

Postmodern Openings

ISSN: 2068-0236 | e-ISSN: 2069-9387

Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2022, Volume 13, Issue 4, pages: 84-100 | <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.4/507>

Submitted: February 1st, 2022 | Accepted for publication: June 26th, 2022

Metaphysics of Corporeality in the Post-modern Thinking. A. Artaud's Theater: Self-less Actions, Mercantile Identity Accents

Liudmyla OBLOVA¹,
Svitlana KHRYPKO²,
Maryna TURCHYN³,
Yuriy PAVLOV⁴,
Tatiana BEZPROZVANNA⁵

¹ Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Philosophy and Science, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine, zbirka@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7872-6026>

² Doctor of Philosophy, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Kyiv, Ukraine, s.khrypko@kubg.edu.ua, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9426-4549>

³ Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and History of Medicine, Bogomolets National Medical University, Kyiv, Ukraine, m_turchin@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8506-4027>

⁴ Candidate of Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Philosophy and Methodology of Science, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine, pavljv1982@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8390-785X>

⁵ Postgraduate student at the Department of Philosophy, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University, Kyiv, Ukraine, t.bezprozvanna.asp@kubg.edu.ua, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2056-4922>

Abstract: The article is devoted to the experience of postmodern representation of the metaphysics of corporeality. The meaning of A. Artaud's "Theatre of Cruelty" is shown as a living act of ontologization of the body through the pain phenomenon. The game of mercantile and thinking participant in the action is distinguished. The purpose of scientific research: to distinguish between psychological and metaphysical experiences as those that determine the bodily and carnal goals of the participants; accordingly, to show the actions of selfish and selfless roles with their ability to pass or block pain. Objectives of the research: to investigate the mechanisms of postmodern understanding of the metaphysics of the body through A. Artaud's experience; to present the sphere of the Theater of Cruelty as the destiny of mankind to be a participant in the horrible and to be able to sympathize with it; to highlight the game of mercantile and selfless participant in ambiguous actions; to emphasize pain as a criterion of ontologizing the body; to show the places of the Theater of Cruelty in action on living examples. The scientific novelty lies in the view of the metaphysics of corporeality through the Theater of Cruelty and existential pain. Being a man of postmodern thinking, A. Artaud considers metaphysics in action and shows corporeality by a joint action, which is an event.

Keywords: *metaphysics of corporeality; postmodern thinking; Theater of Cruelty; metaphysics of pain; split body; body without organs; mercantile accents.*

How to cite: Oblova, L., Khrypko, S., Turchyn, M., Pavlov, Y., & Bezprozvanna, T. (2022). Metaphysics of Corporeality in the Post-modern Thinking. A. Artaud's Theater: Self-less Actions, Mercantile Identity Accents. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(4), 84-100. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.4/507>

1. Introduction

Interesting lessons in realizing corporeality are experiences that recognize its ontological properties and move in pairs, occur in the process of “connection of times” and maintain the absoluteness of the body. These are, first of all, experiences of Spinoza (2020) and Ilyenkov (1984), as well as Descartes (1989; 2020) and Mamardashvili (2000). What is special here is the relationship between modern and postmodern thinking of philosophers and their attempt, regardless of temporal distance, to comprehend the unconditional rupture of body and flesh through personal efforts. Thus, Spinoza’s “Ethics” and Ilyenkov’s “Dialectical Logic” resonate with the “spiritualized body”, the body as a state of things, the body as a way of things, the “thinking body” (Ilyenkov, 1984), “the idea of the body”, the movement of the body along the contours of other bodies, the natural ability of the body to act based on the logic of a different thing. Both Descartes in “Metaphysical Reflections” and Mamardashvili in “Cartesian Reflections” demonstrate ideas about the relationship between body and consciousness. Descartes says that the body is an extent thing, and the spirit is a thinking thing. And it is not clear what happens between them. Something does not allow them to be different than they are. And then, it leads to the following reflections: why the view of an individual on what is unfolding in front of him or her now does not change what is unfolding in front of the individual. Excited by Descartes’ experience, Mamardashvili makes the body of his philosophy from the existence of consciousness, such a consciousness, which is both in the human body and in the social body, and distinguishes between what is perceived by the body and what is realized by the body, that is, the body of perception and the body of consciousness.

However, it is important that there is someone who, being a person with a postmodern mind, not only did not jumped at the modern accents of the corporeality, but also presented a unique and original act of understanding the absoluteness of the body. This is A. Artaud, who made the Theater of Cruelty the driving force of his philosophy and on its basis managed to show how the mercantile attitude to the world destroys the zone of corporeality, deprives it of its unconditionality (Artaud & Corti, 1965; Artaud, 2021), therefore, substitutes the place of the body with the quantitative movement of the flesh. The thinker suggested “with the help of theater to return to the idea of bodily cognition of images” and get rid of the futility of action (Artaud, 2021).

The purpose of the article is to try to distinguish between psychological and metaphysical experiences on the basis of A. Artaud's reflections as those that determine the bodily and carnal goals of the participants; accordingly, to show the actions of selfish and selfless roles with their ability to pass or block pain. **Objectives of the research:** to investigate the mechanisms of postmodern understanding of the metaphysics of the body through A. Artaud's experience; to present the sphere of the Theater of Cruelty as the destiny of mankind to be a participant in the horrible and to be able to sympathize with it; to highlight the game of mercantile and selfless participant in ambiguous actions; to emphasize pain as a criterion of ontologizing the body; to show the places of the Theater of Cruelty in action on living examples.

The scientific novelty lies in the view of the metaphysics of corporeality through the theater of cruelty and existential pain. Being a man of postmodern thinking, A. Artaud considers metaphysics in action and shows corporeality by a joint action, which is an event. And the compatible feeling – compassion – the ability to unite, which protects against the disappearance of the living.

2. The peculiarities of Artaud's view on corporeality

The peculiarity of A. Artaud's thinking is that he considers it important to distinguish between body and flesh within the corporeality, because he understands: the body provides identification. This is the human constitution. And the flesh is the unification. It is organic. Although the thinker does not express it directly, the thought of the opposition of physical and verbal theater can be seen. That is why the body identifies action with thought, and the flesh removes thoughts from actions (Artaud, 2021). Undoubtedly, the body is related to rebirth, and the flesh is related to destruction.

Interestingly, the elimination of the subject as a transcendental thing in postmodern thinking and the emphasis on corporeality as the original capacity for human self-determination and self-implementation did not stop the body from being reduced to the flesh. Consideration of the body in the ontological status by Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Husserl is still accompanied by the objectification of the body and reduces it to the problem of "organicity". The flattening of the experience of obtaining a special body and the acts of acquiring a certain flesh did not stop. In the postmodern, the body is insistently commended, it is drawn into the world of necessity, it is revered,

but it is still not maintained within the bounds of good or within eternity because it is associated with “processing” and “nutrition”, and in the non-classical method of philosophizing, the fact that the body not only sows good, but also fertilizes the world attracts attention. Therefore, it is difficult to ontologize the body. Even in another world (in the realm of the supersensible), it shows its dependence on the “exudation of the disgusting”, continues to excrete repulsive things.

Thus, Husserl describes the concept of the “passive body”, “passivity of the body” (Husserl, 1998; 2009), Merleau-Ponty – the “phenomenal body” (Merleau-Ponty, 2001). Husserl speaks of “experience” and avoids the psychologization of experience, but the “eternal body” (the body of eternity) is extracted by him from “conscious body” (the body of consciousness). And where is the guarantee that what is perceived by the body of consciousness as true is not its “production” (goods, products, income)? We see the philosopher’s lifeworld and reduce the eternal body to the establishment of a certain body. Then, the body that attains such a high rank in Merleau-Ponty’s philosophy (it is the “point of unity” of human being and the world) is proclaimed the bearer of metaphysical meanings and the executor of the “temporal synthesis” of these meanings. It is the subject of perception. But then, the phenomenal body does not implement the principle of creation, but only facilitates the growth of the already embodied. It does not turn out that the body is a priori expected – determined by the way the body of eternity. Again, this means that there is a “saw-cut” where the body is, and with it, there is the inevitable stretching of pieces. Payments, deductions, compensations arise.

First of all, Artaud sees that for the postmodern thinker, the idea of metaphysics has lost its significance. Moreover, its rejection and non-admission have intensified. In peace with the dead God, a person is not worried about the eternal, whole and unconditional. After all, everything is filled with crisis, deformation, automation, assimilation, simulation. It is important to earn, provide, receive, appropriate. Investment, economic benefit, but not essential care worries his contemporaries after the change in money relation (Smith, 2019). And that is why a person still feels – experiences what is happening. But these experiences are solely psychological, especially considering that the nature of money is not only symbolic, but also societal and is directly connected to the everyday life (Armstrong & Siddiqui, 2020). This is the excitement of a monster that thinks with systems (Artaud, 2021). Such a being is scared when the dollar or price of gasoline go up, no, when there is no opportunity to buy another car

(no matter which one, just to do not with one's own hands and feet). Such a person is infuriated when he or she is not "liked" for their work. He or she thinks about whether to invest in a new building, and then is afraid of the fact that there will be trouble – construction will stop. He or she shouts when a person is insistent, is silent when something inappropriate and unexpected happens.

However, according to Artaud, a person who is capable only of psychological experiences does not feel when one's personality is entered from the outside, uniqueness is used, despised – the special is reduced to the substantive. If there are no potential penalties and it brings income, unworthy is allowed. When this is not accompanied by something "paper" (document or bill) but occurs only because of excessive indifference, then the ugliness continues with human permission. In the essay "No More Masterpiece", Artaud writes that "stories about money, worry over money, social careerism, the pangs of love unspoiled by altruism, ... have nothing to do with the theater" (Artaud, 2021). Therefore, he calls to realize that such a separation of life from art is associated with the separation of art from life.

Artaud shows that, in contrast to psychological experiences, metaphysical experiences are neither private nor material. These touches are not typical. They are co-existing (eventful). These are not defined feelings, i.e. not situational, but co-feelings, in other words, "aches of the heart" that are perfectly understandable to a person and experienced necessarily together, in relation.

Imagine that you are witnessing an accident. You see a quite real scene. The driver hits the animal and it dies. You can see its body going limp, bleeding and getting cold. What happens to a person as a spectator? Will he or she shout, take a step back, turn away?

Reading Artaud, one thinks that when a person affected by such testimony feels disgust, he or she is in a zone of a dead feeling. This is the criterion of physical corporeality, which is frozen. Such a being is stuck in the social plane of mercantile accents and cannot transform the dead into the living, is not capable of revival, because it is already transformed from the living to the dead (Artaud, 2021). So, he or she does not understand that this event is not a nuisance and the thinking entity in such scenes feels oneself not unpleasant, but painful.

When a person is in pain, he or she is in the zone of compassion, true action, magical corporeality (Artaud, 2021), that is, of not only personal existence, but of the existence of the world. And this means that he or she thinks with living feelings (co-feelings). Artaud called this hit an entry into a

state of a *split body*, when body and rationality are separated with feelings (Smith, 1985).

Speaking in the language of (any) classics, such a classic would express the following within the idea of the split body: this is the moment when the indivisible species (you are what you are) is the cause of personal presence. Your form affirms you.

Returning to Artaud, we see that a person of living feelings gets the idea of world cruelty and his or her own ugliness. A person who sees the catastrophic, criminal, also thinks: I am here for a reason; identifies oneself with the play (Artaud, 2021). If it were not me – not my split body, then there would be nothing that had happened in my presence. Such a person does not let guilt, thoughts that it all happened “because of me” go.

Thus, Artaud wants to show that it does not matter that a person is physically close to the tragedy and is safe, because he or she is a spectator, not a participant in the case. Its completeness and integrity, in fact, is only seem to be. In fact, a person is struck by “the reality not used by people at this time” (Artaud, 2021) and not only sees, but also understands how it hurts now. It does not matter that there is no direct collision. The provider of pain here is a special view of the extreme event (Artaud, 2021). Accordingly, a person is also in pain (he or she is also an actor). So all living and capable of rebirth can feel pain, no more, no less pain as it happens in a state of anatomical pain, but compassionately, not because of transmitting pain, but because of its event. A person draws oneself into the power of pain and transmits it through one’s body. Therefore, a split body strikes, occupies only a split body.

Artaud formulates the idea that a split body is a representative of corporeality, it is the first among other bodies. It has independence and is derived not from the flesh (dense, piled up, bound, assembled, glued, gathered), but from itself. It is the result of one’s own action, free effort, not carnal permanence (mercantile identity). It is given to a person not as an imposed body that undergoes transformations or that has already been transformed because of its essential laziness, but as a body in its immediacy, which is not specifically amenable to transformation, even when it is interfered with. However, there is a rebirth through action.

Artaud understands that, for example, the body of an accident (when two cars collided and their hulls were covered) is a ghost body. It evokes those impressions that are related to domestic or disappearing, disguised violence (Artaud, 2021). Therefore, they are repeated and limited only by perception. Because ghost bodies do not involve realizing the meaning, but

only evoke the meaningful, they are suitable for cinema or for a recorded and repeated experience – all that is related to the empiricism of images and does not accept the magical mimetic gestures (Artaud, 2021). And real bodies are felt exclusively in the theater. Their actions are not recorded, but are present at the time of action, of living coexistence, and can be caused without distorted bodies, but in the agony of life, along with others.

Real bodies are seen not in distortions, but in the preservation and maintenance of a “higher” body or the body that is before the incarnation. A ghost body, in contrast, is a body that has transformed itself into flesh. Therefore, it is related to the cruelty, which carries with it evil. But the body without organs (Artaud's discovery again) refers to the cruelty associated with the creation of good. By the way, Deleuze, who takes up Artaud's “body without organs” and develops his ideas (Baranova, 2014) creates his “virtual body”, however, he does so through the real discovery of the reality of “body without organs”.

Artaud realized that the body, unlike the flesh, could not be held, kept “for later” in its pre-existing state. It is not permanent, but the result of action. He saw not death, but rebirth in this requirement of the existence of corporeality. The body must constantly be shaped, created to fall into it, changed absolutely in order to have a place to be independent of material circumstances. This moment struck Mamardashvili (Mamardashvili, 2015).

While the flesh, in order to maintain its existence, passes through itself the edible (that which has mass), and therefore causes mercantile movements, the body passes through itself pain, a feeling that is not objective, in order to preserve its essence. It is pain, as Artaud discovers, that unequivocally ontologizes the body, affirms its sacredness (infinity), despite its profanation through the “processing” function (Artaud, 2021).

The body, stretching pain through itself, gives off not disgusting, but the “beautiful” that does not attract and does not seduce, but is appropriate and selfless, namely, dignity, that without which man does not embody his image, as a human being.

Thus, Artaud believes that pain is a qualitative cause, so it keeps decay out of itself, carries the disappearance. It does not allow the body, which is full of flesh, to disappear. That is, holds the “reality is nothing” of the body.

The pain splits the dense, dead and opens the abyss. Not only opens the wound, but “screams” freedom, a place that manifests itself in the vision of everything but itself. And from which, the indefinite, the unknown—perhaps the spirit, perhaps peace – always emerges.

When it is important for a person today to have a place to live, that is, not a place where you can sleep, but a decent space, world, peace, light, he or she will inevitably have to go through an act of pain, disturb oneself with an effective (idea), affect oneself with what never was and never will be, and, only then, immerse oneself in what “befalls”, “flies away” from the split and stay as long as possible in what reveals oneself. And there is no place for meaningful human life without concerns about the effective, if one does not do what brings pain (the abyss and its pulling), if one does not make a grand gesture. There is a place to be a stuffed animal, a scarecrow, a carcass, but no place to be human.

Why is it so? Because the house is clutched between the past and the further without the effort of embodiment – the forces of rebirth. A thinking being without going through “metaphysical torture” (suffering, personal effort) does not test oneself for “liveliness”. Then the world is not amazed by the fact that it opens a split and that it is born from a split – from a split body, from freedom. A person cannot feel and do anything special. In fact, he or she only deals with the narrow, irritation, pressure, survival clips – everything that gives a quantitative implementation, is busy with temporary image of everyday clues. One’s home, the world is in the “queue” for the real. It is not where the living is blooming, but waits for the actual implementation. Thus, a person who cannot leave the “dead house” or the queue (it is a question of physical experience) is passive, because he or she is dead or “regular”

Where a person is carefree (it can be said that he or she is worried about the same thing – even buying), obsessed with what is absorbed by oblivion – not a real home, but “intentional housing”, this experience is obsessive, relentless, annoying. It is “stuck” because it is done forcefully, not existentially. This **forced departure** is waiting. This means the untimeliness of your place, inappropriateness, it is “for evil”. The person is transformed into a doll. **Forced departure** also can mean disappearance, the remains of the body. Here we talk about turning into a corpse.

Therefore, Artaud makes the “metaphysics of pain” the core of his incarnation (incarnation of the world in the world), and the place of formation, the creation of the body in the metaphysical sense proclaims the “Theater of Cruelty”. This is his shell and bodily realization to the level of personality.

3. The “Theater of Cruelty” and the personal self

Artaud's “Theater” is not an institution that performs plays. It is a space full of bodies that cannot be other than to act in a special way, to interact (Artaud, 2021). Theater is a collection of bodies that inevitably feel a real connection with each other and therefore need to “transform ideas into things”. They must do the right thing, starting not from their own body, but from the body that is before any incarnation. Therefore, it is a place of moral acts or experience of morality. From Artaud's letters, it is clear that this is a place where, due to special images (acts of high feelings and awareness of the impossibility of influencing what is happening), a person falls into thinking about the irreversible (Artaud, 2021).

Artaud's cruelty, again, is not domestic. It is rather crazy, fateful, necessary. He is not going to saw anyone, anatomize, amputate something to cause physical pain. For him, the pain arises not from an external damage, but from a “split body”, from existential excitements, interests – the level of human intelligence, the power to question the invisible. (Artaud, 2021).

When the word-symbol “cruelty” is replaced by words with such meanings as “metaphysics”, “necessity”, “good”, “ambiguity of morality” – this will be Artaud's lesson. His theater is a theater of unconditionality, which is alive and cannot be dogmatized. Sensory supersensibility, which depicts the image, but does not freeze in it. This is the space of metaphysics in action, when the supersensibility itself points to itself in the process of transition to the sensual – shows the invisible, not necessarily demonstrative, not clear, not enviable.

It should be noted that Artaud's metaphysics is not a metaphysics of action or activity metaphysics, but fundamentally metaphysics in action (Artaud, 2021). The thinker was irritated by the utilitarian and pragmatic activities of the theater and he protested against the applied role of actor and spectator.

In a letter about cruelty, Artaud writes that effort is cruelty, existence through effort is cruelty (Artaud, 2021). Thus, the thinker thinks “the existence of man through action”. He is interested in an entity that acts not mercantile, but as if its efforts to embody (human creation, realization of the human) will never be recorded, will not be presented, announced, as if it does not happen and will not have a positive result.

Artaud argues for the creation of an essentially new, really existing, but not yet revealed. He speaks of the alienation of interpretations. He rebels

against the new replays of the created – grimacing, distortions, evulsion, elevation of what has already been implemented, like it can be seen in creation of brands and trademarks (Vats, 2016). And he takes the act of good and evil as an example (Artaud, 2021). Good must always be created by effort, and evil replays itself. Thus, Artaud does not speak of a complete rejection of interpretation and reproduction. He understands that images and decorations cannot be avoided, but allows “repetitive” only in cases where the body is stuck in everyday life. When an absolute case interferes with your “theater” (personality) and the plans for creation are formed immediately, as soon as possible, then there must be unknown and uncontrolled openness. When what is happening “here and now” is not explained as usual, does not fit into the textual scheme and looks like an exception, the person does not act in a prepared way. Artaud realizes that a person is submissive and helpless. But only in such states virtue occurs. The thinker insists that in order for good to happen in the moment of split, it is necessary to completely reject “evil” – even the slightest interpretation of it, and to show efforts to create the unprecedented. Strictly speaking, it is necessary to play the role of the Creator.

How is the role of the Creator possible? Is not it already played? How to portray supersensibility when you are the mediator of two worlds and involved in the sensual? How to convey the inimitable – what is not pretended to be, but exactly is? Artaud symbolically conveys that you need to constantly play yourself, do everything yourself.

According to Artaud, a person can be successful in the role of the Creator when he or she pretends to be who he or she really is “here and now”. When a person is a benefactor, he or she must pretend to be a benefactor, commit existential, not domestic violence. In the usual way, a person who lives surrounded by thieves begins to play the role of a thief. Such a person flatters the masses, makes such a choice of more criminal behavior than the real behavior of the criminal. Because of the mercantile attitude, he or she brings out increased violence. Artaud thinks that only playing a benefactor, regardless of the environment (being especially cruel in the face of widespread violence) gives an opportunity to do good – is not a guarantee of its appearance, but the opportunity.

Artaud notices that in real theater, people play perfection that they do not really work, but which they have expressed and subtracted. They play good, not evil. In useless actions, they portray something that personally appears before them and never goes out forcibly. Therefore, they distort what is not physical, but what is essentially charitable, worthy to be

embedded and used. For example, they play reason, courtesy, honor, justice. And during real actions (when originality or cruelty is presented to people), real experiences are postponed. Moreover, they turn to texts (teachings) to hide infidelity and cunning switch to the status of the faithful. Artistic theater is dead precisely because it puts this simulation into a textual scheme and reproduces through the actors what is unworthy of repetition. And therefore it exists only once. Artaud sees that showing someone who does evil under the guise of good is denying oneself the right to live. Therefore, he offers a theater where simulations will not be played, but where simulacra are simulated with fair play. He sees the theater the way to transmit not only positive, but honest sensory experience (Kurmelev, 2015; Brooks, 2019). For Artaud, this is the main way of destroying the “false reality” (Last, 2013).

Artaud's Theater of Cruelty emphasizes the actions of the “split body” and therefore rejects the dominance of textual teaching. He is an opponent of entertainment, because a wrestler is an athlete of the heart (Artaud, 2021). Artaud needs real logic of actors. And he looks into the flesh and speaks of the revival of the lost sense of the body, of directly human effective side of speech, gestures, outbursts of feelings. And he actually represents the action as the only true (acting) place of awareness of the effective (existential). For Artaud, corporeality is a body without organs – without parasites, without intentional, without everything that is “evil”.

It may seem that Artaud is moralizing. That he accepts only good and flees from evil. However, the thinker does not offer an escape from evil, but an impossible action, which, in fact, has a negative technique. This is evident from the work “The Cenci” (Cohen, 1982). Artaud believes that it is necessary to act so as not to play the eternal body. The point is, however, that in order to be perceived as typically insane, one must play madness, but not ask for typicality. Just as drunk, in order to give the impression of being sober, has to play a drunk in front of a sober. It is important to keep the true state invisible.

Thus, Artaud speaks of the poetics of a split body as a feeling of the painful state of the birth of good. Exit is impossible in the phenomenon when it is preserved in essence. This is a state when words do not convey what is happening, because they do not transmit everything. However, in such states, they shout, howl, strike, and become contaminated with blood. So Artaud shows that corporeality is and occurs because of reluctance (impartiality) of its appearance, insensitivity to its detection. But it is never profitable. Corporeality is interesting, exciting, because it is not desirable. It

is intolerant, terrible and therefore it is not wanted. Everyone does not count on it.

In short, the will to corporeality is due to its necessity. It is not attractive and it is not lust or thirst (hunger), but another attraction here.

Further, Artaud suggests that the metaphysics of pain marks the one who is an actor and a spectator at the same time, that is, the one who is always **an actor**, but not quite depicts – carries an image, the idea of an existing text or character, and **a spectator**, but not quite a witness to the image – a reproduction of the finished story. It is a participant in what is transferred to the performance. Such an essence has grounds for asserting the personal experience of the real, and it does not pretend to have consciousness of what is appropriate. It relates to the real or is related by it. The actor-spectator (the one who gives birth to the worthy with his or her body) can act within the limits of his or her destiny without instructions and condemnations and, at his or her own discretion, command the fruits of his or her experience, that is, to decide how to deal with the consequences (phenomena) that have come into existence due to transferred pain.

Probably, if you asked Artaud who they were, he would say that they were philosophers, mothers, victims, ballerinas, Olympians – entities that could withstand the difficult and sincere. For example, the scientist and researcher would not assume the immortality of the human soul, being the philosopher. They would not be allowed to do this “sense of reality”. Then, different person would not give birth, being the mother. No matter how scary it is before the birth pains – otherwise the child is not given. Again, there was no one to accept death with his children instead of Janusz Korczak. The act of conscience is unique.

However, one can appropriate incredible actions. If you win, you can get on the podium. It is a known opportunity to hire a surrogate mother. People dare say that Janusz Korczak’s action was a demonstration. But what matters is not domestic cruelty, which expects to extract the desired from the person, but insurmountable – hopeless cruelty. For example, thought, upbringing, training, executioner, crossing the threshold of the crematorium furnace.

Thanks to Artaud, even within the framework of postmodern thinking, the understanding is maintained that physical cruelty is not related to the physical world (flesh), to the usual, affordable things, and it has a special place and it is such a place. This showed itself very well in the live act of the Theater of Cruelty, which took place in Moscow in 2002 at the theater center in Dubrovka. During the performance, people in masks broke into

the concert hall and ordered the audience and artists to gather with the help of weapons and specific gestures. And then, all of them were declared hostages. It was a moment of maximum tension, the stage in not a descriptive theater, the one in which the spoken language disappears. And communication takes place with looks, breath, postures, gestures, excitement.

And here they are: have the audience and the actors all become actors? They all have become spectators? And those who mixed the separated by stage and hall, depersonalized closed worlds, who were they? Were they actors or spectators? According to Artaud's concept, all participants were in two worlds at the same time (Artaud, 2021). That is why the play began to take place, where "the characters themselves served as a decoration" (Artaud, 2021), the crazy play, which is artistic, but not yet artistic; which is real.

It was a well-thought-out play, performed under the guidance of cruel creatures. But "here and now", it was played out by both the cruel and the rightful to hurt others. Then it did not matter who was the actor and who was the spectator. After all, people looked at each other and understood that the next moment depended on each movement of each of those present. It depended on how everything could unfold and how it could end. One action, wrong and not beneficial to the cruel, and everything would explode. However, together, in their own way, they challenged their strength and destiny.

This event is an act of connection between danger and reality, not a copy of reality, not nonsense. There, metaphysical cruelty manifested itself not because people died, not because of the fact of corpses, but because it all ended unequivocally. Because it cannot end.

The meaning of non-domestic cruelty is not that it is horrible – insurmountable, and should not be experienced by those who are not cruel. There are events that are not removed by human virtues because they have no solution. Such events cannot be influenced in any way. Therefore, a person feels fear and humility towards them.

When we think about it, everything ended neither well nor badly in Dubrovka. It was something like a happy ending – because for the negative characters it all ended badly. It is impossible to say unequivocally that this is a bad ending – because the negative heroes were stopped and punished. And at the same time, everything ended badly – innocent people died.

However, even the death of bad people does not relieve pain. In an instant, the "screenwriters", acting out of mercantile interests, turned into

spectators – they saw their liquidation. Was it for the sake of pressure on the political environment and a profitable solution to their problems? If we believe that a positive solution is good, then cruel screenwriters become bloody actors, acting evil for good? Is it done to play a virtue motivated by good, evil as an instrument, in other words, to play the eternal body?

Obviously, money is the driving force in the organization of domestic violence, even if it is transferred to the cyberspace and is dematerialized (Graham, 2015). They are the meaning of the existence of cruel beings. However, again, according to the rhythms of the Theater of Cruelty, the real directors of such actions remain behind the scenes, because a mercantile person will never sacrifice himself or herself for something, even invitingly majestic.

From the point of view of the Theater of Cruelty, such “non-artistic” completion took place through the act of a split body. And what still flies out of there cannot irritate, offend, infuriate a living and thinking creature. It hurts the thinker, because everything is seen through the eyes of the realization of the mismatch of oneself with oneself.

Thus, according to Artaud, the cruel feels the pain from such “scenes”. He or she sympathizes with a person who cannot get rid of evil, despite the fact that he or she is originally set up for good. But a sentimental or violent person (someone who plays with cruelty and shows experience) hates this. For anyone who cannot experience this event on the basis of moral feeling, it is reduced to a situation and turns into a textual scheme, information. Therefore, the mercantile worries only about who benefited from it.

4. Conclusions

While in postmodern thinking, the metaphysical dimensions of existential forms are replaced by quantitative and objective concepts, the phenomenon of corporeality is actualized. In this case, the ontological properties of the body are still reduced to the quantitative movements of the flesh. But, with the general trend, the experience of A. Artaud stands out, because he not only does not deprive the body of absoluteness, but proves its sacredness. The thinker creates the Theater of Cruelty and on its basis distinguishes the game of mercantile and thinking participant in the action. Thus, he shows that a cruel person is capable only of psychological experiences. Such a person is busy with calculation, profit and commerce. Therefore, this person perceives everything situationally and worries about

one's own body. Such an entity is limited to the external side of pain and does not feel its truth. In contrast to the mercantile, the thinking entity experiences worldview meanings – events, so it passes metaphysical pain through the body. When deciding on the movement of the body as such, such a person has the right to cruelty, but only because of its inevitability. The phenomenon of the “split body” shows the dependence of mercantile accents on the flesh and the freedom of the body-oriented thinker.

The uniqueness of Artaud's Theater of Cruelty lies in the understanding of corporeality with the existence of finitude and the metaphysics of pain related to it. Without substantiating the new modern understanding of the ontological properties of the body, but independently representing its action, the thinker went beyond postmodern thinking. He avoided a destructive attitude to reflections on the corporeality. Thus, Artaud showed the ability of the existing being in the body to a compatible feeling – compassion – a feature that ensures the unity of the relationship of all living things to reality. Therefore, it protects itself from decay and disappearance.

Acknowledgment

Contribution of the authors:

Liudmyla Oblova is the author of the main theoretical research on A. Artaud's metaphysics of corporeality

Svitlana Khrypko is the translator of the text and the author of the identity analysis connected with the issue of corporeality

Maryna Turchyn conducted the research on the connection between corporeality and the Theater of Cruelty which resulted in the ideas on metaphysical dimension of corporeality in postmodern thinking

Yuriy Pavlov summarized the sources of the article and complemented the theoretical block dedicated to corporeality with different philosophers' ideas

Tatiana Bezprozvanna conducted the part of the research concerning the aspect of mercantile identity and cruelty caused by the monetary issues

References

- Armstrong, P., & Siddiqui, K. (2020). The case for the ontology of money as credit: money as bearer or basis of “value”. *Real-World Economics Review*, 2019(90), 98-118. <https://pure.hud.ac.uk/en/publications/the-case-for-the-ontology-of-money-as-credit-money-as-bearer-or-b>
- Artaud, A. (2021). *Teatr i yoho divnyky* [Theater and its counterpart]. Kyiv: Zhupansky Publishing House.

- Artaud, A., & Corti, V. (1965). To End God's Judgment. *The Tulane Drama Review*, 9(3), 56–98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1125049>
- Baranova, J. (2014). Antonin Artaud and Gilles Deleuze's Philosophy of Modern Cinema. *Problemos*, 86, 83-97. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Problemos.2014.0.3953>
- Brooks, V. (2019). Interrupting the Courtroom Organism: Screaming Bodies, Material Affects and the Theatre of Cruelty. *Law Culture and the Humanities*, 15(2), 332-351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1743872114543767>
- Cohen, H. (1982). Artaud's "The Cenci." *The Drama Review: TDR*, 26(2), 132–135. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1145436>
- Descartes, R. (1989). *Opisaniye chelovecheskogo tela. Ob obrazovanii zhivotnogo* [Description of the human body. On the education of the animal]. Vol. 2. Moscow: Thought.
- Descartes, R. (2020), *Metafizychni tvory* [Metaphysical works]. Kharkiv: Folio.
- Graham, W. (2015). Cities, corporeality and consciousness. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal*, 1(2), 113-129. <https://dx.doi.org/10.17570/STJ.2015.V1N2.A05>
- Husserl, E. (1998). *Kartezianskiye razmyshleniya* [Cartesian Meditations]. St. Petersburg: Science; Yuventa.
- Husserl, E. (2009). *Idei k chistoy fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoy filosofii* [Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy]. Moscow: Academic Project.
- Ilyenkov, E (1984). *Dialekticheskaya logika* [Dialectical Logic]. *Ocherki istorii i teorii* [Essays on history and theory]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Kurmelev, A. (2015, 2016, Dec 06-06). *Theater and its purpose: Antonin Artaud and Tennessee Williams*. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on Communication in Multicultural Society (CMSC), Natl Res Nucl Univ, Moscow Engn Phys Inst, Moscow, RUSSIA. <https://in.booksc.org/book/63866782/355535>
- Last, A. (2013). Negotiating the Inhuman: Bakhtin, Materiality and the Instrumentalization of Climate Change. *Theory Culture & Society*, 30(2), 60-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276412456568>
- Mamardashvili, M. (2015). *Metafizika Antonena Arto* [Metaphysics of Antonin Artaud]. <https://mamardashvili.com/archive/interviews/arto.html> (Date of access: 31.01.2022)
- Mamardashvili, M. K. (2000). *Kartezianski rozhdumy* [Cartesian Reflections]. Kyiv: Stylos.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2001). *Fenomenolohiia spryniattia* [Phenomenology of perception]. Kyiv: Ukrainian Center for Spiritual Culture.
- Smith, I. (1985). The Semiotics of the Theater of Cruelty. *Semiotica*, 56(3-4), 291-307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1985.56.3-4.291>

- Smith, M. (2019). 11. 'Modernity,' Postmodernism, and the Law of Value. In *Invisible Leviathan: The Marxist Critique of Market Despotism beyond Postmodernism* (pp. 220-242). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/9781487574765-012>
- Spinoza, B. (2020). *Etyka* [Ethics]. Kyiv: Andronum.
- Vats, A. (2016). Marking disidentification: Race, corporeality, and resistance in trademark law. *Southern Communication Journal*, 81(4), 237–251.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2016.1200128>