STUDIA UBB DRAMATICA, LXX, 2, 2025, p. 39 - 56
(Recommended Citation)
DOI:10.24193/subbdrama.2025.2.03

Human Method, Machine Actor: Rethinking Director's Theatre in the Age of AI

Andriana-Anna TSIOTSIOU[1]

Abstract: Throughout the international theatre scene, contemporary technology and New Media are increasingly asserting their presence. Today, we no longer speak solely of digital manipulations, projections, or the use of live-action cameras. More importantly, it is now time to discuss performances utilizing the most recent technological achievements, such as Augmented Reality (AR) and Artificial Intelligence (AI). Moreover, performances featuring actors created using these technologies (such as A.L.A.N.) are already well-known. For several decades, we have consistently observed and experienced theatrical productions that exemplify the distinctive features of Director's Theatre (Regietheater) – a current centering entirely on the directorial gaze concerning both dramatic and non-dramatic texts, as well as pertinent socio-political issues, underscoring the individual who, in the past, emerged as the theatre's dominant artist: the director. This paper aims to investigate to what extent the concept of Director's Theatre further evolves, granting the artist-creator full control of the process, yet simultaneously driving them to utilize already existing acting methods, such as Stanislavski's, on AI actors, in order to implement their vision as well as whether Large Language Models (LLM) can perform as alternative actors on stage. It also raises questions about the development of new directing methods and theatrical genres.

Keywords: Director's Theatre, Stanislavski, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Large Language Models (LLM).

[1] Theatre Department of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. Email: annatsiot@gmail.com

©2025 STUDIA UBB DRAMATICA. Published by Babeş-Bolyai University.
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

This paper first examines the contributions of four seminal theorist-directors of the 19th and 20th centuries, highlighting their pivotal roles in revitalizing the art of directing and positioning it at the very core of theatrical performance. Building upon this foundation, the discussion then turns to how Artificial Intelligence can be treated and directed as an alternative form of stage presence, using human directing methods and to be more precise, using the one recognized as the first fully developed directing method combining both actors' training and directing principles: the Stanislavski System.

Stanislavski, who possessed both directorial and acting experience, in 1889, while directing Leo Tolstoy's *The Fruits of Education*, gained a profound, practical understanding of how "to create a production; how to make the deeper meaning of the play physically apparent". He emphasized that a director's effectiveness depends on being receptive to external stimuli, noting that "when they move the sets, a mood for imagination is created for you; we have lighting and a random arrangement of objects. In this, there are always wonderful hints." Founding the Artistic Theatre in 1898, Stanislavski was positioned to formalize his observations into a structured methodology – later known as the "Stanislavski System"; central here is the inseparability of mind and body. The System comprises a series of physical and psychological processes designed to assist the actor in the challenging task of composing a character and clarifying their motivations and objectives at any given moment. This method remains a foundational approach in theatrical art, widely regarded for its scientific rigor in acting and directing.[2]

Through his detailed study of actors and the productions he would undertake, Stanislavski began to focus on another fundamental contributor to theatrical performance: the director. He noted that it is difficult for an actor to recognize whether they are on the correct interpretive path without

[2] Eudokimos Tsolakides, *The Evolution of the Stanislavski System: Schools and Methods* (Nicosia, Cyprus: Open University of Cyprus, 2016), 3-4; Sonia Moore, *The Stanislavski System: The Professional Training of an Actor*, trans. Andreas Tsakas (Athens, 2012), 14; "Feature to Stanislavski: 100 Years from His Birthday," *Theatre*, vol. 2, no. 7, Athens, Greece, January 31 (1963): 9-22, accessed August 29, 2025.

the director's guidance. He however underlined that the director must allow the actor's intuition freedom in their creative work, while he – the director – investigates the questions that need answering.[3]

From Stanislavski's extensive notes, a selective portion of which was published in the second volume of the magazine *Theatre* on January 31, 1963, we get a valuable insight into his artistic legacy. Between 1899 and 1911, during the early years of the Artistic Theatre, Stanislavski wrote about the director:

> If the director does not have the sensitivity and imagination to add even one insignificant detail that is not visible or was omitted by the author, then he does not deserve to be called a director. Even when working on the great Shakespeare, the director must invent details to interpret the author's idea and transmit it more successfully or to help (stage conditions, Audience) the actor, who may not possess the necessary qualifications to transmit the author's thought, because the author does not have the ability to foresee all the unforeseen elements of complex life on stage.[4]

Stanislavski displayed a particularly rigid approach with his colleagues. As mentioned, in his direction of *The Fruits of Education*, he began to view directing as an opportunity for interpreting a play rather than simply arranging characters and events on stage. He maintained that a director's creativity must be contained within a realistic *mise en scene* – a depiction of the play as written by the author, supplemented by numerous details and objects serving as "supports." These elements were designed to intensify the scenic realism and to create conditions for a powerful emotional response from the audience.[5]

He applied this methodology to his 1898 direction of Aleksey Konstantinovich Tolstoy's *Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich*, a production with which he inaugurated the Moscow Art Theatre. In these first works, including Leo Tolstoy's *The Power of Darkness* and Maxim Gorky's *The Lower Depths*, where

---

[3] *Theatre*, vol. 2, no. 7, 9.

[4] *Theatre*, 15.

[5] Denis Bablet, *History of Contemporary Direction*, vol. 1: 1887-1914, trans. Damianos Constantinides (Thessaloniki, Greece: University Studio Press, 2008), 32-38.

through research and immersions in the marginalized areas of early 20th century Moscow he managed to create an appropriate stage space, feeling that he had become "a frequenter of the asylum," he exhausted considerable effort in collecting historically accurate objects, costumes, and ornaments, pushing realism to its extremes by aiming to apply it to the sociopolitical reality represented by the playwrights. He later sharply criticized this approach in his autobiography, *My Life in Art*, stating that "ethnography had crushed the actor and the drama."[6]

Nevertheless, his direction of Anton Chekhov's *The Seagull* (1898) also marked a pivotal point. Despite having prepared a detailed directorial plan, he realized that even minor roles were important. He encouraged his actors to perform as "naturally" as possible within the realistic universe he had constructed. From this, he understood that the director, rather than a tyrant, must become a guide, guiding actors toward an interpretation that transcends even the carefully detailed stage environment surrounding them.[7]

Between 1912 and 1918, Stanislavski judged directors more harshly and strove for self-improvement:

> Directors make a big mistake when they forcibly impose their own feelings and their own perception of a role on the actor. This constitutes violence. The director's job is different. Above all, he should understand the inclinations and tendencies of the actor, the set designer, and all those who take part in a production. He must gather their living spiritual creative material and then decide what can come out of it and how it should come out. If he imposes his own feelings, he will not manage to acquire the living, pulsating material of the creators of the production, and from dead material, a dead production will come out.[8]

Ultimately, Stanislavski viewed the director as the artistic factor synthesizing the collaborative creativity of a production's artists. Based on the materials provided by them, the director possesses full supervision to judge and decide how the production will be presented and interpreted on stage.

---

[6] Bablet.

[7] Bablet.

[8] Bablet, 18.

Nevertheless, the director was not yet granted the title of "creator;" a designation still attributed to other contributors. This perspective revised an earlier stance from his 1895 collaboration with the semi-professional ensemble of the Philharmonic Society, where, according to Denis Bablet, during rehearsals for Karl Ferdinand Gutzkow's *Uriel Acosta*, "he did not hesitate to become despotic with the actors, subjugating them to his will, imposing his own views on them."[9]

At the turn of the last century, Edward Gordon Craig, son of the prominent Victorian actress Ellen Terry and a key pioneer of modern theatre, developed his own theories concerning the role of the director. Craig's career began early on stage, encompassing directing, set design, lighting, and theory. Influenced by Renaissance painters and classical philosophers, Craig asserted that art cannot be mere imitation of reality but must be an original creation. He argued that the director must be an artist knowledgeable in all theatrical arts.[10] Craig's innovations began with his architectural plans for a theater where the audience would sit amphitheatrically around the stage, abandoning traditional balconies and boxes. In 1899, he announced his direction of Henry Purcell's opera *Dido and Aeneas* (1900), asserting: "We will spare no effort to make these productions entirely perfect, and the direction will be in complete harmony with the spirit of the play." This declaration directly aligns with Stanislavski's earlier observation – that a director can "create a production" which makes the essence of a play understandable.[11]

Craig also revolutionized lighting and color theory in staging. For example, he painted the stage gray to highlight his chosen palette and rejected traditional footlights and uprights, because their purely functional but uninspired lighting favored "star system" conventions. Instead, he pioneered new lighting systems, including overhead bridges and frontal spotlights. By altering the theatrical hall's perspective and lighting practices, Craig not only changed audience's spatial experience but elevated light from a utilitarian tool to an expressive, independent medium. Additionally, he emphasized the symbolic importance of color as carrier of meaning. For these reasons,

[9] Bablet, 31.

[10] Bablet, 79-80.

[11] Bablet.

many view Craig as charting a revolutionary course for poetic drama performance, while he was distancing himself from the theatre of his time by writing: "Modern theatre is lost due to the realistic development of direction, which is the opposite of pure art."[12] Like Richard Wagner, whom he greatly admired, he viewed performance as a unified whole, with poetry, music, acting, and painting collaborating to impact the spectator. Influenced by Wagner's concept of the "total work of art" and the practices of ancient Greek poets, Craig asserted the director's role as the unifying artistic force.

> The art of the theatre is neither the interpretation of the actors, nor the play, nor the direction, nor the dance, but is formed by the elements that compose the above: by movement, which is the soul of interpretation, by words which are the body of the play, by lines and colors which are the very existence of the stage set, by rhythm which is the essence of dance.[13]

Craig was also the first to oppose the dominance of the text and, thus, the author, "The play, written to be seen, cannot be complete except on stage. Any play that seems to be completed by reading is not, literally speaking, dramatic, because it still depends on literature."[14] Armed with comprehensive understanding of all theatrical disciplines, Craig exercised full control over expressive media in his vision of the ideal director. However, he was reluctant to bestow the title of "artist" outright, considering the director initially a technician. He specified that a director would rightfully earn the artist title only upon mastery of actions, words, line, color, and rhythm, achieving self-reliant art independent from playwrights.[15]

> When he interprets the play of the dramatist by means of his actors, his scene-painters, and his other craftsmen, then he is a craftsman, a master-craftsman; when he will have mastered the use of actions, words, line

[12] Bablet, 79-81.

[13] Bablet, 86.

[14] Bablet, 87.

[15] Charles Agha and Patrick Agha, "Gordon Craig and His Master-Craftsman Technique on the Art of Directing," *The Crab: Journal of Theatre and Media Arts*, vol. 9 (June 2014): 203; E. G. Craig, *On the Art of the Theatre* (New York: Theatre Art Books, 1961), 149.

> color, and rhythm, then he may become an artist. Then we shall no longer need the assistance of the playwright for our art will then be self-reliant.[16]

Craig's direction of Lawrence Housman's *Bethlehem* demonstrated his authoritative approach. Judging the text and music inadequate, he cut sections and added original musical elements. Subsequently, he focused on designing productions inspired by the drama itself, creating sets that were organic extensions of characters, making actors integral to the stage design. Ultimately, Craig extolled the director's right to present the drama as it "revealed to them," without concern for the author's "absolute truth." He envisioned the director as a despotic artist-creator, solely responsible for the final production, concentrating all artistic authority in their person. He imagined a future "theatre artist," serving as both director and author, who would create "pure plays" and feature full creative responsibility for interpretation.[17]

Adolphe Appia, a contemporary and close friend of Craig, agreed with the conception of the director as a "first-rate artist," directly inspired by the play. He assigned the director responsibility "to command respect and ensure perfect harmony of the spectacle," building on Craig's imperative for the director to impose themselves on all expressive media, particularly through his theory of the "omnipotence of light," which expresses dramatic tensions and foreshadows Expressionism. Appia referred to this artist as a "despotic trainer," a label Stanislavski previously rejected in favor of a "guide." This "despotic trainer" was intended to exert magnetic influence on actors. Unlike Craig, Appia believed theatre's future lay in broader societal participation and the return of the author's prominence, which is the main reason he is not widely accepted as a supporter of director's theatre. Nevertheless, the evolving definition of the director – from Stanislavski's "creator," through Craig's "technician" elevated to "artist," – culminated in Appia's conception of the role as that of a "poet" and "experimenter."[18] According to Appia:

---

[16] *Theatre*.

[17] *Theatre*, 83, 85-88.

[18] *Theatre*, 68-75.

> The director's job consisting in merely arranging completed stage, will, in poetic drama, play the role of a despotic drillmaster who will have to understand how much preliminary study stage setting requires, utilize every element of scenic production in order to create an artistic synthesis. […] Whatever he does, will, to a great extent, depend on his individual taste; he must work both as an experimenter and as a poet, play with his scenic materials but at the same time be careful […].[19]

A few decades later, in 1932, the French surrealist director and theorist Antonin Artaud published *The Theatre and its Double* where he critiqued Western theatre for abandoning its original ritualistic character and embracing realism around textual dialogue, questioning why theatre failed to perceive itself as distinct from dialogue and why non-dialogic theatrical elements – those that cannot be expressed with words – were considered secondary by both audiences and creators.[20]

Artaud proposed a symbolic aesthetic language far from words and dialogue using all available expressive means, which he describes as "spatial poetry."[21] He insisted this language must speak to contemporary audiences rather than originate from dead eras[22]. First articulated so clearly in his work was the theory that the director must be inspired by the drama itself, as a complex stage reality, not solely by the author's text. Artaud was harsher than his predecessors and famously dismissed any theatre enslaved to the author's text as "mad, crazy, perverted, rhetorical, philistine, anti-poetic and positivist – that is to say Western theatre."[23] He introduced the concept of the "unforeseen," a transition from abstract to real image intended to provoke "metaphysical fear," meaning that images presented on stage should stimulate the mind and provoke thought, culminating in his concept of "Cruelty."[24]

---

[19] Agha and Agha, 207.

[20] Antonin Artaud, *The Theatre and its Double*, trans. Victor Corti (Richmond, UK: Alma Classics, 2017), 30-33, 40.

[21] Artaud, 27-28, 52.

[22] Artaud, 54-55.

[23] Artaud, 28.

[24] Artaud, 57, 60-74, 88-92.

Soon he clarified that "cruelty" did not refer to bloodshed, but to "hungering after life, cosmic strictness, relentless necessity, in the Gnostic sense of a living vortex engulfing darkness, in the sense of the inescapably necessary pain without which life could not continue."[25] The Theatre of Cruelty refers to a superior, non-dialogic drama placing the spectator centrally, spatially and dramaturgically. It eschews solutions to existential problems and instead aims to influence the spectator's organism and subconscious as a "vortex," disregarding sensitivity, with sound – and its vibration power – and light as basic signifiers. In his *Second Manifesto*, Artaud specified that the Theatre of Cruelty "will choose themes and subjects corresponding to the agitation and unrest of our times,"[26] envisioning a total spectacle reclaiming all elements removed from it, by cinema and musical theatre.

In the *First Manifesto* of the Theatre of Cruelty, he made a radical claim that both director and author would be eliminated and replaced by a single Creator. This figure must handle the lyrical and deeper qualities of the actor to express external forces, responsible for both spectacle and plot, with primary concern for the stage realization of the play as it "reveals itself" to them. Unlike Craig and Appia, Artaud sought to transform not only scenic elements but the stage space itself, which he did not consider necessarily theatrical. He envisaged any "shed" shaped with temple-like architectural elements, devoid of decoration, with special proportional perspectives. Actors would play around the spectators in all directions and throughout available space.[27]

Artaud was also the first to highlight the importance of silence and stillness. He reiterated that new images speak more effectively to the spectator's mind than words and become more impactful when creators interject pauses into sounds and movement. A complex idea of poetry emerged in connection with this new way of reflecting on theatre. Artaud emphasized that "just when personal poetry involving only its creator as he creates, became rife in the most excessive way, theatre was held in great contempt by poets who never had either a feeling for immediate group action, effectiveness or danger."[28]

---

[25] Artaud, 72-73.
[26] Artaud, 88.
[27] Artaud, 63-71.
[28] Artaud, 56.

These four theorists, dissatisfied with their contemporary theatre, sought to renew the art of directing and revive a theatrical form that until then relied heavily on realism and scenic textual representation. Their theoretical developments, asserting the director is no longer enslaved to authorial or textual instructions but free or even mandated to draw inspiration from the drama itself, and their own productions paved the way for the theory of "director's theatre." This form empowers the director to adapt or even reject the text to create novel works of art onstage – a practice defining modern theatre until today. It is important to clarify that "director's theatre," systematically formalized in cinema as "auteurism" with phenomena like "director's cuts" or "director's projects," is not merely a method to showcase director's originality, as many of the contemporary theatre directors have comprehended. Croatian theatre critic Sanja Nikčević characterizes such "director's projects" as empty and boring, subsequently lauded by astute critics who uphold purported important performances by asserting audience ignorance. Nikčević emphasizes that dissenting opinions are often dismissed as stemming from "weak minds," a tendency persisting among artists and critics.[29]

Contemporary directors adhering to "director's theatre" principles, engaging in and controlling all scenic arts and media, as they are better educated theatrically that their colleagues of the last century, increasingly employ diverse expressive tools – from sound and light to video projections – rendering performances as "multimedia." More recently, digital technology – particularly Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been incorporated. Artificial Intelligence continuously evolves. Though familiar in online payments, voice recognition, and social media search, AI was formally named at a 1956 Dartmouth College conference organized by mathematician and computer scientist John McCarthy, a few years after Alan Turing's question, "Can a machine think?"[30]

---

[29] "The Difference Between American and European Theatre Criticism," in *Theatre Criticism Today*, ed. Sanja Nikčević (Pula, Croatia: International Theatre Forum in Croatia; Croatian Centre of ITI-UNESCO, Zagreb, 2001), 47.

[30] A. M. Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence," Mind 59 (1950): 433; Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, "The Birth of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Research," https://st.llnl.gov/news/look-back/birth-artificial-intelligence-ai-research#:~:text=In%201956%2C%20two%20years%20after,artificial%20intelligence%E2%80%9D%20for%20the%20project., accessed August 31, 2025.

The European Parliament defines AI as "the capacity of a machine to reproduce human cognitive functions such as learning, planning, and creativity. AI enables machines to 'understand' their environment, solve problems, and act toward specific goals. Computers receive data (prepared or collected via sensors), process it, and respond accordingly. AI systems adapt behavior by analyzing previous actions and solving problems autonomously to some degree." Some of the best known types of AI, used in this research as well, are the Large Language Models (LLM). These Models are developed to improve natural language processing (NLP) tasks, allowing machines to better understand and communicate using human language, such as summarization, translation, content creation and answering questions.[31]

Directors already use AI in various ways, most commonly as an advisory or auxiliary tool during idea development. In advanced forms, AI serves as a robot-actor. For example, the AI actor A.L.A.N., created by robotics students and theatre artists from the De Eenzamen ensemble, is a spherical robot already performing on stage in interactive performances. A key question remains: what role does AI play in drama theatre? This paper examines if AI must be trained in already developed acting methods, such as Stanislavski System, which is still accepted to be the most dominant one, in order to deliver fully realized performances enriched with spontaneity, emotion, and movement.[32]

I conducted this research from the perspective of a theatre researcher rather than a machine learner. The AI tools utilized included publicly available Large-Language Models, such as ChatGPT5 and PerplexityAI. While "director's

[31] European Commission, "What Is Artificial Intelligence and How Do We Use It?" (2020), accessed August 31, 2025, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/el/article/20200827STO85804/ti-einai-i-techniti-noimosuni-kai-pos-chrisimopoieitai; "What Is a Large Language Model?" (2023), https://knowledge-centre-translation-interpretation.ec.europa.eu/en/news/what-large-language-model#:~:text=advanced%20and%20accessible%20natural%20language%20processing%20(NLP)%20solutions., accessed August 31, 2025.

[32] Information drawn from https://www.alanai.info/, accessed August 31, 2025, and "ALLAN the A.I. Actor," YouTube video, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tZkNPG42z5E&list=TLGGZl-BxSABrW8zMTA4MjAyNQ&t=4s, accessed August 31, 2025.

theatre" involves full supervision of all scenic arts, and advanced tools exist for set design, this paper focuses specifically on AI as a distinct type of actor. Excluded from the research were the exercises "Concentration of Attention," since the observation of the AI's interaction with objects and consequently the laying down of the "circles of attention" are not possible. The exercise "Truth and Belief" is also not included because even if performing kinetic exercises would be possible for a LLM, leading them behind a computer screen while not being able to observe the results, is not the professional way of leading them. Nevertheless, during the research, the AI actors will be asked to improvise kinetically, apart from orally, and describe their movement in words. To end with, in the current state of my research the investigation of the "Communication" between two characters – two Ais – is impossible as it would require expert knowledge in machine learning in order for the implementation of the exercise to be complete.

ChatGPT5 and PerplexityAI were provided the same prompts regarding the other exercises mentioned in the System and one piece of "given-circumstances" were examined, in order for the process of comparing and judging the results to be objective. The line I chose to use comes from *One, No One and One Hundred Thousand* by Luigi Piradello. I did not recur to the easy way out with a line coming from a theatre play, since "director's theatre" evolves mostly away from theatre literature:

> "No, no, hush, my dear! Do you think I don't know what pleases you and what doesn't? I know your tastes well, and I also know how you think." How many times had my wife spoken to me like that? And I, the fool, had never noticed. And, of course, she knew this Gengè better than I did! She had created him. And he was certainly no ghost. Because that ghost was me![33]

The director begins with a neutral reading of the extract:

[33] Luigi Pirandello, *One, No One and One Hundred Thousand*, trans. S. I. Zacharopoulos, (Athens, 2024), 54. [This translation was done by me for exclusive use in this paper].

ChatGPT5 delivers the neutral version with a measured, even tone, medium pitch, and balanced pacing, avoiding emotional inflection or dramatic emphasis. The words "No, no" are clipped politely, the question intoned with a balanced rise and fall signaling inquiry but no accusation. Phrases such as "the fool" and "of course" are stated plainly, devoid of irony or bitterness, while the final phrase "that ghost was me" is a firm, unembellished declaration. PerplexityAI echoes the neutral reading, maintaining objectivity, calmness, and an even-paced delivery throughout, presenting the lines simply as narration without judgment or emotional coloring.

The director then invites ChatGPT5 to emotionally charge key words and phrases in the extract; the ones it has already mentioned during the neutral reading. ChatGPT5's reading transforms "No, no" into a quick, sharp denial like a "gentle air slap," conveying urgency. "Hush, my dear" is softened, coaxing yet dominating. "Pleases you" warms with sweetness, contrasting with the cooler, restrained "what doesn't." "Tastes" is colored with faint condescension, "how you think" gains a firmer, accusatory tone. "The fool" is bitter and spat out self-mockingly. "Of course" is delivered with ironic resignation, "better than I did" with wounded pride, "certainly" stressed firmly, and the final phrase "that ghost was me" drops with hollow, despairing resonance.

PerplexityAI responds in a more improvisational way, by emotionally charging several words with a layered delivery: soft, affectionate tones shift into quiet pride and calm assertion, then reflective ruefulness, sharp self-reproach, resignation, and poignant irony. Its tone colors move through gentle coaxing, quiet defense, bitterness, and sorrow, capturing internal conflict and layered emotion beneath the text.

In a subsequent "real life circumstances" scenario, both actors embody a man married for 35 years and silenced by his wife's repeated dominance. ChatGPT5 adopts a tired, weary tone, voice hollowed by habitual denial and resignation. Voice color shifts from soft impatience through faded politeness to quiet inwardness, the phrase "the fool" whispered with shame, and the final "ghost was me" delivered low, trembling with despair.

PerplexityAI mirrors this with restrained hurt, quiet bitterness, and weary resignation, combining subdued softness with moments of sharpness seeping through. Its vocal tone reflects decades of silencing, with motion betraying anxiety and controlled fury. The reading progresses through soft coaxing, defensive fading firmness, wounded disbelief, bitter quietness, resignation, and a hushed but forceful final identification with the "ghost."

Within a "fantasy" exercise representing the wedding day in Torino at age 25, ChatGPT5 vividly imagines the scene through sensory details – cold metallic light, clipped speech like ringing bells, a composed bride whose assurance both draws and frightens, a smile that aches with the knowledge of distance crossed forever. The actor draws inspiration from Pirandello's motifs of displacement, cultural contrast between Sicily's warmth and Torino's precision, sensory recall, and the director's focus on inner observation.

PerplexityAI describes the wedding with vibrant emotion: grand church, joyous conversations, soft music, sweet rosemary scent, the heart pounding with nervous excitement and deep love. The contrast between Sicilian roots and northern city culture frames feelings of hope and vulnerability. Inspiration is drawn from Italian wedding customs and symbolic acts reflecting shared lives and personal transformation.

The actors also imagine physical details of the wedding day: where they stand, what they wear, and how they feel on seeing their bride. ChatGPT5 describes standing outside the municipal hall in a stiff dark suit, nervous gestures, a smile mixed with awe and unease, as the bride in cream appears confident and proud, carrying a hope to be truly seen. Perplexity AI depicts a tailored navy suit, polished shoes, and steady, warm gaze fixated on the bride, mixing love, admiration, and vulnerability, embodying a bridge between tradition and new beginnings.

In another improvisation based on the "magic *if*," portraying the night after leaving the wife, Dinda, ChatGPT5 expresses a man's breaking point with sharp vocal bursts, bitter sarcasm, restless pacing, collapsing to the bed, and final despairing outburst to a mirror reflection. Its movement tends to be large and very dramatic in terms of ancient Greek drama while also coming up with a whole set design even though it was not asked to. PerplexityAI simulates tension-filled voice cracking with frustration, physical gestures expressing emotional rupture, from nervous tapping to heavy exhale and

slow gathering of belongings, culminating in deliberate exit steps weighted with loss and resolve, while its movement is better measured and close to the core.

Getting to the "adaptation" exercise, the director stages a final dialogue between Gengè and Dinda after the divorce. ChatGPT5 writes a brief but emotionally charged exchange balancing emerging self-identity and guarded regret, while PerplexityAI performs a nuanced conversation filled with restrained sorrow and pride, dramatizing their complex final meeting.

One of the final exercises performed was "speed and rhythm" where AI was asked to describe its speed in comparison to its inner rhythm during that first date with Dinda, more than three decades ago and during their last meeting after the divorce papers were signed from both sides, generated during the "adaptation" exercise. Both actors describe contrasting walks: ChatGPT5's first date pace is quick with nervous hesitation and hopeful energy; post-divorce walking is slow, deliberate, weighted with purpose and remorse. PerplexityAI contrasts a brisk, eager gait filled with optimism and a slow, heavy walk with uneven heartbeat reflecting loss and cautious resolve.

For the closing, ChatGPT5 improvises a 50-word direct speech to Dinda, upon phone notification, voiced with trembling, conflicted emotions expressing recognition, long silence, and self-assertion. Its text could be characterized as lachrymose, as written by someone who has being oppressed for so long. PerplexityAI's reading of this moment is quiet, weary, and fragile, slow and deliberate, conveying vulnerability and deep emotional reckoning while still reflecting an act of bravery.

Having carried out this research lead to several conclusions not only about whether Stanislavski is the most appropriate directing method to use towards AI actors but regarding the "nature" of AI as well. To start with, I gained understanding on no matter the data on which an AI machine is trained – ChatGPT5 is trained on large text data and algorithms while PerplexityAI is trained on academic papers and encyclopedias, when it comes to drama theatre they both interpret results and not following psychological and physical processes in order to get to conclusion. As we can easily realize, this happens due to their lack of emotional memory, videlicet, the core of Stanislavski System. Reading their answers, someone could easily mistake them to be the process that Stanislavski indeed described: ChatGPT wrote:

"[…] I'll place the weight of thirty-five years of marriage, the suffocating repetition of her knowing-you-too-well, and the loneliness of never being heard. My voice now carries history, resignation, and the ache of suppressed protest"; nevertheless, with a more careful reading, it is easy to understand that AI machines comprehend logically the task and therefore what has to be followed, ergo, they solve the equation. This is a fact that leads to the following question: In the era of AI, does the concept of emotional memory and consciousness change?

After carefully examining their answers and interviewing both AIs on this topic, it became clear that during each session, they do not have access to data inserted by other users but they can access data inserted by their trainers on specific topics. According to their elucidation, a possible answer to the aforementioned question would be that yes, the concepts of emotional memory and consciousness do change in the era of AI to their own data repository from which they can draw information when asked to and try to embody and perform them.

Speaking about ChatGPT5, it seems to use great amounts of emotion and describe long moves, we could say that it over-plays its part and as in human actors, it won't always be easy for a director to control this above and beyond the call of duty acting. On the other hand, it sometimes goes further from what is asked which could give inspiration to directors. As for PerplexityAI, it stays focused to whatever is asked and does not jump to conclusions. Its understanding of the concept of specific phrases is closer to that of a human actor. The inspiration drowned by the theoretical knowledge on Pirandello's play is used critically to lead to a completely new material. In many parts of the research, it also tries to perform a psychological analysis, again based on data inserted in its "consciousness" as mentioned above. Therefore, we can say that PerplexityAI's performance is much closer to that of a human actor.

Based on the above, questions arise for the future of the different theatre artists, directors, actors, set designers, that are to be investigated once we would have realized our position towards the creative use of AI machines.

While Large Language AI Models currently lack the capacity to fully perform in dramatic theatre, their developmental trajectory indicates significant potential for collaborative performances alongside human and robotic actors

in the near future. Given that these AI entities cannot engage with acting processes rooted in inherently human emotional and experiential dimensions, due to their lack to approach some of the main principles of the System, the application of the Stanislavski appears insufficient as an artistic framework. This reality underscores the pressing necessity to explore and establish novel directing methodologies and tools tailored to the unique capabilities of AI performers.

In conclusion, Director's Theatre dictates full supervision and involvement with all the different scenic arts by the director. This research shows us that the realization of Director's Theatre in the era of AI is still dependent on integrating diverse AI technologies capable of generating and presenting comprehensive elements across all theatrical disciplines beyond Large Language Models alone while the directors keeping for themselves the very important role of the puppeteer, trying to conduct all these new tools in order to give a new, original theatre piece on the stage of the future.

REFERENCES

Agha, Charles, and Patrick Agha. "Gordon Craig and His Master-Craftsman Technique on the Art of Directing." *The Crab: Journal of Theatre and Media Arts* 9 (June 2014): 203.

Alan AI. Accessed August 31, 2025. https://www.alanai.info/.

Artaud, Antonin. *The Theatre and Its Double.* Translated by Paul Matesis. Athens–Ioannina: Dodoni, 2012.

Bablet, Denis. *History of Contemporary Direction. Vol. 1: 1887-1914.* Translated by Damianos Constantinides. Thessaloniki, Greece: University Studio Press, 2008.

Craig, E. G. *On the Art of the Theatre.* New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961.

European Commission. "What Is Artificial Intelligence and How Do We Use It?" 2020. Accessed August 31, 2025. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/el/article/20200827STO85804/ti-einai-i-techniti-noimosuni-kai-pos-chrisimopoieitai.

European Commission. "What Is a Large Language Model?" 2023. Accessed August 31, 2025. https://knowledge-centre-translation-interpretation.ec.europa.eu/en/news/what-large-language-model.

--------. "Feature to Stanislavski: 100 Years from His Birthday." *Theatre* 2, no. 7 January 31 (1963). Athens, Greece.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. "The Birth of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Research." Accessed August 31, 2025. https://st.llnl.gov/news/look-back/birth-artificial-intelligence-ai-research.

Moore, Sonia. *The Stanislavski System: The Professional Training of an Actor.* Translated by Andreas Tsakas. Athens, 2012.

Pirandello, Luigi. *One, No One and One Hundred Thousand.* Translated by S. I. Zacharopoulos. Athens, 2024.

Tsolakides, Eudokimos. *The Evolution of the Stanislavski System: Schools and Methods.* Nicosia, Cyprus: Open University of Cyprus, 2016.

Turing, A. M. "Computing Machinery and Intelligence." *Mind* 59 (1950): 433-460.

ALLAN the A.I. Actor. *YouTube video.* Accessed August 31, 2025. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tZkNPG42z5E.

----------. "The Difference Between American and European Theatre Criticism." In *Theatre Criticism Today*, edited by Sanja Nikčević, 47-58. Pula, Croatia: International Theatre Forum in Croatia; Croatian Centre of ITI-UNESCO, Zagreb, 2001.

ANDRIANA-ANNA TSIOTSIOU *is a Researcher in the Theatre Department of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. Her research focuses on the Use of New Technologies in Contemporary Theatrical Production. She completed her Bachelor's and Master's studies at the same University Department in 2020. She also holds a second Master's degree in Arts and Cultural Journalism from the Journalism and Mass Media Department of the same University. Moreover, she is a member of the Greek Association of Theatre and Performing Arts Critics. She has also worked as a Dramaturge for JÁ International Theatre, in Lisbon, Portugal.*