the castle, which symbolized the 'mask-costume' of each person, and there were eight actors in it. When the actors–mannequins were 'provoked' by the Hungarian group Móricz Zsigmond Színház to remove their 'masks', actions such as mixing the lumps of soil from the countries where the groups came from, and defining the acting area by 'sowing' them, creating a 'table' by spreading a large sheet, handing out commemorative gifts to the audience, lighting the mannequin and reciting the participants' pledge in all languages. *The Prologue* ended with the appearance of the representatives of the Oracle (Pythia) on the castle walls who invited the event participants to another play.

gost only had a separate part in the second play, in which the ensembles asked Pythia questions they considered important. gost asked (staged) the following question: "Is it possible to perform a play when less than 300 km away people are being killed in a fratricidal war and Europe is only watching?" (Jochwed 1996a: 209)[28].

---

27   The second part of the trilogy also included the interconnection.

28   The second play was as follows: the Master of Ceremonies was sent by the Oracle to receive the guests and their questions, which he wrote down in a book. After the end of this part the audience could record their questions and wishes for a day or two. The knocking on the castle door

The third play began with the final and relatively quiet procession of the groups through the city because its participants came for the answers. After the procession was welcomed, the Master of Ceremonies asked the groups to repeat their questions. This was followed by a staged performance of the questions in a shortened version and a musical intermezzo in the form of a harp concerto. Then the Master of Ceremonies declared that there were no answers to the questions, and when he pointed to the walls of the castle (Jochwed 199b6: 204-209), a spectacular symbolic action followed. Its intention was not only to update the message of an old myth or connect some elements of the language of ancient Greek theater with contemporary theatrical means, but mainly to find a new – contemporary form of catharsis.

> seven large straw pillars explode and burn to the accompaniment of music from invisible sources. We hear a song based on the motifs of our first song, which we sang at the "consecration".
>
> That is our deus ex machina.
>
> While the columns are burning, a huge mirror appears on the castle walls, reflecting the entire space, the fire, actors and audience. Through the smoke we see the famous words of the Oracle of Delphi: "Know thyself" (Jochwed 1996: 208).

The Ljubljana stopover consisted of a procession and a shortened version of the trilogy, which was performed over the course of one day at the castle above the city. Instead of Hungarian, Slovenian and English was heard[29].

The selected visual codes combined the primary symbolism of urban architecture with the archetypically understood symbolism of ancient Greek myth, including the structure of ceremonies and rituals with the today's understanding of the expressive possibilities of meaning of site-specific theater.

---

was done by drumming, and after the order was drawn, each group presented its own action on the relevant topic for a maximum of 15 minutes. After the events, Pythia's answers were awaited. However, the Master of Ceremonies gave a laconic answer – come tomorrow, thanks to which the second play connected with the next – by waiting for the answers. The second play also included scenic music – playing the harp. It was the staging of the motif known from many visual depictions of the Oracle (Jochwed 1996b: 204-209).

[29]   In 1999, the main organizers of *JOURNEY TO DELPHI* received an offer to organize its next part. The company Arte Okzident from the German Weimar, which at that time was the capital of European culture, "decided under the leadership of Ralf Peter Schultz to stage a large international theatrical Schritt für Schritt with the theme of Iphifenia, and the further continuation of the *JOURNEY TO DELPHI* was to be part of it" (Hejduk 2006: 79). However, the offer was not acted upon not only due to the organizational exhaustion of the project leaders and ongoing financial problems but also because of Peter Scherhaufer's serious health problems. Due to his illness, the plan that "only the project coordinators will make the trip to Delphi and concrete the message somewhere in the mountain" (Hejduk, in: Nvota 2020: 43:10-43:29) never materialized.

COMMEDIA DELL'ARTE
(CZ: Brno 1999)

Another international project contemplated by Scherhaufer was *Commedia dell'arte*. It was to be realized by his students at JAMU, and the premiere was planned after a week-long happening in Łódź on 08/05/1999, and another one in Brno, while he also considered the later involvement of students from Italy and the Bratislava Academy of Performing Arts (Scherhaufer, Michalidesová 1991: 1). In the end, it was only performed in Brno as a street project on four stages during the *Brno City Celebrations* two weeks before Scherhaufer's death[30].

4.   *Conclusion*

From the beginning of its existence, the Goose on a String Theater not only searched for its own theatrical language and gradually developed into a unique poetics, but it also created a very different environment in terms of the ideas and aesthetics for the creation of theatrical forms "different from" the usual symbolized ones. In international projects, it significantly participated in the creation of readable and understandable visual symbols, which were only based on direct reception. Considering the contemporary aesthetics and philosophy of socialist realism, these symbols formulated and reflected the opposition of the social and political thinking of the theater and its audience. For example, in connection with Eliade's concept, we can conclude that GOST and Scherhaufer were looking for new symbolic performative forms that would connect the symbolism of the archaic, i.e. archetypal actions, with forms of social and artistic life postulated by different contemporary political, aesthetic and philosophical theater views. The language of these newly created audiovisual events (Lehman 2007: 174) was most articulate in international projects because the symbolism of their visuality was created on the basis of the convention of a large number of theater actors from different countries with different theatrical, cultural and socio-political traditions, albeit with similar thinking. If the notion that theater is seen as the only symbolized reality by American theoretician and historian of performative studies Richard Schechner applies in this case, there existed a connection between theatrical language, ceremonies, rituals and forms of happenings, which do not have to be a symbolic reality because they do not have to have an audience or a script (Schechner 2009: 34). The main features of these events also include the ambivalence of primary meaning because, for example, in accordance with the concept of the artistic symbol by German theater researcher and theoretician of performative studies Erika Fischer Lichte, the symbols created on the artistic level make the impression that meaning cannot be attributed to them, but

---

[30]   Its four parts were created by Scherhaufer's students of direction: Tomáš Svoboda (*Murder in Venice*), Pavel Baďura (*The Troubles of a Hatter in Love*), Claudia Francisci (*Fulvio's Trickery*) and Patrik Lačarič (*Pompei's Revenge*).

they evoke "their true meaning" in their understanding outside of artistic reality in which subjectivity becomes impossible (Lichte 2021: 208).

Peter Scherhaufer and GOST fulfilled yet another commitment through international projects, which they declared both in the Programmatic Principles and other contemporary materials. Namely, the need to build on the traditions of the Czech folk theater, which – similar to other folk performances – strongly reflects the archetypal thinking and actions of the time. Of course, thanks to the international nature of the projects – it also involves the traditions of European theatricality and the symbolism of the visuality of public spaces and our behavior in it.

Literature

Bąbol 2017: J. Bąbol, *Nowoszesnośćin – wzbogaceniem tradycji*, "Dziennik Popularny", 27.03.1980, transl. by K. Kamenská, in: P. Oslzlý (ed.), *Let husy z Brna až do Amsterodamu a Avignonu. Divadlo na provázku v letech 1972-1979/1980*, Brno 2017, p. 608.

Cimerák 2009: M. Cimerák, *Vesna národů – Wiosna ludów (The Springtime of Nations)*. "Theatralia", XII, 2009, 1, p. 152.

Davies *et al.* 2017: T. Davies, R. Gough, Z. Hejduk, A. Jochwed, J. Mills, P. Oslzlý, R. Posner, K. Rynkiewicz, P. Scherhaufer, *Together – Společně – Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint svět a ráj srdce – Kopenhagen. Reconstruction of a joint literary production-event*, in: P. Oslzlý, *Together – Společně – Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint světa a ráj srdce – Kopenhagen – Kodaň 1983. Documentation and reconstruction of an international project*, Brno 2017, pp. 169-268.

Eliade 1993: M. Eliade, *Mýtus o věčném návratu. Archetypy a opakování*, Prague 1993.

Engel 1980: T. Engel, *Experiment*, "Scéna 80", V, 1980, 4, p. 5.

Fuchsová 1996: G. Fuchsová, *Document no. 5. Pýtame sa európanov. Kolíska Kultúry*, in: P. Scherhaufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 196-198.

Glinkowski, Hejduk 1991: M. Glinkowski, Z. Hejduk, *Chelmsky žalm. Stopover scenario* CESTY DO DELF, Łódź 1991, pp. 1-3. GOST archive.

Glomb 1996: K. Glomb, *Document no. 9, Meeting on the Mountain – Prehyba (The Polish-Czech border, 23.-24 June 1991)*, in: P. Scherhaufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, p. 200-201.

Hejduk 1996: Z. Hejduk, *Document no. 1*, in: P. Scherhaufer, *Theater projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 187-191.

Hejduk 2006:   Z. Hejduk, *Moje stretnutie s Petrom Scherhauferom*, in: D. Inšti-
                        torisová *et al.* (eds.), *Peter Scherhaufer – Učiteľ "šašků"*, Bratislava
                        2006, pp. 66-79.

Hejduk, Soldenholf 1996: Z. Hajduk, T. Soldenholf, *Document no. 8. The Polish Stopover
                        on the* JOURNEY TO DELPHI I. (Excerpt from draft), in: P. Scher-
                        haufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava
                        1996, pp. 199-200.

Itzin 1979:   C. Itzin, *Socialist Feminist Vitality*, "Tribune", 07.12.1979. [Fur-
                        ther data undetermined]. GOST archive.

Jochwed 1990-1991:   A. Jochwed, *Evropa, Evropa* (Working script of the I version), ap-
                        prox. 1990-1991, pp. 1-3. GOST archive.

Jochwed 1996a: A. Jochwed, *Document no. 11. Questions to Pythia*, in: P. Scher-
                        haufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava
                        1996, p. 209.

Jochwed 1996b: A. Jochwed, *Description of the 7-day event in Gyula (Hungary)*,
                        in: P. Scherhaufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*,
                        Bratislava 1996, pp. 204-209.

Group of Authors 1991: Group of Authors, *Journey to Delphi*, in: Group of Authors (eds.),
                        Journey to Delphi I (program for the production), Denmark 1991.
                        [Unnumbered].

Kovalčuk, Oslzlý 2011: J. Kovalčuk, P. Oslzlý, *K historii "Společného projektu Cesty"*, in: J.
                        Kovalčuk, P. Oslzlý (eds.), *Společný projekt Divadla na okraji, Di-
                        vadla na provázku, HaDivadla a Studia Ypsilon Cesty (křižovatky
                        – jízdní řády-setkání). Project Documentation and Reconstruction*,
                        Brno 2011, p. 43-53.

Kunderová, 2017:   R. Kunderová, *Theater and (Overcoming) the Stratification
                        During the Cold War*, in: P. Oslzlý, *Together – Společně – Lab-
                        yrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint svět a
                        ráj srdce – Kopenhagen – Kodaň 1983. Project Documentation and
                        Reconstruction*, Brno 2017, pp. 370-381.

Lehman 2009:   H.Th. Lehman, *Postdramatické divadlo*, Bratislava 2007.

Fischer-Lichte 2021:   E. Fischer-Lichte, *Úvod do divadelných a performatívnych štúdií*,
                        Bratislava 2021.

-mpt- 1980:   -mtp-, *Vesna národov*, "Javisko", XII, 1980, 9, pp. 505-508.

(om) 1980:   (om), *Vesna národů*, "Zemědělské noviny, Praha", XXXVI, 1980,
                        43, p. 2.

Oslzlý 1982:   P. Oslzlý, *Smysl nepravidelnosti*, in: K. Šeda (ed.), *Program Státní-
                        ho divadla v Brně*, Brno 1982, pp. 2-8.

Oslzlý 1999: P. Oslzlý, *Slovo dramaturga – katalóg Mir Caravane, 1989*, in: Id. (ed.), *Divadlo Husa na provázku 1968(7)-1998 kniha v pohybu I...: roky, inscenace, grafika, fotografie, dokumenty*, Brno 1999 [Unnumbered.]

Oslzlý 2007: P. Oslzlý: *Dramaturgie jako konceptuální umělecký výkon na hranici divadla a jiných druhů umení*, in: J. Kovalčuk *et al.*, *Přednášky o divadle a umení. Habilitační a profesorské přednášky pedagogů Divadelní fakulty JAMU v letech 1990-2007*, Brno 2007, pp. 105-112.

Oslzlý 2017a: P. Oslzlý, *Medzinárodní divadelní projekty s účastí Divadla na provázku (druhá polovina sedmdesátých let)*, in: Id., *Together – Společně – Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint svět a ráj srdce – Kopenhagen – Kodaň 1983. Project Documentation and Reconstruction*, Brno 2017, pp. 15-23.

Oslzlý 2017b: P. Oslzlý, *Programová východiska Projektu Togheter*, in: Id., *Together – Společně – Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint svět a ráj srdce – Kopenhagen – Kodaň 1983. Documentation and reconstruction of an international project*, Brno 2017, pp. 23-25.

Oslzlý *et al.* 1996: P. Oslzlý, P. Scherhaufer, Z. Hejduk, P. Chmielewski, A. Podgórsky, *Vesna národov (Pracovný scenár spoločnej inscenácie – pracovný rukopis, máj 1979)*, in: P. Scherhaufer, *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 32-50.

Oslzlý *et al.* 1999: P. Oslzlý *et al.*, *Programová východiska Divadla na provázku*, in: P. Oslzlý (ed.), *Divadlo Husa na provázku 1968(7)-1998 kniha v pohybu I... : roky, inscenace, grafika, fotografie, dokumenty*, Brno 1999 [Unnumbered].

Oslzlý *et al.* 2017: P. Oslzlý *et al.*, *Smernice pro činnost divadelního oddělení – Divadla na provázku Domu umení města Brna*, in: P. Oslzlý *et al.* (ed.), *Let husy z Brna až do Amsterodamu a Avignonu*, Brno 2017, p. 10.

Oslzlý, Jochwed 2017: P. Oslzlý, A. Jochwed, *Dávalo nám to "na vlastní kůži" zkušenost, co je to ukryto na "druhé straně" . Z rozhovoru Petra Oslzlého s Alexandrem Jochwedem – Århus 25. září 2014*, in: P. Oslzlý, *Together – Společně – Labyrinth of the World and Paradise of the Heart – Labyrint svět a ráj srdce – Kopenhagen – Kodaň 1983. Project Documentation and Reconstruction*, Brno 2017, pp. 344-346.

Oslzlý, Scherhaufer 1980: P. Oslzlý, P. Scherhaufer, *Projekt Vesna národov. Wiosna Ludov. Scénosled*, "Stage", XII, 1980, 9, pp. 510-511.

Pallesitz 2006: *Beseda s Petrem Scherhuferem v roce 1998*, in: D. Inštitorisová *et al.* (eds.), *Peter Scherhaufer – Učiteľ "šašků"*, Bratislava 2006, pp. 216-225.

Schechner 2009:   R. Schechner, *Performancia: teórie, praktiky, rituály*, Bratislava 2009.

Scherhaufer 1981:   P. Scherhaufer, *Kalendárium Labyrintu světa a lusthausu srdce podle režijních každodeníků*, "Dramatické umění", I, 1981, pp. 26-35.

Scherhaufer 1984:   P. Scherhaufer, *Společně. Labyrint svéta a Ráj srdce*, IX, "Scene", 3, 1984, p. 8.

Scherhaufer 1990a: P. Scherhaufer, *Mir Karavan a amatérské divadlo*, "Amatérská scéna", XXVII, 1990, 2, pp. 23-24.

Scherhaufer 1990b: P. Scherhaufer, *Odyssea ´89, XII. ... a spol. (Basilej)*, report "Tvorba", XXII, 1990, 4, pp. 18-19.

Scherhaufer 1996a: P. Scherhaufer, *Labyrint svéta*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 70-84.

Scherhaufer 1996b: P. Scherhaufer: *Mir karavan – Karavána sveta*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 108-168.

Scherhaufer 1996c: P. Scherhaufer, *Nádej. Joint theater event on the theme of hope*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku* Batislava 1996, pp. 25-29.

Scherhaufer 1996d: P. Scherhaufer, *Comment*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, p. 191.

Scherhaufer 1996e: P. Scherhaufer: *Comment*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, p. 200.

Scherhaufer 1996f: P. Scherhaufer, *Introduction*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 3-5.

Scherhaufer 1996g: P. Scherhaufer, *Vesna národov*, in: Id., *Divadelné projekty Divadla Husa na provázku*, Bratislava 1996, pp. 30-50.

Scherhaufer, Michalidesová 1999:   P. Scherhaufer, S. Michalidesová, *Sisa, Ty chorľavejúca flautička*..., letter from P. Scherhaufera to S. Michalidesová, approx. 1999. 1 p. [Undated], S. Michalidesová's archives.

Scherhaufer, Oslzlý 1985:   P. Scherhaufer, P. Oslzlý, PROJEKT 1985 – *Scénické čtení (Project 1985 – Scenic reading)* (Program for the production), Brno 1985 [Unnumbered].

Závodský 1980:   A. Závodský, *Česko-polská inscenace*, "Tvorba, Praha", XXII, 1980, 8, p. 2.

Žur 1980:   Žur, *"Provázek" + Teatr 77*, "Čs. voják. Praha", XXIX, 1980, 7, p. 51.

Electronic resources

Colectivo 2010:

Colectivo, MIR CARAVAN 2010, <https://www.teatronucleo. org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/MIRCaravan_2010_ EN.pdf> (latest access 02.08.2022).

Herrendorf *et al.* 2010:

C. Herrendorf *et al.*, *MirCaravan,* <https://www.teatronucleo. org/eng/mir-caravan/> (latest access 02.08.2022).

Tomandl 2009:

J. Tomandl, *Husa na provázku po 20 letech znovu vyjede s Kara-vanou míru*, <https://www.divadlo.cz/?clanky=husa-na-provaz-ku-po-20-letech-znovu-vyjede-s-karavanou-miru> (latest access 03.08.2022).

Popov *et al.* 2018:

G. Popov *et al.*, *Odyssea Karavana*, <http://www.odysseekarava-na.com/> (latest access 03.08.2022).

Audiovisual Resources

Jureček 1985:

K. Jureček, *Netradiční divadlo provázek*, TV documentary, direc-ted by V. Sís, Czechoslovak Television Brno 1985 [Premiere date unknown].

Kebl 1998:

J. Kebl, *Divadlo v pohybu (v.) Brno 98*, TV documentary, Czech Television, Television Studio Brno, directed by: J. Kebl, premiere 07/06/1998.

Kilby 2014:

J. Kilby, MIR CARAVAN 1989 – part 2, <https://www.youtube. com/watch?v=x2KqvUVW-6M> (latest access 10.08.2022).

Nvota 2020:

J. Nvota, *Múdry blázon*, TV biopic, directed by J. Nvota, Edit stu-dio, RTVS Bratislava, premiere 15.12.2020.

Abstract

Dagmar Inštitorisová
Visuality in Peter Scherhaufer's European Events

The present study deals with the main features of visuality in European para-theatrical and theatrical events (1978-1993) authored by the theater director of Slovak origin Petr Scherhaufer (1942-1999), the co-founder of the legendary Goose on a String Theater in Brno in the then Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. These events were almost always hosted and prepared by theater groups and artists from Eastern and Western Europe. They were unrepeatable because of their atmosphere, humanist message, but also form. They often connected old theater and other forms with known visual (and not only) codes of today and with the socio-political signs of the time, creating interactive and highly authentic-looking and experiential forms. The study is also based on P. Scherhaufer's and P. Oslzlý's opinions on the function and meaning of the work of GOST, which is connected to the analyzed forms. It also relies on a wide range of available archival materials and the author's own experience with the creations of GOST. The core of the study is focused on a pragmatic analysis of the European events, their main features, the essence of visuality and the symbolic elements of the language used. Mainly in the conclusion, the findings are embedded in broader philosophical, aesthetic, anthropological and theatrical contexts (M. Eliade, E. Fischer-Lichte, J.TH. Lehman, R. Scherchner).

Keywords

Peter Scherhaufer; Peter Oszlý; Goose on a String Theater in Brno; Theatrical Projects; European Events; Language Signs; Symbolism of Visuality; Updated Archetypes; Pragmatic Analysis.