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This research is about authenticity in the performing arts. Departing from the hyperreal condition of postmodernism, we attempt to argue that some performing arts’ spectators look for and experience a kind of authenticity when attending such shows. Looking at the different dimensions of authenticity, a series of propositions is made about its applications to the performing arts. We namely rely on a “constructivist” perspective supporting that the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic can be socially or personally constructed. We argue that authenticity in performing arts remains in the communion of honest and true artists with a passionate audience.
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Although philosophers (Benjamin [1936] 1973), anthropologists and sociologists (MacCannell 1973) have examined the concept of authenticity decades ago, it has been neglected by consumer researchers for a long time. Only recently did authenticity draw the attention of a few scholars (Arnould and Price 2000, Camus 2001, 2004; Cova and Cova 2004; Grayson 2002; Grayson and Martinec 2004; Grayson and Shulman 2000; Rose and Wood 2005). According to Grayson and Martinec (2004), consumer quest for authenticity has existed for hundreds of years and still persists today as reflected by a substantial number of purchase situations and a wide variety of market offerings. For Camus (2001), an actual culture of authenticity only emerged in the seventies. This emergence may be explained by three major factors: nostalgia of the past and of elsewhere, the quest for references, meanings and truth (Benjamin [1936] 1973) and the need for singularity.

Much in contrast with the idea of authenticity as emerging cultural framework, postmodern writers have argued that technology’s innovations and globalization have undermined consumers’ ability to assess the difference between the real and the fake, between the authentic and the contrived. Benjamin ([1936] 1973) was among the first authors to point at the depreciation of authenticity in the arts. In his “Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”, he observes a shift in the status of traditional art, in a period where technical means of art reproduction such as photography and film increasingly dominate the imagination of mass public. Similarly, for Baudrillard (1983), authenticity has been replaced by copy and nothing is real though those engaged in the illusion are incapable of seeing it. For others, as Belk (1996), consumers now prefer the easily accessible replica to the more inaccessible original. Moreover, as far as museums and historic sites are concerned, Belk (1996) underlines that consumers are no longer interested in history, art and culture as such but in fantasy and spectacle. In the same way, Benjamin quotes Duhamel (232). In summary, in a cultural world of hyperreality where the distinctions between real and unreal are blurred, the search for distraction and entertainment appears to prevail over the quest for authenticity.

This paper is about authenticity in arts and more precisely in the performing arts. Our research was guided by an attempt to answer the following questions: are consumers looking for authenticity in their artistic/cultural experiences? Are they looking for “artertainment” rather than authenticity? Which type of authenticity is relevant when considering different types of cultural domains? Departing from the hyperreal condition of the postmodern view (Baudrillard 1983; Belk 1996; Firat and Venkatesh 1995), we argue that some performing arts’ spectators look for and experience a kind of “authenticity” when attending such shows. The paper is articulated in three major parts. Firstly, we briefly examine the concept of authenticity according to relevant streams of research. Secondly, we propose an extended review of the concept of authenticity and of definitions/dimensions according to different theoretical perspectives. Finally, we consider the extent to which those definitions/dimensions can be applied to different forms of art focusing on “high” and “pop” performing arts.

**PARADIGMATICAL SHIFTS**

MacCannell (1973) is the first to suggest that an object’s authenticity can be assessed according to certain standards. In tourism, products such as souvenirs or works of art are usually described as authentic or inauthentic depending on whether they are made or performed by locals according to local traditions (Reisinger and Steiner 2006). Hence, in the tourism literature, modernists usually refer to authenticity as something which is perceived and judged independently by experts and not by the tourists themselves. Tourists sometimes have the illusion they have encountered authentic things but tourist spaces are often constructed backstage in a contrived manner. This is the origin of MacCannell’s popular concept of “staged authenticity.” The modernist view of authenticity as something that can be determined objectively reflects a way of thinking that is radically opposed by postmodernists.

Postmodern researchers argue that “there is no sense in asking what is the original and what is the copy” (Venkatesh 1999, 157). For them, inauthenticity is even not a problem arguing that people live in hyperreality (Eco 1986). Whereas modern art is characterized by realism and representation (Firat and Venkatesh 1995), postmodernism is characterized by the blurring of art and everyday life, high and pop culture, pastiche, irony, etc. (Featherstone 1991). For some postmodern writers like Firat and Venkatesh, postmodernity should lead to the liberation and emancipation of consumers as opposed to the highly pessimistic view of other postmodernists. For Baudrillard (1995) and Featherstone (1991), life is becoming more aesthetic, more like the arts: ephemeral, experiential, image- and style-based. Postmodern performance theorists such as Kaye (1994) show that postmodernist–or more accurately anti-modernist–projects seek to disrupt any foundationalism or essentialism and question the very concepts of authenticity, wholeness, meaning and originality. He isolates three unifying elements in many of the postmodern works he approaches, i.e. (1) the deflation of the art object as an autonomous whole in favor of an emphasis on the spectator’s construction of that object as an image in the mind; (2) the shift from art as object to art as receptive event; and (3) the upsetting of the hierarchies and assumptions that define and stabilize the formal and thematic parameters of the performance work (on that point, see also Auslander (1992) and his analysis of the Wooster Group’s work).

Recent studies in consumer research, supporting the perspective that the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic can be personally or socially constructed, pinpoint common cues that consumers use to evaluate different kinds of authenticity (Grayson 2002; Grayson and Martinec 2004; Grayson and Shulman 2000). In their consumption study about reality television, Rose and Wood (2005) even argue that the consumption of reality shows represents a sophisticated quest for authenticity within the traditionally fiction-oriented entertainment paradigm. These “constructivist” approaches of authenticity contrast postmodern views of hyperreality and even accept as authentic the fantasy that consumers co-produce during recreative experiences.

**DECLINATIONS OF AUTHENTICITY**

The term “authenticity” derives from the Greek “authentikos” in which “autos” means self and “entea” refers to tools or instruments. Nowadays, “authentic” is generally defined in two different ways: it means either “of the authorship or origin claimed, real, genuine” (something which has genuine authority) or “worthy of acceptance, true” as opposed to that which is false, fictitious and counterfeit (Costa and Bamossy 1995; Kennick 1985; Phillips 1997). In other words, genuineness and true value are the two
broadly accepted meanings of authenticity and, as we will see, they often are taken into account in the different approaches exploring the concept.

Following a semiotic approach, Barrère and Santagata (1999) define a work of art according to three criteria, i.e., originality, artistic labour, and aesthetic need (or lack of utility). In the quest of authenticity in the art, the two first criteria appear to be more relevant. Indeed art aesthetics cannot be generalized as some goods may be considered art in one society and not in another (Barrère and Santagata 1999; Gell 1996). Originality may be connected with the “genuineness” definition of authenticity mentioned above. Every creative act, if original, is also unique and, in this sense, is to be opposed to the multiple productions of standardized goods. This characteristic means that art can be copied but not perfectly reproduced (Barrère and Santagata 1999). According to Benjamin ([1936] 1973), the presence of the original is central to the concept of authenticity, and the existence of the original is enhanced by its survival through time. According to him, authenticity includes “everything that is to be transmitted, from its origin, its material duration as well as its historical testimony” (214) and is depreciated by any mechanical reproduction. Of course, mechanical reproduction enables to reproduce all transmitted works of art but even the most perfect reproduction is lacking an essential feature: its hic and nunc, its unique existence or history. The hic and nunc of the original forms the essence of the notion of authenticity. With mechanical reproduction, the hic and nunc is depreciated. The subsequent proliferations of a traditional artwork bear only an imagistic similitude to the original, lacking the aura and therefore any relation to the actual historical dimension thereof. The aura refers to the artwork’s “presence in time where it happens to be” (Benjamin [1936] 1973, 214) and is an indicator of its authenticity and authority. According to Benjamin, in the age of mechanical reproduction, the aura is declining because exhibition value (emerging from reproducibility) gets the prevalence over cult value (arising from the devotion to a work of art or an artist). Originality is not the only condition for authentic artworks for Barrère and Santagata (1999). A second criterion is artistic labour, or the fact that the creation is achieved through a specific work. Because of its own specificity, the output of artistic labour is extremely heterogeneous. What is important here is the quality and personality of artistic labour, as well as the talent and the creativity incorporated in it. This criterion involves a broader definition of authenticity than “originality” because its emphasis is more on the artist’s performance than on the history of the work of art. This criterion includes the author’s inspiration and intention to create the object, which makes it authentic (Camus, 2001). In the same way, Cova and Cova (2002) argue that authentic refers to which is “built” without any strategic intention in it. The “producer” is to be authentic in his/her actions focusing on his/her current production/work and not on the future of it. This “short-term” disinterested view is, for us, the landmark of authentic artistic work as opposed to a mid-term perspective guided by returns or yields. On the one hand, spontaneity, emotionality, and simultaneity prevail, whereas, on the other hand, mechanical reproduction, calculation, and simulation contribute to inauthenticity. Those dimensions are in accordance with the “truth” definition already mentioned in the sense that a work of art will be considered as authentic because each performance is unique in itself.

Perhaps the earliest account of authenticity still popular today is Socrates’ admonition that the “unexamined” life is not worth living. In the 20th century, discussions of authenticity often refer to the key writers associated with existentialist philosophy (e.g., Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Sartre). Heidegger (1977) associates authenticity with non-technological modes of existence, seeing technology as distorting a more “authentic” relationship with the natural world. With the new technologies, people observe spectacles, via control screens instead of living real experiences. Instead of the real, we have simulations and simulacra (Baudrillard 1983). So, from a philosophical point of view, the drift towards authenticity may be seen as a reaction to threats of inauthenticity inherent in postmodernism (Firat and Venkatesh 1995). Authenticity is contrasted with “falsity” or “fakery” in ordinary discourse, but, falsity does not imply fraud at every stage of the production of a fake, as argued by Dutton in his essay “Authenticity in Art” (2003). The latter author identifies two broad categories that help making a distinction between the authentic and inauthentic in aesthetics, which parallel the originality and performance criteria described above. First, works of art may possess “nominal authenticity”, simply defined as the correct identification of the origins, authorship, or provenance of an object, ensuring that an object of aesthetic experience is properly named (our originality criterion). However, the concept of authenticity often connotes something else, having to do with an object’s character as a true expression of an individual (our “artistic labour” or “performance” criterion). This second dimension of authenticity is called “expressive authenticity”. According to Dutton, many works of art that are called “inauthentic” are merely misidentified. There is nothing fraudulent about wrongly guessing the origins of an apparently eighteenth-century Italian painting. Fraudulence is approached only when what is only an optimistic guess is presented as well-established knowledge, or when the person making the guess uses his/her position or authority to give it a weight exceeding what it deserves (Dutton 2003).

In consumer research, many studies on authenticity have observed that commercialization can undermine authenticity and that the assessment of authenticity involves complex perceptual processes (Belk and Costa 1998; Kozinets 2002; Peñaloza 2001). But few of them clearly define and consider it as a key component that consumers take into account in their assessment of the arts. According to Rose and Wood (2005), consumers increasingly value authenticity in a world characterized by the mass production of artifacts. Recent works by Grayson (2002) and Grayson and Martinez (2004) on tourist attractions specified and identified two types of authenticity based on a semiotic perspective: indexical authenticity and iconic authenticity, both being associated with genuineness or true but in different ways. On the one hand, indexicality helps to distinguish “the real thing” from its copies. To perceive something as an index, the consumer must believe that it actually has the factual and spatio-temporal link that is claimed (Grayson and Shulman 2000). On the other hand, iconicity refers to the object being perceived to look like what was expected. In other words, iconic authenticity describes an entity whose physical manifestation resembles something that is indexically authentic of it (writers sometimes use phrases such as “authentic reproduction” or “authentic recreation”). The authors also mention that these two kinds of authenticity are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, all market offerings have both properties but not all will be judged as authentic by a particular consumer. Finally, perceptions of indexicality and iconicity are graded: consumers may perceive market offerings as being more or less iconic or indexical. These studies contrast postmodern views of hyperreality by suggesting that consumers can readily distinguish between the authentic and the contrived. Rose and Wood (2005) challenge the notion of indexical authenticity adopted by Grayson and Shulman (2000) considering that authenticity necessarily depends on a judgment of genuineness. In the context of reality shows, indexical authenticity is found to be an important condition for commitment but not sufficient to ensure a judgment of “satisfying” authenticity (a function of the conjunction of the objectively real and the desirable). The authors argue that...
consumers mix fantastic elements of programming with indexical elements connected with their personal reality. In other words, viewers value "hyperauthenticity", a label used by Rose and Wood after Baudrillard’s (1983) notion of hyperreality: "whereas hyperreality denotes the nonreflexive substitutions of signs of the real for the real itself, hyperauthenticity denotes viewer’s reflexive consumption of an individualized blend of fantasy with the real" (294). In fact they propose a third way between the modern quest for authenticity and the postmodern view of hyperreality; they accept as authentic the fantasy that is coproduced in entertainment experiences.

Looking at authenticity from different perspectives reveals the multidimensionality of that concept and hence, the complexity of its assessment. Consumers will rely on different cues to assess different kinds of authenticity (Grayson and Martinec 2004). In the arts, the way the authentic/inauthentic distinction sorts out is thus importantly context-dependent. In the next section, we describe the particular characteristics of performing arts and investigate how these characteristics can influence the complex process involved in the perception and assessment of authenticity.

AUTHENTICITY IN THE PERFORMING ARTS

There is a need to analyze the nature of authenticity in arts, like dance and music, even though they are being created, *hic et nunc*. Seminal works of Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) have frequently been mentioned as the first attempt to understand consumer behavior in the cultural field. For these authors, consumption has to be seen as involving a steady flow of fantasies, feelings and fun encompassed by an "experiential view." According to them, cultural and artistic activities are particular services whose consumption normally aims at satisfying the consumer’s hedonic and aesthetic needs. What the consumer really looks for is living a rewarding experience rather than solving a utilitarian problem. It should be stressed that "live" cultural activities involve more experiential and spectacular aspects of the consumption than cultural goods. The artwork remains the same in time and is unaffected by the presence of a different audience; this is not such the case for the cultural activity/experience. In this paper, the focus is on cultural activities involving "a performer" (e.g. a singer, an actor, an orchestra, a ballet dancer, etc). Performing arts not only involve one or more performer(s) but also an audience. In live performances, the audience usually reacts to the performers who, in turn, react to the audience in a permanent cyclic interchange. Actors often acknowledge that they live on an audience’s energy, especially as far as comedy is concerned, and complain when the audience does not react in conspicuous ways. Artists’ performances will vary from one night to the next depending in large part on the audience’s feedback. The togetherness of both actors and spectators is a feature that helps making a distinction between performing arts such as theater, ballet or concerts, and cultural industries such as film and television. Along with the live presence of an audience, group participation distinguishes performing arts from plastic/graphic arts like painting or sculpture.

In the following paragraphs, a series of propositions are made about authenticity in the performing arts. These propositions are summarized in Table 1. First, a show could be qualified as "authentic" because it is performed more or less the way it was fixed in time several decades/centuries ago, this conception of authenticity fits into the idea of "genuineness" or "originality." This question of original work often arises in "high" performing arts. Here, the word "authentic" refers to a class of performances that seek historical verisimilitude, typically through using period tools and attempting to recreate performance as in the past. According to some philosophers (Davies 2001; Dutton 2003), the historical reconstruction of a performance (i.e., nominal authenticity) is not the best way to convince spectators of the artwork’s interest. One would not go back to Shakespeare’s productions in which boys performed females’ roles just because it was the way it should happen in Shakespeare’s time. In other words, we assume that Shakespeare would have chosen women to play these roles if had the option. Similarly, the Beethoven piano sonatas were written for the biggest, loudest pianos Beethoven could find in the early 19th century; there is little doubt that he would have favored the modern concert grand, if he had the choice (Dutton 2003). Nevertheless, in “high” performing arts, original texts, compositions or scores left by authors and composers are cues of authenticity spectators are still looking for because reputation and time have elevated them to a “sacred” status. We like to hear “good” French when attending Molière plays. We like to be meditative hearing Bach’s Passion. We often exhibit a kind of “respect” due the sacred character of the work in high performing arts. Precision and trustworthiness are more important than improvisation. Despite those “original” cues, spectators are now searching for creativity and renewal in performances. The very idea of a performing art allows performers a degree of interpretive freedom (Davies 2001). The best attitude towards authenticity in performing arts is when performers try to take the largest artistic potential out of the work.

Another conceptualization of authenticity in the performing arts adheres to the definition that the Greeks must have intended. Authenticity here derives from the quality of the relationship between the artist’s self and its performance on stage. The more honest this relationship, the more authentic is the art that emerges. Performing arts exist in a finite space and time; this means that a performance has a very short-lived existence. Another similar work of art may be created the next night, but the different audience and the differences in the performers themselves will make the performance different. Because performances of actors in a play or of musicians in a rock concert are never twice the same (uniqueness of the performance), it is impossible to reproduce such performances exactly in their original state (Evvard, Bourgeon, and Petr 2000). The artist(s) on stage has no right to make mistakes; s/he has to be committed, “true” and as honest as possible with respect to his/her public and fans. Benjamin ([1936] 1973) argues that new forms of imaging—such as film and photography—challenge traditional conceptions of art that emphasize genius, originality and uniqueness. These new forms of visuality are rooted in mechanical reproduction. A film print or photograph has no “original”—and, according to Benjamin ([1936]1973), no aura—in the conventional sense. Also, the aura that envelops film actor also vanishes in comparison with the stage actor because of new techniques (and the cult of the “movie star” that it generates). Performing arts’ spectators often perceive an aura emanating from the stage actor. This is most obvious when considering the charismatic power emanating from singers such as Mick Jagger and Bonnet or actors like Ethel Barrymore and Gerard Depardieu. This aura may be connected with indexical authenticity defined by Grayson and Martinec (2004) as “a person’s actions or expressions [that] are thought to clearly reflect who the person really is” (297). It is also in line with the concept of performance authenticity (expressive authenticity in philosophers’ terms) that may be defined as faithfulness to the performer’s own self and originality in that the performer does not ape someone else’s way of playing (Kivy 1995). In summary, the performance’s uniqueness (including live production, aura, indexicality) and irreproducibility seem to make the experience real and true and so, to determinants of authenticity in the performing arts.

As mentioned before, in performing arts, the live presence of the audience is an essential element of the show. The existence of strong social interactions with the rest of the audience as well as
with the performers (in comparison with the more anonymous cinema) adds authenticity to the show. Aesthetic experience inspires and produces a reaction, but art is something that exists both independently and outside of the consumer of art, as well as within the human realm. It is through the interaction between the consumer and the art that aesthetic experience is materialized (Venkatesh and Meamber 2006). For the audience, attending performing arts is a major opportunity to establish and maintain social ties, to experience and share emotions. Social interactions contribute to authenticity through rituals and the emergence of a communitas of devoted spectators. This concept has been introduced by Turner (1969) and was redefined by Belk, Wallendorf and Sherry (1989) as “a social antistructure that frees participants from their normal social roles and statuses and instead engages them in a transcending camaraderie of status equality”(7). In other words, people who otherwise do not have anything in common interact and share experiences. Turner (1977) has characterized communitas as involving a “shared flow.” It should be noticed that, during the show, the balance between outer and inner manifestations of communitas may differ between high culture (i.e. opera, theatre) and popular culture (i.e. rock concerts). For example, in a rock concert, a strong interaction between an individual and the rest of the audience is clearly illustrated by situations when spectators sing together with the performer or “bring the house down.” A larger and highly-involved audience gives more room for laughing, crying, shouting, or jumping together, which add authenticity to the show. The audience forms a collective identity (communitas) during the performance, which results in spectators’ feeling of having lived a “real” authentic experience. These interactions also imply rituals (Rook 1985). Various aesthetic products such as operas or theatre are commonly considered to be spiritually elevating, and their consumption is highly ritualized (Levy, Czepiel, and Rook 1981). Even less elevating aesthetic situations, such as heavy metal concert, are extensively ritualized episodes (for instance, some AC/DC fans also called “headbangers”, all shaking their head while following the beat). With these communitas and rituals, the cult value, beloved by Benjamin ([1936] 1973), persists and contributes to authenticity.

Fantasy in performing arts can also contribute to authenticity. Logically enough, performing arts experiences involve a steady flow of fantasies, feelings and fun. As in Rose and Wood’s study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Authenticity and Its Applications to Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>Can be reproduced but not always in its original state (fakes) and is often transmissible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness and truthfulness</td>
<td>Uniqueness of the performance, “live”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aura emanating from the artist</td>
<td>Aura emanating from the performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexical (and possible Iconic) authenticity</td>
<td>Indexical (expressive) authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence without any audience</td>
<td>Existence through audience (moderate interactions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cult Value (but with multiple reproduction, increasing exhibition value)</td>
<td>Cult Value (more inner ritual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation between fantastic and real elements</td>
<td>Negotiation between fantastic and real elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Authenticity</td>
<td>Postmodern View of Hyperreality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2005), attending performing arts results in an active negotiation of fantastic and real elements that leads to a constructed, authentic experience characterized as “hyperauthentic” (Rose and Wood 2005). Moreover, at the opera or during a theatre play, the participation to the show also implies a flow or peak experience. Flow experiences include a centering of attention, a loss of self, a feeling of being in control of self and environment and an autotelic aspect such that the activity is its own reward (Csikszentmihalyi 1975 referenced by Belk et al. 1989, 8). As pinpointed by Arnould and Price (2000), activities that induce flow or peak experience (intense emotions for instance) may be experienced as authenticating acts. The issue here (regarding strong social interactions and the blend of fantasy and real) is not whether the individual “really” experiences the authentic, but rather whether the individual endows the experience with authenticity (with empathy for example). So, authenticity of the performing arts may be constructed both socially and through spectator’s personal experiences. This idea is in opposition with postmodernists’ view of a “pristine world of uncontaminated art” i.e., a world where artists create aesthetic objects to realize their personal vision and to satisfy their own creative impulses and where the artistic enterprise is removed from the world of consumer whims and fantasies (Venkatesh and Meamber 2006).

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

“Without culture, and the relative freedom it implies, society, even when perfect, is nothing but a jungle. This is why any authentic creation is a gift to the future” (Camus 1953, 186). This quote from Albert Camus summarizes pretty well which kind of authenticity performing arts spectators are looking for: the authentic (re)creation. In this paper, authenticity has been presented as committed, as resulting from personal expressions, as being true to one’s artistic self rather than to an historical tradition (Dutton 2003). The aura of the artists clearly survives. Really taking part to the show, the audience contributes to authenticity: the performing art’s experience is not objectively real but rather endowed with authenticity by the spectators themselves (Arnould and Price, 2000). That is why we have to accept that fantasy and real are blended and negotiated by the consumer. Moreover, the existence of the work of art with reference to its aura is never entirely separated from its ritual function (Benjamin [1936] 1973). With communitas and rituals, performing arts have something “sacred” that make them more authentic experiences. Nevertheless, some threats to authenticity exist like when adaptations are made in order to be in fashion or when performers lack honesty.

In addition to the quest for genuineness in performing arts, future research should be directed toward the concept of nostalgia that certainly is connected with authenticity. Some people are nostalgic when thinking about the Woodstock festival that Arnould and Price (2000) would certainly qualify as an authoritative performance, i.e., “a collective display aimed at inventing and refashioning cultural traditions” (140) such as the antiglobalization or antibranding practices exhibited en masse during the Burning Man festival (Kozinets 2002). Perhaps present events such the Live Eight is a substitute for the Woodstock’s nostalgic person and attempts to remind us what are the “true” values or what is a community so finally what is “authentic”.

Finally, more and more performers and producers spread political views through their shows. Philip Auslander has written about the Wooster Group’s political postmodernism (1992): the group uses to recontextualize historical texts and exposes the texts’ underlying political assumptions. Then they calls on audience members to formulate their own commentaries, their own answers to the questions raised; in doing so, the group returns critical voices to the audience. In that way, they also create a kind of “authentic” experience, making spectators reflect on present reality. As mentioned by Turner (1982) in his book on theatre, “when we act on the stage, whatever our stage may be, we must now in this reflexive age of psychoanalysis and semiotics as never before, bring into the symbolic or fictitious world the urgent problem of our reality”.

Philosophers will certainly agree if we assume that the depth of authenticity in the performing arts finally remains in the communion of honest and “true” artists with a passionate audience...
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