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Theatre of Exile: 
The Possible and the Improbable in the

Alison Richards and Yoni Prior

Birth and Rebirth:

In 2001, Corina Schoef traced what she described as the “impossible birth of a
Jewish theatre” as it arose during the late nineteenth century, despite theological
proscription, out of the turmoil of persecution and transmigration experienced
by the Jewish peoples of Eastern Europe (67). This paper extends Schoef’s
notion to suggest that, since then, Jewish theatre has been reborn on several
occasions, in different locations and in often unfamiliar guises. Its global history,
far from showing a smooth growth curve from infancy to maturity, is, rather,
characterised by leaps and transformations through a series of improbable, if
no longer impossible, reincarnations. From its European crucible, the theatre
dispersed itself as part of the cultural baggage carried with successive waves
of diasporic migration, emerging in often unexpected ways in new and “new
old” locations from Jerusalem to Johannesburg and beyond. Indeed, ideas of
reincarnation, possession and other unlikely methods of rebirth and renewal
have particular resonance when discussing the work of the Gilgul Theatre
Company. Its improbable emergence was the work of a group of young theatre
artists whose odd and varied connections to Jewish culture and heritage brought
them together for a relatively brief period in the last decade of the twentieth
century, in the interstices of the Australian Diaspora, at the edge of a number of worlds.

This essay focuses on the particular possibilities, improbabilities and paradoxes faced by the members of the Gilgul Theatre in their effort to establish a contemporary Jewish theatre-in-exile. It is one of a series of publications, the product of research carried out by both authors, individually and in collaboration, since 1994. The particular subjective/objective approach to this research reflects the status of the researchers in relation to the company and its work. Yoni Prior was one of the founding members of the Gilgul acting ensemble, co-devising and performing in four of their works, and has carried out performance research on her work with the company from a more subjective “insider” perspective as a participant. Alison Richards’s research was undertaken from the point of view of an “outside eye,” both in her observation of rehearsals and in conversation with the director, actors and other members of Gilgul.¹ The research was also informed by the responses and reflections of other company members, with whom extensive interviews were conducted during 1995 and 1996. Both sides of this double perspective are invoked in the following discussion.

Impulses and Influences

The Gilgul Theatre began rehearsal for its inaugural production, The Dybbuk, in mid-1991. The entire rehearsal process, and two of the three subsequent performance seasons, took place in a disused motor repair shop in St Kilda, an inner suburb of Melbourne, Australia, that is strongly associated with Jewish immigrants and provides a central meeting point for a range of diasporic Jewish groupings and subcultures (Zable, Scheherezade 3). The theatre’s co-founders, promising young theatre and opera director, Barrie Kosky, and lighting designer and producer, Robert Lehrer, derived the company’s name from the Hebrew word for revolution, rolling or metamorphosis, used in mystical writings to describe the transmigration of souls, or reincarnation. Gilgul’s life as a working theatre company extended over a cycle of seven years, from 1991 to 1997.

Gilgul created theatre about the Jewish experience, from an Australian perspective. Its performance-making depended on the construction of powerful interconnections between fragments—of lived experience, texts, images, spaces, bodies, theatrical styles, and historical documents. From these fragments emerged themes of exile, of journeying, of the doubleness of worlds.
Gilgul staged five original theatre works. In chronological order, these productions were: The Exile Trilogy, consisting of The Dybbuk (1991-1993), Es Brent (It Burns) (1992—1993), and Levad (Alone) (1993); and two subsequent works, The Wilderness Room (1994) and The Operated Jew (1997).

The three works of The Exile Trilogy were loosely based on, or incorporated segments from, key texts from the canon of Yiddish theatre and Jewish performance culture. These included S. An-ski’s iconic play The Dybbuk, Elie Weisel’s The Trial of God, Mordechai Gebirtig’s anthem Es Brent, material from the traditional Purimshpil, songs from the popular Yiddish theatre, and Jacob Gordin’s female King Lear, Mirele Efros. The works also used non-performance sources such as the Biblical books of Numbers, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, and quotations or reconstructions from Jewish ritual, literature, and history. The subsequent two works drew on a range of historical texts, including documents of Jewish settlement dating from the arrival of the first fleet of convict ships to Australia in 1788, the music and painting of the colonial period, including songs by the nineteenth-century Australian Jewish composer Isaac Nathan, the Passover ritual, Oskar Panizza’s infamous anti-Semitic novella The Operated Jew, Sander Gilman’s scholarly work The Jew’s Body, and material from contemporary war crimes trials involving Australian residents.²

Despite this evidence of cultural, historical, and literary awareness, it is important to understand that for the theatre-makers of Gilgul, creation of the performance text itself was the primary imperative. Citations from or allusions to visual, verbal, written, and behavioral sources were, in an important sense, pretextual or even textural, with the company’s main focus being on the process of developing performance ideas through action and image (Prior 32). A text was translated, edited or left intact, spoken or sung in Yiddish, Hebrew and English, and frequently interspersed with new material, largely on the basis of its contribution to the work as it developed on the rehearsal floor, rather than due to any overriding desire to preserve an original context or sequence. The juxtaposition and layering of citations and allusions became a key marker of Gilgul’s aesthetic, but even this was partly a matter of conscious decision, and partly a response to circumstances by a group of initially disparate theatre-makers. Having undertaken to establish a sensibility and a repertoire in parallel, the artists found common ground in what Lyotard identified as a posture of “incredulity toward meta-narratives” (23) more than in mutual allegiance to any one tradition, discipline, or set of influences. In this sense only, the frequent characterisation of Gilgul’s work as post-modern by local critics could be said to have some force. In the thrust and detail of its composition however, the
work might more accurately be characterised as theatre with performance tendencies, bearing out Johannes Birringer's contention that the development of contemporary theatre and performance practice owes very little to the discourses of post-modern theory (45).

**Early Works**

Kosky assembled collaborators from a variety of cultural and theatrical backgrounds over a period of some months in early 1991, to form what became an occasional ensemble, working on a project-to-project basis. A general manifesto, published in the company's first theatre program, detailed the company's aims “to establish Australia's first professional Jewish theatre company and to expose Jewish and non-Jewish audiences to an artistic expression of 'the particular complexity and diversity of the Australian diaspora’” (Kosky, *Dybbuk* 16). In practice, Gilgul’s “professional” status was more a statement of ambition than a description of day-to-day reality. Its first two productions were privately funded; they depended heavily on in-kind support from Melbourne's Jewish community and on the commitment of performers, designers, and other collaborators who worked long hours for little or no financial reward. Its ways of working, therefore, developed organically, in response to available resources. These included the texts, the “found” performance spaces (Meyrick 158-159), the eclectic array of material that individuals brought into the rehearsal room—but above all on the personal resources that Kosky and the ensemble brought to bear on the work, their networks of cultural reference and experience, and their attitudes to life and to theatre.

The diversity of aspiration, and the variety of personal, cultural, and professional experience within the ensemble, were its greatest strengths and perhaps, ultimately, its Achilles heel. The theatre background of its ongoing members, Michael Kantor, Tom Wright, Elisa Gray, Louise Fox and, Yoni Prior, was mixed. Kosky, Kantor, and Wright had worked together before in student theatre at Melbourne University; the others had not. No company member had a traditional drama school background. They had acquired their skills through experience in university, experimental, youth, fringe, and amateur theatre, including local Yiddish theatre productions. Several of its members were of non-Jewish or mixed ancestry. The majority were not practising Jews; the company therefore held no common allegiances, either to religious traditions, to any one mode of theatre-making, or indeed to a single vision of what theatre should be.
Kosky had already established himself as a promising young director of theatre, music theatre, and opera. His public image as an autocrat auteur was belied by his eagerness and ability to make work with, rather than on, his collaborators. The company dynamic most closely resembled that of an archetypal Jewish family: contradictory, belligerent, argumentative, but ultimately democratic. The company culture defined the actor, in the words of performer Louise Fox, “as an investigative agent. It presumes you have a brain and a response and a contribution. It encourages performers’ intellectual responsibility for the piece and for their own performance” (Richards and Prior, *Into the Wilderness* 44).

**The Evolution of the Performance Frame and Language**

The works of the trilogy were linked by a thematic of possession, in which fictionalised characters based on actors from the Vilna Troupe, the original interpreters of *The Dybbuk*, found themselves trapped in a space between life and death, attempting to traverse the worlds created by “their fractured and displaced recollections” (Kosky, *Exile* 3). The performance style juxtaposed the vocabularies of Expressionist film, Meyerholdian gesture, and pre-World War Two European cabaret. These vocabularies were elaborated and presented through a dialectic of effort and struggle between the performers’ bodies and elements of the mise en scène. The two later works moved away from characterisation, towards wordless performative abstraction in *The Wilderness Room* and a frenetic, heightened contemporary cabaret style in *The Operated Jew*.

Each work was, in a sense, site-specific. It is testament to the contribution and influence of eminent architect and theatre designer Peter Corrigan, that choice of site so informed the visual style of each of the works. Corrigan worked alongside the company, spending many hours in the spaces with the performance makers, and his theatrical intelligence conscripted the performance space, and its objects and machines, as another character. The company’s aesthetic thus built cumulatively, but was at all times distinct and recognisably “Gilgul.”

The company’s physical style in performance developed according to a similar logic. Narratives were told by means of the actors’ bodies: the audience saw history enacted, rather than merely represented, as physical forces and conflicts worked on and through them. Secondary, corporeal, texts emerged as the effort of execution told on the bodies of the actors in signs of exertion.
Weariness, breathlessness, sweat, and strain were visible on the skin and palpable in the voice. Images of stoic endurance in the narrative frame of the theatre pieces knit into the impact of the real effect of performance time on the body of the actor, as the actors’ overextended bodies stood in for others’ bodies and became, by extension, the always/already fractured and fragmented, collectively stigmatized, Jew’s Body (Gilman, Body 173). The outcome was a theatrical style which demanded and demonstrated extraordinary virtuosity as the actors switched between physical task, characterisation, narration, song, and dance; and between English, Yiddish, and Hebrew.

Reception

The company made its work at the crossroads of a number of strong, and at times contradictory, cultural traditions. Gilgul refused authenticity, insisting on its ability to borrow and transmute the sources on which it drew. The impulses that drove the making of the work privileged theatre history as equal to, and in many cases, predominant over, cultural history. Much of the flavor of Gilgul’s work came from its ironic recuperation of lost theatre-making traditions, especially those regarded, even within the cultures of the Jewish Diaspora, as lowbrow or trivial.

The work, therefore, had potentially broad appeal that was not without its inbuilt cultural tensions. These were evident in its reception amongst the various, Jewish and non-Jewish, groups that constituted its audience. Gilgul’s jaunty affirmation of a fragmented past in terms of a contemporary urban sensibility, its juxtaposition of the trivial and the tragic, was received by Australian critics as post-modern, although company members managed to make a joke even of this. The work opened wounds with its evocations of horror. References to the Shoah, and to the tribulations of Zionism and exile, were no less powerful for being oblique and consciously aestheticized.

The spectator’s experiences too depended on the visceral transmission of shared experience: watching, one was transfixed, as if brushed by the wing of the angel of death. As a member of the audience, one was drawn in through physical proximity to the breath and sweat of bodies pushed to the brink of endurance, then jolted into laughter with the performers’ defiantly comic and triumphantly theatrical routines. Gilgul’s members were all raised in Australia, and the mood, both of its work and its working processes, borrowed from a recognizably Australian tradition of larrikinism and disrespect for authority. Invoking this tradition gave the artists space to translate their physical
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confidence into claims for creative and intellectual freedom; by this means audiences as well were given permission to experiment with their reactions, without being bound by existing rules and traditions.

**Gilgul in Context: Australian Performance Tendencies in the 1990s**

Gilgul’s physical style emerged between the waves of Australian theatre practice, and reflected changes in the way theatre training and realization techniques were appropriated from the international avant-garde. Critic Keith Gallasch cites Gilgul as having established an individual and influential style within the Australian circus and physical theatre renaissance, a movement recognized internationally as making what is probably Australia’s most distinct contribution to contemporary performance (Gallasch 20). Whereas the “New Wave” theatre-makers of the 1970s had drawn on Meyerhold, Artaud, Grotowski, Le Coq, and Brook, recent enthusiasms had veered towards Butoh, Tadashi Suzuki, Anne Bogart, and Phillipe Gaulier. In contrast, Gilgul’s scepticism extended towards orthodox regimes of training; the company was willing to incorporate elements from anything which appeared useful and hence to develop its own distinct stylistic mélange.

Australian theatre over the past twenty-five years has been a key forum for discourses of nationalism. Veronica Kelly has argued that the late twentieth century saw the “dissolving of the central theatrical narrative of ‘national identity’” in favor of a more “selective and post-colonial type of post-modernism” (8). By 1991, the Anglo-Celtic nationalist certainties of Australia’s 1970’s theatrical “New Wave” had been destabilized, as artists and intellectuals began to grapple with the complex realities of a nation which, since 1945, has increasingly comprised a multiplicity of cultural, regional, class, and gender identities. Gilgul emerged at a time when Australia’s taste-makers and audiences were ready to challenge the ways in which these complex identities had been represented to that point. Sander Gilman has suggested that the notion of the frontier can be used as a productive model for Jewish history (Gilman and Shain 1-25). Gilgul’s theatre actively presented volatile Jewish bodies intersecting with unstable frontiers that were, and were not, Australian; it thus played a part in promoting a more fluid consciousness of Australian culture and a more nuanced idea of nation. In the past decade, the frontier has shifted again, with the acknowledgement of Australia’s inherent diversity once more under attack from a conservative government promoting
Alison Richards and Yoni Prior

a militant and militarized white isolationism based on a nostalgic Anglophone monoculture—the cultural politics of Gilgul’s approach to theatre may be more contrarian now than when it was first articulated.

Gilgul’s work also spoke directly to tensions in Jewish culture, evident in the loyalties and political allegiances of Australia’s Jewish communities. The history of Jewish theatre-making internationally in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is one of strong engagement with constructions of cultural and political identity, from the broadly Socialist intentions of the Bundist Yiddish theatres, to interrogations of nationalism in Zionist and post-Zionist representations in the contemporary Israeli repertoire. Jewish theatre in Australia has reflected many of these key shifts and conflicts; in that sense Gilgul continued a tradition, while marking new positions and boundaries of its own.

Arnold Zable, while pointing out the contribution that individual Jewish practitioners have made to Australian theatre since the early days of settlement, dates the emergence of a consciously Jewish, Yiddish theatre to the early twentieth century (Wanderers 1). Yiddish theatre artists were enthusiastically supported by Australia’s growing Jewish communities, particularly in Melbourne, which has one of the largest Jewish populations outside of Israel. Although the numbers were never sufficiently large to sustain an ongoing, professional Jewish theatre, the support of middle-class, liberal Jews was vital to the development of Melbourne’s post-war cultural institutions across the performing arts; support for local doctor and playwright Ron Elisha by the Melbourne Theatre Company from the mid 1970s, for example, was a testament to the influence of Jewish theatre-goers (Fitzpatrick 200-201). Gilgul’s aims spoke to a confluence between the aspirations to cultural identity maintained by the largely amateur traditions of Jewish theatre in Australia, broader Australian debates over nationalism, and hope for the possibilities of an art theatre sustained by public and private patronage. In its membership, its style, and its audience appeal, Gilgul straddled cultural positions. It was able to benefit from the support of the Jewish community, and to interest broader audiences, at a time of shifting definitions of cultural identity.

“This is not ghetto theatre!” trumpeted the publicity material prepared for the interstate tour of The Exile Trilogy to Sydney in 1993. The marketing strategy reveals an anxiety on the part of producers that the work would not address a broad enough audience in the new frontier of Australia’s “other city” to justify the expense of hosting the company for three months. This begs the question: What ghettos were being referenced? The energy and imagination of the work generated a positive public response; however, it also generated a surprising
level of comment in regard to the company's refusal to translate Yiddish and Hebrew text and song into English, or to explain iconography or aspects of ritual borrowed directly from Jewish culture and history. Public anxiety was not confined to the non-Jewish audience. For example, Peter Morrison, theatre critic for the Sydney edition of The Australian Jewish News, objected to the use of the grotesque and the arcane in the production, predicting that it would serve to confirm anti-Semitic prejudice (23).

As well as engaging with the complexities of Jewish history and the cultural politics of Jewish embodiment, The Exile Trilogy was self-consciously and self-reflexively theatre about theatre, replete with references to, and parodies of, anachronistic theatre practice. Missed cues, forgotten lines, calls for the author, confusion of backstage for onstage and vice-versa, created a metaphor for a culture attempting to relocate and reconstruct itself. This parodic use of theatre metaphor also exposed the deep ambivalence, amongst members of the company and amongst sections of its audience, towards another imagined culture, that of the "legitimate theatre."

Gilgul was one of an increasing number of independent companies in Australia working between the fringe and the mainstream, involved in the collaborative creation of new work, and addressing issues of cultural difference. Its "otherness" provided a syntax and vocabulary for the work, but also informed its public image. This was reinforced by Kosky's increasingly public prominence as a recalcitrant cultural critic who strategically deployed the position of "outsider" to comment on the endemic provincial smugness of mainstream Australian culture. Through his work as a director both in Australia and internationally, and in his public statements, he challenged, and continues to challenge, the dominant culture to examine its assumptions (Prior 50).

Paradoxically, the mystery and exoticism of the work, and its refusal to explicate its textual and cultural sources, reinforced its appeal for Australian taste-makers in a cultural moment when issues of multiculturalism, the integrity of cultural traditions, and the degree to which "other" traditions could be articulated in relation to the dominant culture, were beginning to be debated. As we have indicated, these debates are still very much alive.

The Influence of Material Circumstances.

Over its lifespan, the conditions under which Gilgul's theatre was created varied from voluntary unfunded work, undertaken after hours and on weekends in draughty sheds with concrete floors, to relatively-well funded subsidized
projects which allowed company members to be paid at professional rates for a limited period. At no time did the company maintain an established headquarters, or have full-time staff including an ongoing professional ensemble. The reasons for this are complex. On the one hand, funding for Australian theatre has declined in real terms to the point where very few small theatre companies survive. On the other hand, the suggestion that the company might be eligible for longer-term government subsidy after the success of The Exile Trilogy was rejected by company members, who feared the effects of bureaucratic demands for product, administrative compliance, and financial and artistic accountability, on the company’s creative freedom.

As a result, Gilgul’s work was mounted under other pressures. The first two productions were made without funding, but in circumstances which allowed considerable development time, and the luxury of experimentation and reflection. Later subsidized projects had the advantage of production partnerships and access to infrastructure, but were constrained by time pressures and the need to work in spaces which could not as easily be incorporated into the realization process as had earlier been the case. Critics noted that the physical demands placed on Gilgul’s actors were often at the limits of safety (Thomson 11). While this was not, as some inferred, a case of a tyrannical auteur director exploiting actors as puppets, it is still the case that Gilgul performances tested bodies to and at times beyond their limits as they climbed, rolled, were squashed into tight spaces, hung from ropes and beams, bounced off a range of unforgiving surfaces, and were drenched in a variety of liquids. These were demands that even youthful bodies could not sustain indefinitely.

Later Works

Following the success of The Exile Trilogy, the company moved in new directions, away from character-driven narrative and the “spine” of an established text. These moves, while productive, deprived the ensemble of the references to performance genres, languages, and styles, and the structures inbuilt in “found texts,” however transfigured, that sustained the earlier work. Whereas the terrain explored in The Exile Trilogy was peopled with voluble, dimensioned characters, the terra nullius of The Wilderness Room was populated by peoples silenced and rendered generic under the lens of history. The stage figures, who represented an overlap between early Jewish convicts and old people waiting for death in the Montefiore Homes,7 could not speak. They could not remember
exactly what to do, and waited for a sign from one who would guide them. They tried to reconstruct a Passover ritual and the singing of songs, but they could not remember the details. They did not know where they were, or quite where they were going. They could not remember themselves. They could not place themselves. The performance mood was the antithesis of that established in *The Exile Trilogy*; here, sparseness and silence reigned.

*The Operated Jew* went even further in presenting a critique of contemporary Australian culture from the perspective of the Jew as outsider. It also marked the first time that the company presented work with an explicitly theoretical dimension, as it engaged with Panizza’s anti-Semitic text, Gilman’s analysis of the Jewish body, and the complexities attendant on the projection and internalization of anti-Semitic stereotypes, for Jews as “others” and for other “others” in a vicious cycle of reflection and mimesis. This dystopian vision presented the figures on stage as again trapped, but this time within their own bodies and their own self-disgust. In *The Exile Trilogy*, history operated on the body from the outside, represented by forces of nature, such as floods and fire and by mechanical contrivances that ground, ripped, and crushed. This new work explored an eternal and ahistorical present, where stigmatized Jewish bodies were displayed as both colonized by, and complicit with, a corrosive fear of otherness as infection.

These bodies compulsively reiterated excruciating, draining regimes of self-correction through exercise, mantra, DIY surgery, deodorizing, and cleansing. This was an only apparently perfect world, haunted by the echoes of pseudo-scientific theories of racial supremacy. The production explored new stylistic territory, marked by the extensive use of electronic music and new media but with sly references to Brecht in its use of an elevated boxing ring stage. Its high camp citations ranged from Egyptian deities to Oscar Wilde’s *Salome*, from Meyerholdian biomechanics to the pop aesthetics of the infomercial—identity as shopping mall. Here, suburban Jews overcompensated with grotesque displays of normalcy, revealing in the process not only the impossibility of their own assimilation but also the pathological dimension of current social obsessions with the control, sanitization, and correction of the physical body.

**Post-Mortem: Impossible Theatre**

This was to be the last work made by the ensemble. For several years the company had been dealing with the consequences of its success. As members were offered more opportunities outside the company, it became harder to
find spaces in the calendar when all were available to work. Several company members moved from Melbourne to Sydney. Some started families, further reducing their ability to give the intense commitment of time and energy that the work demanded. Kosky’s move to Vienna in 2001 to take up a position as co-Artistic Director, with Eiran Berg, of the Schauspielhaus, signalled the beginning of another transmigration and the effective end of this cycle of collaborative creation. Typically, the germ of another Gilgul production was already under discussion, based on an early proposal to site a Jewish homeland in the West Australian Kimberleys region—but, like the proposal itself, it failed to prosper.

Gilgul’s alumni have subsequently made a considerable impact, as individuals, on contemporary Australian theatre, film, television, music theatre and opera production. Kosky remains resident for most of the year in Europe, but returns regularly to Australia to create special projects. Kantor is currently Artistic Director of Melbourne’s Malthouse Theatre, and Wright has the title of Artistic Associate at the Sydney Theatre Company under Artistic Director Robyn Nevin. As a theatre scholar, Prior maintains industry connections as a researcher, dramaturg, and board member of cultural organizations. Fox works as a film-maker and writer for stage and screen. Gray has maintained the strongest links with local Jewish culture, in Yiddish theatre and language education.

Gilgul’s trajectory demonstrates the possibilities open to a group of dedicated, flexible theatre-makers engaged with, but not bound by, the complexities of history, culture and tradition. It also shows the difficulties faced by anyone trying to sustain an independent theatre company with an uncompromising edge of innovation. But while success may have come to individuals, including Kosky, his vision of a Jewish theatre in the wilderness, speaking to and from the Australian experience, remains only partly realized. That theatre still lacks a place to stand, against the pull of time and in the face of temptations to be elsewhere. If not an impossible theatre, it is certainly an improbable one: but since it has manifested more than once already, there must surely be grounds to hope for its eventual reappearance.

For now, the voices of ghosts half-heard, of stories half-told, and theatres half-forgotten, must wait for another improbable regenerative moment, another round of reincarnation.
Notes

1 In the course of this research collaboration, intensive rehearsal observations were conducted during 1994; Gilgul company members were interviewed between April 1995 and January 1996. This paper is based on a joint FIRT/IFTR conference presentation in Sydney, Australia, 2001. Other published papers focus on the performance research methodology employed in the study (Richards and Prior 1997) and on the making of The Wilderness Room (Richards and Prior 2002). For each author’s viewpoint on the theatre-making and research processes, see their individual theses (Prior 1998 and Richards 2003, Ch. 5, pp.178-221).

2 For a full list of sources, see Richards and Prior, Into the Wilderness 28-29, 45.

3 For a history of Yiddish theatre in Melbourne, see Zable, Wanderers and Dreamers.

4 His first major public success, at the age of 19, was as director of Sir Michael Tippet’s The Knot Garden for the Melbourne Spoleto Festival in 1989.

5 Corrigan is a Professor in the School of Architecture and Design at RMIT University, Melbourne. He has won multiple awards in both his architecture and theatre design practices, having designed sets and costumes for theatre and opera productions since the 1970s in most Australian capital cities, and most recently for Kosky in Vienna and Berlin.

6 Geoffrey Milne identifies three distinct waves of theatrical innovation and energy in recent Australian theatre: Limited Theatre 1953-c1969, Unlimited Theatre 1966-1981, and Theatre, Limited 1980-1998 (Milne 2004). Milne sees Gilgul as amongst those companies which provided an alternative “against the stream” in the latter period, heralding a situation where “it will be those who really want to do it—who are prepared to subsidise their own art practice regardless of personal income or government policy—who will make waves into the future” (401).

7 The Montefiore aged care facilities are managed by the Jewish Care organization in Melbourne, Australia.
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