ПРОБЛЕМИ НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

2014 2

ПРОБЛЕМИ НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ТРИМЕСЕЧНО СПИСАНИЕ ЗА ТЕОРИЯ, ИСТОРИЯ И КРИТИКА НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ART STUDIES QUARTERLY

2

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ НА ИЗКУСТВАТА
ПРИ БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ – СОФИЯ

ISSN 0032-9371

ГОДИНА 47-ма 2014

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ

Камелия Николова. Шекспир в българското театрално пространство днес 3

Duška Radosavljević. The Problem of Page and Stage in Russian and British Productions of Shakespeare 12

Евгения Панчева. Укротяване на публиката 18

Сава Драгунчев. Етапи в процеса на създаване на Шекспиров драматичен образ. 23

Надежда Маринчевска. Шекспир в анимационен пунктир.....31

Ингеборг Братоева-Даракчиева. Филмът „Ромео и Жулиета" на Франко Дзефирели като модел на филм мост.....36

Ненко Атанасов. Опърничавите усилия на неукротения български театрален плакат 40

Марияна Лазарова. Шекспир завинаги! Адаптацията като реконтекстуализация в британското кино от 90-те години на XX век 48

РЕЦЕНЗИИ

Надежда Маринчевска. Българско игрално кино – от „Калин Орелът" до „Мисия „Лондон" 57

Николай Йорданов. За драмата и за съпротивата – един съвременен критически поглед.....58

Анна Топалджикова. За едно плодотворно влияние. „Българският театър след 1989 и новата британска драма" 59

Милена Георгиева. За книгата на Анжела Данева „Българи в италианските академии за изящни изкуства 1878-1944" 60

РЕЗЮМЕТА.....62

CONTENTS

Kamelia Nikolova. Shakespeare in Bulgarian Theatre Space Today 3

Душка Радосавлиевич. Проблемът за „страницата и сцената" в някои руски и британски постановки 12

Evgenia Pancheva. The Taming of the Audience.....18

Sava Dragunchev. Stages to Achieve a Shakespearean Character 23

Nadezhda Marinchevska. Shakespeare in an animated stippled line.....31

Ingeborg Bratoeva-Daraktchieva. Franco Zeffirelli's „Romeo and Juliet" as a crossover film model 36

Nenko Atanasov. Shrewish labours of the untamed Bulgarian theatre posters 40

Mariana Lazarova. Shakespeare forever! Adaptation as re-contextualization in British cinema of the 90s of the 20th century.....48

REVIEWS

Nadezhda Marinchevska. Bulgarian cinema - from „Kalin the Eagle" to „Mission London". 57

Nikolay Yordanov. For the drama and the resistance – a recent critical view.....58

Anna Topaldzhikova. For a productive influence. „Bulgarian theatre after 1989 and new British drama". 59

Milena Georgieva. For Angela Daneva's book „Bulgarians in Italian Academies of Fine Arts 1878-1944" 60

SUMMARIES.....62

Адрес на редакцията:
Институт за изследване на изкуствата при БАН, списание „Проблеми на изкуството“
ул. „Кракра“ 21, София 1000. тел. 944 24 14, факс +359 2 943 30 92
E-mail: probleminaizkustvoto@gmail.com

Ръкописите се приемат в редакцията на списанието или на електронния адрес. Ръкописите трябва да отговарят на изкванията на редколегията, които се намират в редакцията на списанието. Ръкописи не се връщат.

Информация за абонаменти в редакцията и на електронния адрес на списанието и към Маргарита Керпичиян daisy51@abv.bg.

Contact details:
Art Studies Quarterly, Institute of Art Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
21 Krakra Street, 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
phone: +359 2 944 24 14, fax: +359 2 943 30 92
probleminaizkustvoto@gmail.com

Manuscripts may be submitted either via e-mail or to the Editorial Office. Manuscripts should be prepared in accordance with the editorial staff's requirements, available at the Editorial Office. Manuscripts will not be returned to authors.

Subscription information is available at the Editorial Office or provided by Margarita Kerpitchian at daisy51@abv.bg.

Съставител на броя: Камелия Николова
Технически секретар: Цвета Кунева
Графичен дизайн: Майа Лачева
Фото редактор: Иван Ванев
Превод: Камелия Николова, Милена Лилова

Compiled by Kamelia Nikolova
Clerical secretary: Tsveta Kuneva
Designed by Maya Lacheva
Photo editor: Ivan Vanev
Translated by Kamelia Nikolova, Milena Lilova

I корица

„Хамлет” от Уилям Шекспир, реж. Доминик Дромгул/Бил Бъкхърст, Шекспиров театър „Глобус”, Лондон

(Показан в България на 3 юни, 2014, МТФ „Варненско лято” - Световно турне на Театър „Глобус” около глобуса 2014-2016)

First cover

„Hamlet“ by William Shakespeare, directed by Dominic Dromgoole/Bill Buckhurst, ‚Shakespere‘s Globe Theatre, London, UK (In Bulgaria - 3 June, 2014, ITF „Varna Summer“ - Globe to Globe 2014-2016)

IV корица

Николай Младенов, 1995 г.

Back cover

Nikolay Mladenov, 1995

THE PROBLEM OF PAGE AND STAGE IN RUSSIAN AND BRITISH PRODUCTIONS OF SHAKESPEARE*

Duška Radosavljević, University of Kent, United Kingdom

An interesting event, which brought the English Shakespearean and Russian Stanislavskian tradition together, took place in September 2010 in Stratford-upon-Avon. Organized by Paul Allain (Professor of Theatre and Performance, University of Kent) and Struan Leslie (Head of Movement, RSC), the event was a culmination of a two-year research project between the University of Kent and the Moscow Art Theatre (MHAT) School entitled 'Tradition and Innovation'. Both in the run-up to the 'In the Body' Symposium, and in the course of the weekend during which it took place, one could observe an interesting phenomenon. There was a mutual fascination between the British and the Russians. The British were often greatly impressed by the rigour, intensity and virtuosity with which the actor training is taught at MHAT[1]. The Russians, on the other hand, are intrigued by the apparent variety of working practices that exists in England, such as devising, immersive or site-specific theatre. But both of these sets of experiences have their limit and their flip-side too. The Russians are quickly disappointed when they find that the theatre they see is of apparently indeterminate genre, below a standard they expected, or so verbal that it does not sustain their attention. Conversely, the British are worried by what they perceive to be a certain dogmatism that underlies Russian performer training as there is little accommodation of personal ability of the students in it.

In Stratford, the British participants were dazzled and thoroughly exhausted by a sprightly, charismatic septuagenarian, Andrei Droznin, an engineer-turned-acting coach who teaches his extremely dynamic movement classes in a suit and tie[2]. He was accompanied by his former students, MHAT movement teachers Slava Rybakov and Natalia Fedorova. However, when experiencing British movement workshops, often designed to provoke an individual response from the participants, the Russians found this too basic and amateur. The project examining tradition and innovation therefore revealed an entrenchment of the respective positions of both sides. In my experience – and because I could intuit the reasons for the impasse between them, having witnessed similar encounters between Eastern and Western Europeans – this seemed like a problem of cultural translatability and translation. I was reminded of an anecdote I was once told about the first experiment in computer translation conducted between American and Soviet scientists. The format was to feed a phrase in English into the machine, have it translated into Russian, and then, as a means of testing accuracy, feed the Russian translation back and have it translated into English. The original phrase was 'out of sight, out of mind'. It came back as 'the invisible lunatic'.

No successful act of translation can ever be literal. But could we view the relationship between text and performance by means of translation?

This is not to propose a return to a linguistic or semiotic framework for analysing performance. My intention rather is to underline the notion of a categorical difference between distinct cultures as well as the paradigms of text and performance, whereby the process of any 'translation' between them must be understood as an epistemological rather than a mechanical endeavour. This notion of translation presupposes that not only the verbal content is rendered from one idiom to another, but also its contextual meaning.

Philosopher Levi R. Bryant offers a very useful interpretation of Bruno Latour's idea of translation which seems particularly suitable here:

„Think about photosynthesis. Here we have photons of sunlight, the leaf and its photosynthetic cells, and the sugar produces [sic.]. The leaf 'translates' the photons of sunlight and produces something *new:* the complex sugars. There is no resemblance or identity between the photons of light and these complex sugars. Rather that sunlight becomes something new in passing through the medium of the photosynthetic cells"[3].

Given this conception of translation as photosynthesis – as a process which yields 'something new' – we can perhaps begin to conceive of the relationship between text and performance as translational – or, more precisely, transformational. In considering the process of staging a play, we may need to resort to the notions of director's theatre which, due to distinct cultural genealogies, will have different manifestations in continental Europe as opposed to the anglophone world. Needless to say, those traditions must be understood paradigmatically, in relation to their own contexts, before they can be appropriately related to each other. Despite living in an age of globalization, the MHAT/RSC encounter mentioned above has highlighted that the pre-1989 conception of the East/West binary is still at times difficult to overcome. The Slovenian philosopher Rastko Močnik has noted that in comparison with the East, the West sees itself as 'timeless, canonic, general, it is a non-space, since it is a norm, a measure against which the peripheral, the provincial is to be measured' (quoted in Buden 2010: 6). As an individual in between the East and the West – faced with pertinent examples of theatre-making within both of those contexts – I reserve the right of recourse to the reversed perspective too.

It certainly appears that we entered the twenty-first century prepared for a compromise in relation to the dichotomies of text and performance or page and stage – the latter of which has, particularly in that form of words, concerned those who deal with the work of Shakespeare. The field of Performance Studies contributed to a considerable extent towards what Erika Fischer-Lichte has called a 'reversal of hierarchy between text and performance' (2001). The fact that this reversal more recently led to a backlash from literary scholars has been noted by W.B. Worthen (2011). However, there have also been some attempts at reaching a truce. Weimann and Bruster, for example, have proposed in Shakespeare's theatre a 'dramaturgy of „bifold authority" which, bridging and yet exploiting the gap between language and performance, does not permit an order of „hierarchy" between them' (2008: 14).

One useful aspect of a transformation model of the page to stage translation is that a relationship of 'hierarchy' between

two distinct languages is not really tenable. Andrew James Hartley touches on this when he claims that 'the difference between page and stage is one of kind, not degree' (2005: 4). In his rather pragmatic project to provide a practice and theory guide for a Shakespearean dramaturg, Hartley addresses the problem head on, with typical dramaturgical clarity – and in a rather conclusive manner:

„To put the play on stage is to transform it, to draw on fundamentally different means of signification [...]. Theatre is not a conduit for text, a telephone through which the textual essence emerges at the other end basically the same as it was when it went in, it is a wormhole, a rift in the space–time continuum through which one is transported to a radically different, strange, and – hopefully – wonderful universe. The text is not the production 'in potential', it does not predict or even direct the performance, and it cannot somehow contain or restrict the number of 'correct' stagings of the play [...]. In short, the production does not move from page to stage. A play (text) and a production are fundamentally different things, and while they are interconnected, the former does not dictate or originate the latter" (2005: 42).

An approach to text: Yury Butusov's *Richard III*

Directed in 2004 by Yuri Butusov at the Satirikon theatre in Moscow, 'this comic-book version of the bloody Shakespearean tragedy'[4] was picked by *The Moscow Times* critic John Freedman as one of the 15 most memorable productions of the last decade. The lead is played by Konstantin Raikin, who also runs the Satirikon (previously run by his father, the legendary comedian actor Arkady Raikin).

Angular, mostly uplit and extraordinarily dynamic, Butusov's production is a full-length rendition of Shakespeare's play, in the nineteenth-century translation by Gregory Ben and Aleksandr Druzhinin, and presented here as a 'tragi-farce' in the key of an illustrated-bedtime-story. A bed – or a slight distortion of it – is a prominent part of Aleksandr Shishkin's set, and Richard's famous wooing attempts tend to literally unfold from a graveyard into this horizontal throne. In addition, the whole stage is covered in white sheets of changing textures. Often featuring two-dimensional cut-outs of animals, furniture which towers over the protagonists and a musical accompaniment which mixes cabaret, bossanova and a playing-den brass-orchestra, the production also at times evokes German Expressionism and Ionesco. It is no surprise that Butusov's greatest hits, which propelled him to international fame in the early stages of his career, include a production of *Waiting for Godot*, *Woyzeck* and Ionesco's *Macbett.*

There are memorably poignant moments in the show too. Clarence is killed as glasses of red wine are flung onto his white nightshirt. Margaret's curse is delivered in a snowstorm as she stands on top of a giant kitchen table. The snowstorm motif is repeated during Richard's dream in the second half, and his speech is delivered like a nursery rhyme. On the battlefield he is haunted by the dead princes, who are having a pillow-fight just like they did moments before their death. The frolicking brothers are also given the very last 'word' in the show – chasing each other around Richard's dead body as it gets bound up in the same silky sheets which had first seen the deaths of his victims – thus somehow appearing to restore divine justice.

In an interview he gave me, Butusov confessed that even though the text is an important departure point for him, so is the actors' and his own artistic impulse:

„When I make a piece of theatre I am telling a story about the actor or about myself, not a story about the play" (in Radosavljević 2013: 58).

Butusov made the decision to direct the play in conjunction with being able to cast Konstantin Raikin in the lead. In preparing for this piece, Butusov knew that childhood was going to be an important theme, especially as he was working with Raikin, who had grown up in the shadow of a famous father and was therefore forced to prove himself on his own terms as an actor:

„He had a childhood which was by all means extraordinary. And I knew that there would be a painful spot in there somewhere. Looking at the play itself, it could also be argued that the problem of Richard can be traced to his own childhood, to his illness and his personal view of himself within the world. And this became a kind of engine for the production" (in Radosavljević 2013: 58).

The motif of the snow is reminiscent of Christmas-time and a particular ritual which all Russians know and remember from their childhood: the festive custom of being put on a chair and asked to recite a poem. For a child it is often a 'moment of sickness' which leads to the horror of forgetting your words: 'And then of course what this leads to is a desire to become an actor or a director in order to resolve this complex caused by a bad childhood memory'[5].

This evokes Pavis's notion of the *mise-en-scène* 'provid[ing] the dramatic text with a situation that will give meaning to the statements of the text' (1992: 29). However, the methodology of making the piece (as well as the acting style adopted) can be seen as still being rooted in the Stanislavskian tradition.

The visual world of the production was derived from Butusov's reading of Shakespeare through the prism of the Theatre of the Absurd.[6] Shakespeare's interest in the paradoxes of human nature prompted this approach – the scene between Richard and Anne, for example, is seen by Butusov as particularly exemplary of the absurd. Shakespeare's own inconsistencies in his treatment of time and space provided further justification; while Butusov's prior engagement with Beckett inspired a metaphorical use of space:

„In my view, the space in the Theatre of the Absurd is the internal space of human psychology. My understanding of this notion began with my first production, *Waiting for Godot.* You completely lose a sense of reality and go inside. That's what helped me to create the space for *Richard III* looking so strange. It is linked to the play, but not literally" (in Radosavljević 2013: 61).

Njål Mjøs has an interesting take on the visual aspect of Butusov's Shakespeare productions, contained in an ongoing partnership with the designer Aleksandr Shishkin:

„A Butusov/Shishkin production resembles a kind of theatrical neo-primitivism; without any post-modernist irony they play with the 'primitive' conditions of the stage, the primal, ordinary elements of the theatre"[7].

Although Mjøs's comment is not intended in a derogatory way, this perspective evokes the customary Western position of cultural superiority in relation to the East, as proposed by Močnik and discussed earlier. This gap is conceptualized further by Boris Buden, inspired by Habermas, as an instance of 'belated Modernism' (Buden 2010: 6), although, whatever the label, the difference in cultural attitude is clearly marked by different epistemological genealogies between Eastern and Western Europe throughout the latter half of the twentieth century.

At the turn of the 1990s, Patrice Pavis very effectively encapsulated the position of a Western theatre-maker and audience member in terms of relativism, made even more acute by the end of Marxism as a tenable ideology:

„Relativism is particularly evident in what has been called the postmodern *mise en scène* of the classics: the rejection of any centralizing and committed reading, the leveling of codes, the undoing of discursive hierarchies, the rejection of a separation between 'high' culture and mass culture are all symptoms of the relativization of points of view. We are no longer encumbered with the scruples of a Marx, who sees in classical (for example, Greek) art a high culture admittedly distorted by class, but above all a potential universality, which ought to be preserved. At the moment, the split between tried and tested classical values and modern values to be tested no longer exists; we no longer believe in the geographical, temporal or thematic universality of the classics" (1992: 14).

Nevertheless, the 'peripheral' and 'provincial' East, rendered as such by the 'timeless' and 'general' West (Mocˇnik in Buden 2010), still manifests a desire to be seen as 'universal', as illustrated in the following quote of Lev Dodin from an interview published in 2010:

„[E]very time we perform in another new place, we are convinced yet again that people cry in the same places and people laugh in mostly the same places all over the world. [...] All the legends about national mentalities get destroyed when we go on stage. When it pertains not to the form, but the essence, we're all alike" (Dodin in Delgado and Rebellato 2010: 73).

It is crucial to note that postmodernism – with the 'levelling of codes', 'undoing of hierarchies' and 'relativization of views' – never took place in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc in the same way or at the same time as it did in the West. This is not to say that the West has come further in its understanding of culture and the human condition, or that it should have the right to judge the East from a position of democratic superiority – but it is necessary to acknowledge first and foremost that we are faced with a matter of distinct historical genealogies. An attempt at comparison could bring about speculation as to whether or not the undoing of the types of hierarchies prevalent in the West (class, gender etc.) was as urgent and relevant in the communist East where the political and social structure was, at least notionally, flatter than it was in the West. However, the difference, once again, must be seen as categorical, and beyond direct comparison. For Dodin, therefore, the desire to have universal appeal cannot be seen as imperialist, as it might be in the case of a Western theatre-maker; rather it must be understood within the circumstances of his life in cultural isolation throughout the communist years and as a means of much longed-for international artistic validation. There are of course crucial problems inherent to the monolithic, absolutist worldview that the non-arrival of postmodernism had facilitated, but if these problems are to be addressed in the spirit of liberal relativism, they must first be allowed to be seen as problems from within.

An interesting insight into the role of theatre in a monolithic context is to be gleaned courtesy of Silviu Purcarete, who in the same collection of interviews intimated:

„It's paradoxical, but during the Communist era, theatre and theatre artists were 'high' caste. They belonged to some kind of aristocratic tribe in all East European countries. It was felt that theatre was something extremely necessary and extremely valued by people. [...] And now I don't know why people go to the theatre" (Purcarete in Delgado and Rebellato 2010: 101).

Nowhere is this sense of theatre aristocracy more present, perhaps, than in the seat of Konstantin Stanislavsky and Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko – the Moscow Art Theatre School. But it is an elitism based on merit rather than birthright. We were told by one of the teachers that some 500 students a day audition at the school at certain times, and only about 20 make it through the final round. Although this is not so different from what occurs in some Western drama schools, the key distinction is that the Russian students are all subsidized by the state, and in some cases by the school too. The director of the MHAT, Anatoly Smeliansky, also told us that they expect about a quarter of each acting class to drop out by the final year, explaining that 'this is not for everyone'. This sort of elitism was once fully sanctioned by the communist system(s) which guaranteed equality of opportunity by virtue of the education system which was free and standardized on a national level. In also guaranteeing a limited number of secure jobs for artists, the system had to regulate the number of students completing the training. This established a kind of cultural hegemony that was difficult to challenge. The audiences, on their part, were mostly satisfied to think of theatre people as possessed of a special talent which was to be admired from the safety of their seats. Attempts at collectively devised, or non-dramatic theatre could therefore only happen outside of the institutionalized subsidized sector of a communist country – or, as in the case of the celebrated Russian troupe Derevo for example, outside of the country.

Another approach to text: Shakespeare and the RSC community

When the octogenarian Cicely Berry walks into a rehearsal room, whether it is to work with a group of actors, prisoners or schoolteachers, it is not long before the word 'fuck' makes it into one of her softly spoken elaborations on Shakespeare's meaning. She relishes all types of verbal expression in equal measure, but her workshops are always physically active from start to finish. You will find yourself kicking objects on the floor, jumping on and off chairs and being jostled as you speak verse in iambic pentameter. And in the end you will emerge inspired and ever so slightly elevated, whoever you are.

In 1969 Berry was invited by Trevor Nunn, the then Artistic Director of the Royal Shakespeare Company, to join as its in-house voice coach – a position until then unprecedented in British theatre. This also makes her probably the longest-serving member of the RSC, even though she has in recent years combined her work for the company with working outside of Stratford, and outside of theatre – most notably this has included work with prisoners in the United Kingdom and United States, as well as with a youth group, Nos do Morro, in a Rio de Janeiro favela. She has been instrumental in developing the company's educational and community work – indeed, Berry is often seen as the precursor of the RSC Education Department – and she has published four highly praised books on the relationship between voice, the text and the actor. Her 2008 book *From Word to Play* is, unlike its predecessors, aimed at directors rather than actors and it outlines approaches to the text stemming from the same principles underlying her previous books, but emphasizing ways into the world of the play.

At the outset, she outlines her early experiences of working with three different directors at the RSC, Trevor Nunn, Terry Hands and John Barton, and how their individual styles influenced her own work with the actors. With Nunn, there was the challenge of helping the actors achieve naturalism and intimacy within epic spaces; with Hands the epic was a prerogative, but the issue was achieving precision together with the speed that he required; finally, with Barton, the structure

of the text – 'the specifics of rhythm, antithesis, metaphor and word play' (2008: 27) – was paramount:

„Actors would come to my small upstairs office to go over their speeches; having gone through the necessary voice work in order to release their own private reaction to the language, I would perhaps throw a handful of books on the floor and get them to pick them up and put them in order on the shelf while going through their part. A simple procedure but I soon realized how, by doing a simple task while speaking, the actor was freed up and so allowed him or her to find their own response to the text, while still honouring the speech structures that Barton wanted" (2008: 27).

Imbued with a deep love and appreciation of spoken language, verse and poetic metaphor, and with a drive to liberate the actor from any fears or constraints, Berry's work on the text, in my experiential understanding of it, appears to have two levels. There is the level of active listening where she asks us to speak the text while beating out the iambic pentameter rhythm, listen out for the words that do not fit the meter and use them as clues for understanding what the focus of the text can be. This level is of an analytical kind, but it allows for personal response. Then there is an experiential level where she places us in a physical situation which represents what it might be like for the speaker/character to be feeling the feelings and thinking the thoughts being articulated by these lines. This is not a Stanislavskian reconstruction of a dramatic situation; rather it is physical manifestation of the character's mental state, whereby we are in fact enacting the thought or the feeling itself, rather than the character's behaviour. An example includes: Ophelia moving in the space with all the other workshop participants moving around her; she is trying to establish contact with someone while speaking 'O, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown', but everyone else is instructed to turn away from her every time she reaches them. This is intended to – and often does – conjure up the feeling of utter despair and isolation in the speaker. A character's mental indecision contained within a speech may be explored by speaking the lines while moving between two chairs on each punctuation mark. A sense of inner turmoil might be experienced by getting the speakers to jostle each other while speaking the text, 'although they know this is set up as an exercise, the actual act of jostling affects how one speaks – it is irritating to be pushed, after all' (2008: 58). A strategy for entering the 'world of the play', rather than the character, may involve taking a section of dialogue – in the case of *Hamlet*, for example, the opening scene is suggested – asking the participants in the scene to play it from the outer edges of the space. They whisper the text across the space within which the rest of the group – 'the audience' – are positioned and instructed to mutter back the words that strike them as evocative of the scene's supernatural atmosphere. (A similar workshop is possible with almost any other play, taking into account its specific world and the atmospheric characteristics pertaining to it.) Berry notes that this work and the 'displacement strategies' (such as the one involving the ordering of books described above) are of course not concerned with the story of the play, but with allowing the actor to find a subliminal response to the shapes of the thought and feeling contained in the verbal text itself.

There could be a potential analogy between text and music in Berry's approach in that she believes that 'meaning is rhythm and rhythm is meaning', and insists on working on the structure of speeches and 'the music that goes through those speeches' (Ellis 2010: 122). In addition, she has likened the actors to the singers in their respective necessity for technical training (Berry, Rodenburg and Linklater 1997: 48).

Despite the considerable significance of her work to actors and members of the theatre profession, Berry's methodology has received little attention within academia. Alongside her other two distinguished colleagues, voice teachers Patsy Rodenburg and Kristin Linklater, Berry in fact came up against some academic criticism. In 1996, Sarah Werner infamously attacked their work in a published extract from her PhD on the grounds of its 'anti-intellectual bias', the 'assumption that Shakespeare's characters are universal, that their feelings are ahistorical and readily accessible to twentieth-century actors', and the 'ideological implications of this way of seeing Shakespeare' (1996: 252). All three teachers responded to this in vehement defence of their practical work – Linklater pointing out that Werner was a true 'grandchild of Descartes' and stating that 'while I admit to an anti-academic bias in my work, I refuse to allow the academy to hold a monopoly on the intellect' (Berry, Rodenburg and Linklater 1997: 52).

The accusations levelled at Berry that she was upholding a conservative, male-dominated view of Shakespeare's work by focusing on authorial intention rather than taking a critical approach to text were naturally a product of the post-modern – and more specifically Foucauldian – legacy on the critical theory of the latter half of the twentieth century too. However, Berry and her followers might find relief in the evolving field of cognitive science and its application in Performance Studies, which has shifted the focus from the issues of power and cultural politics towards neuro-scientific investigations of the processes of theatre-making and reception. In her book *Shakespeare's Brain*, Mary Thomas Crane has speculated whether the insights of cognitive science and psychology remained neglected by cultural and literary critics for such a long time due to the fact that 'traditional theoretical models seem more relevant to studies of texts because they are themselves text-based' (2001: 15). The application of cognitive science to the study of performance allows for application of different epistemic methodologies which may be more inclusive of non-text-based aspects of performance. Or, in the words of Bruce McConachie, 'many of the current truth claims of theatre and performance scholarship [... will be rendered] vulnerable to irrelevance in the coming decades' (2006: xii). In her own project, Crane proposes a new conception of authorship that 'challenges the Foucauldian deconstruction of the author' (2001: 3), and a literary theory based on cognitive science which offers 'new ways to locate in texts signs of their origin in a materially embodied mind/brain' (2001: 4). This methodology, which allows for the author and his plays to 'represent what it is like to conceive of oneself as an embodied mind' (2001: 4) and which takes into account spatiality inherent in the author's language, has the potential to validate Berry's work and to render Werner's criticisms futile. Crane does not dismiss the importance of cultural context and ideology in shaping authorial processes; however, in a manner reminiscent of Berry's work, she bases her thinking on the premise that 'language is shaped, or „motivated", by its origins in the neural systems of a human body as they interact with other human bodies and an environment' (2001: 11).

In the Foreword to Berry's first book in 1973, Peter Brook established that 'her book points out with remarkable per-

suasiveness [that] „technique" as such is myth, for there is no such thing as correct voice' and '[t]here is no right way – there are only a million wrong ways' (1973/1993: 3). This, as we have seen above, did not make the work immune from anti-authoritarian critique. Perhaps, after all, the RSC, like MHAT, could never help being seen as an institution upon which certain ideas of authority would be projected? Perhaps they had, or do have, something in common after all?

Having briefly worked at the Education Department of the RSC, under Michael Boyd in the mid-2000s, I would like to highlight some less obvious ways in which the RSC managed to generate a sense of community in and around itself in the early twenty-first century. It is not unknown that Boyd himself trained in Moscow in the 1970s and that this had a crucial influence on his career and his artistic sensibility. When in 2003 he inherited an economically and morally destabilized RSC from Adrian Noble, Boyd was determined to return the company to its founding principle of 'ensemble'. His leadership style was based on inclusivity, empathy and collegiality, and he passionately believed that 'the ensemble way of working', ultimately rooted in the idea of 'the whole being greater than the sum of its parts', was to be applied to the whole company, artists and managers included. To what extent this approach seemed to value Cicely Berry's own legacy – both in terms of her work with the actors and in terms of the education and community work of the company – could be seen in the fact that the Education Department was included in the Artistic Planning meetings in 2003 (alongside a number of other departments). Members of the Education Department, who were often former actors themselves, were embedded in particular productions so that they could facilitate a direct transfer of rehearsal room methodologies and the kinaesthetic approach to the text into the classroom. There were ongoing training sessions within the company, and the Artist Development Programme – mostly tailored to the needs of the acting companies – was routinely open to members of the Voice and Education Departments. In addition there were lunchtime classes in yoga, Pilates and Feldenkrais open to all staff members. Actors and assistant directors were regularly involved in the Education Department activities and eventually they were also given an opportunity to be accredited for their teaching work as part of a postgraduate diploma taught jointly between the University of Warwick and the RSC. The report on the company, entitled *All Together: A Creative Approach to Organisational Change*, notes that in conjunction with these developments, the Education Department 'took on greater importance in the RSC's public profile' (Hewison, Holden and Jones 2010: 70) – but crucially, it continued to derive its greatest sense of achievement from bringing Shakespeare and the work of the company closer to their audience, and particularly to underprivileged children throughout the Midlands. This level of democratization of theatre is rarely seen in those contexts where theatre people are perceived as 'high caste', as the case might have been in communist Romania.

Kinaesthetic or experiential learning, based on Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (1983), as well as the in-house emphasis on mind-body connection, were the key principles underpinning the pedagogical approach of the RSC Education Department, and there were two strands of work on offer: workshops for students and workshops for teachers; with the packages changing in relation to each production. F. Elizabeth Hart notes that since the start of the twenty-first century a number of thinkers, including linguist George Lakoff, psychologist Raymond Gibbs and cognitive scientists/linguists Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier, have proposed theories of human knowledge acquisition emphasizing 'kinesthetic and perceptual interconnections between the human body and its physical environments' (Hart in McConachie 2006: 37). Even though the work of the RSC Education Department has not been hugely informed by theory, it is clear that in its practical form, being rooted in Berry's teaching and in the rehearsal room methodology, the RSC pedagogy paradigmatically belongs to the 'cognitive turn' (McConachie 2006). In addition, it has also inspired new thinking in the area of pedagogical theory itself. Noting a shift in the education and culture policy in England from the 'pro-technical'/information-based to the 'pro-social'/experiential emphasis in learning during New Labour's government in the late 2000s, Jonothan

Neelands (2009) took inspiration from Boyd's ensemble ethos and the RSC's in-house pedagogy to propose a model of ensemble-based drama education. This would be a model founded on:

„the idea of the *paedia* of the participatory experience, of being together in drama and how children and young people are changed by that which is important, rather than the form of the drama work itself" (Neelands 2009: 181).

Its effects would not remain only within the limits of the school subject, but are envisaged as being able to shape the students' social actions 'as a community beyond the drama class and also, possibly, beyond school' (2009: 181).

Although the idea of the ensemble as a 'bridging metaphor between the social and the artistic' (Neelands 2009: 182) can be seen to tap into the very nature of theatre as an art form – particularly its function in Athenian democracy which Neelands also brings into his analysis – this must be a very long way away from what Peter Hall could have envisaged when in 1958, he met with the Stratford entrepreneur Fordam Flower in Moscow to discuss his project of an ensemble in Shakespeare's home town.

Notes:

*Adapted from Chapter One, *Theatre-Making: Interplay Between Text and Performance in the 21st Century* (2013, Palgrave Macmillan) by Duška Radosavljević.

1 Some personal testimonies from Kent staff who visited MHAT are available on the project website: http://www.kent.ac.uk/arts/drama/moscow/index.html.

2 See Allain, Paul (2012) *Andrei Droznin's Physical Actor Training*, Routledge Taylor & Francis DVD and Booklet.

3 Bryant, Levi R. (2009) 'Of Translation, Ontological Realism, and Epistemological Anti-Realism', *Larval Subjects Blog*, 18 November 2009, http://larvalsubjects. wordpress.com/2009/11/18/of-translation-ontological-realism-and-epistemological- anti-realism/.

4 Freedman, John (2011) 'Fifteen Productions to Remember 2001–2010', The Moscow *Times Blog*, 16 January, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/blogs/432775/post/15- productions-to-remember-2001-2010/433227.html.

5 This was shared in a personal conversation, off-camera, rather than in the formal interview.

6 Although Butusov does not refer directly to Esslin, it is worth noting that Esslin's work *The Theatre of the Absurd* (1961) as well as Jan Kott's *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* (1962/1964) both offer a similar perspective.

7 Mjos, Njal (2007) 'Director Yury Butusov's Shakespeare Frenzy', MHAT School website, http://mhatschool.theatre.ru/en/ international/mosjournal2007/chapter2/1/.

Bibliography:

Berry, Cicely (2008) *From Word to Play: a handbook for directors*, (London: Oberon Books).

Berry, Cicely; Rodenburg, Patsy and Linklater, Kristin (1997) 'Shakespeare, Feminism and Voice: responses to Sarah Werner, *New Theatre Quarterly*, 13: 49, 1997, pp. 48-52.

Bryant, Levi R. (2011) *The Democracy of Objects*, (Ann Arbor: Open Humanities Press).

Buden, Boris (2010) 'What to do with the question "What will the Balkans look like in 2020?"' http://www.wus-austria.org/files/docs/Boris%20Buden%20Text%20BCC%202010_edited.pdf

Crane, Mary Thomas (2001) *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Delgado, Maria and Rebellato, Dan eds (2010) *Contemporary European Theatre Directors*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2001)'Reversing the hierarchy between text and performance', *European Review*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 277-291.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2008) *The Transformative Power of Performance: A new aesthetics*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Gardner, Howard (1983) Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences, (New York: Basic Books).

Hartley, Andrew James (2005) *The Shakespearean Dramaturg: A Theoretical and Practical Guide*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Hewison, Robert; Holden John; Jones, Samuel (2010) *All Together: A Creative Approach to Organisational Change*, (London: Demos).

McConachie, Bruce and Hart, F. Elizabeth (2006) *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Neelands, Jonothan (2009) 'Acting together: ensemble as a democratic process in art and life', *RiDE: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, Vol. 14, No. 2, May 2009, pp. 173-189.

Pavis, Patrice (1992) *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Pavis, Patrice (2012) The Contemporary Mise-en-Scene, manuscript.

Pitches, Jonathan (2006) *Science and the Stanislavsky Tradition of Acting*, (London and New York: Routledge).

Radosavljević, Duška (2013) The Contemporary Ensemble: Interviews with Theatre-Makers, (London and New York: Routledge).

Worthen, W.B. (1997) *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Worthen, W.B. (2011) 'Intoxicating Rhythms: Or, Shakespeare, Literary Drama, and Performance (Studies)', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 62, Number 3, Fall 2011, 309-339.

SUMMARIES

SHAKESPEARE IN BULGARIAN THEATRE SPACE TODAY
Kamelia Nikolova

The paper analyzes the presence of Shakespeare in Bulgarian theatre landscape today through the focus of the celebration of the 450th anniversary of his birth. Among the many different activities it discusses two main events – the large number of Shakespearian productions which appeared in the last years on Bulgarian stages and the best performances on Shakespeare's plays from UK made since 2009 which are broadcasted in Bulgaria by satellite as part of London National Theatre global programme *NT Live*.
Between 2010 and 2014 in Bulgaria are staged a significant number of Shakespeare's plays. Depending on its interpretive strategy, they can be divided into three groups. The first group includes performances created in the aesthetics of *theatre of the new realism* - „Hamlet", directed by Yavor Gurdev, National Theatre and „Love's Labour's Lost „ directed by Chris Sharkov, Theatre „Sofia". The second group combines productions „As You Like It „ directed by Krasimir Spassov, Theatre „Bulgarian Army „ and „Richard III" directed by Plamen Markov, Varna Drama theatre, which offer a *personalized classical interpretation* of Shakespeare's drama. The third group unites three very different shows belonging to *theatre of images* - „Winter's Tale" directed by Margarita Mladenova and „Back to Wittenberg „ directed by Ivan Dobchev in Teatre laboratory "Sfumato" and „Romeo and Juliet" directed by Petrinel Gotchev, Gabrovo Drama theatre.
The paper also discusses British Shakespearian performances from *NT Live* programme „Comedy of Errors", „Timon of Athens", „Othello", „Macbeth" and „Coriolanus". It underlines their high artistic quality and innovative contemporary interpretation. In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of creative dialogue between Bulgarian and British theatre productions on Shakespeare in Bulgaria in the years around his anniversary.

ПРОБЛЕМЪТ ЗА „СТРАНИЦАТА И СЦЕНАТА" В НЯКОИ РУСКИ И БРИТАНСКИ ПОСТАНОВКИ
Душка Радосавлиевич

Текстът е обобщена версия на Първа глава от публикуваното като книга изследване „Правенето на театър: взаимодействие между текста и представлението през 21 век" (Duška Radosavljević. Theatre-Making: Interplay Between Text and Performance in the 21st Century (2013, Palgrave Macmillan). Статията проследява посоките на влияние на различни култури върху създаването на театралното събитие и по-спициално върху връзката между текста и представлението. В нея са посочени емблематични примери за статута на Шекспировия текст в представлението в Източна и Западна Европар като е анализирана работата на Юрий Бутусов в Московския театър „Сатирикон", на Сисили Бери в Кралската Шекспирова компания, на Дмитрий Кримов и Устър груп.
Статията оспорва две предубеждения, обикновено присъстващи в този вид анализ: а) имплицитно заложеното йерархизиране на отношението между Изтока и Запада и б) връзката между драматургичния текст и представлението като буквално пренасяне. И в двата случая идеята за базисно различие е ясно подчертана и прякото сравнение между изследваните категории (разглежданите две културни традиции, или текста и представлението) е отхвърлено като неприложимо. Вместо него текстът настоява, че специфичните традиции на създаване на театралния спектакъл трябва да бъдат разбирани във връзка с техните собствени исторически обстоятелства и че понятието за „превод", за пренос на драматургичния текст в друга култура трябва да бъде преосмислено като процес на „трансформация", близък до фотосинтезата, например.

THE TAMING OF THE AUDIENCE
Evgenia Pancheva

The paper discusses Shakespeare's early comedy of *The Taming of the Shrew* (c.1590-91) as a metatheatrical game with the audience. To contextualise the drama's insciption of the observer, it traces the dynamics of pre-Shakespearean exchanges with the spectators - from Mystery plays (*Secunda Pastorum*) through Moralities (*Mankind*) to humanist interludes (*Fulgens and Lucrece*). It also makes references to Elizabethan theatrical conventions, conditions of presentation, including audience status and theatre design, as well as transactions with the audience in the plays of Shakespeare's contemporaries.
The paper argues that the Induction to Shakespeare's play stages the audience's gradual involvement in the theatrical fiction. As a Sidneyan golden world is organised around him, the drunken tinker Christopher Sly, our double upon the stage, watching a theatrical performance, is tricked into believing himself to be „a lord, and nothing but a lord". Sly's complete surrender to theatrical illusionism, however, results in his disappearance from the Shakespearean text.
Within the play proper, the gross fictions of the embedded *Taming* violently school the noisy, unruly Catherine into obedience. Its poetics depends upon the tamer Petruchio's oscillation between illusion-making and illusion-breaking. As exemplified by the ending, this self-interrupting illusionism functions as a fine counterpoint to the theatrics of the Induction, and a metatheatrical reply to the Puritan attacks against the early modern stage.

STAGES TO ACHIEVE A SHAKESPEAREAN CHARACTER
Sava Dragunchev

This research points out the system that would interpret the prerequisites of theatre creating today, of the educational, and the specifically individual characteristics as a starting ground for building the basic benchmarks along the actor's training – the synthesised vocal and speech skills, the movement, analytical- and critical-thinking related competence, so that he or she can work freely in a translation-bound environment such as Bulgaria with a

Shakespearean text, abundant in artistic devices offering some basic *directions* for the interpretation of the role. The rhythm of the language, the sound models and the actor's wilful abiding by them, or on the contrary – wilful violation, bring plenty of interpretative information.

The practical base for teaching Shakespeare today (to either students, or professional actors) brings out the generally recognised theatre categories, which need, however, refocusing in terms of this author – status, power, rhythm (including rhythm of the heart), openness of the body, physical use of space, diction, stress, etc., so that it becomes possible to adequately use blank verse, rhyme, rhythm, verse structure, meter change, metrics, scansion, pause, caesura, breath, end of sentence within a line, sharing lines between characters, transition from verse to prose and vice versa, monosyllabic vocabulary, figures of speech (alliterations, assonances, onomatopoeia, antitheses, paradoxes, contradictions, similes, hyperbolas, hendiadyses, epiphoras, anaphoras, and above all – metaphors). By knowing, recognising and embodying the right content of these devices the actor, being form responsible, can build a complicated palette of images and can create author-dictated emotions and actions in harmony with the rest of his colleagues on stage and in consonance with the director's, the designer's, the movement and vocal aspect of the performance. In other words – the *technical Shakespeare* would give way to the *live Shakespeare*.

By cultivating taste and sense of proportion that would allow for the sensitivity and for the mind to measure the dose and the aesthetic validity of the environment on stage, and in life, the modern actor, instead of standing up in front of the colossus, can step on Shakespeare's shoulders, armed with his voice, expression and life – Vox, Vultus, Vita – or his mind, heart and soul!

SHAKESPEARE IN AN ANIMATED STIPPLED LINE

Nadezhda Marinchevska

The article problematizes the specifics of animated adaptations of Shakespeare's plays. Screen adaptations would necessarily abridge the plays. Animation, disregarding the descriptive narrative codes, compresses into a well-larded and effective story what feature film would draw out to a great length. Animation film atones for the lack of a consistent narration using its own visual, synthetic or fantastic images that refer perception to an expanded connotative field based on prior knowledge of the original texts. The language of animated film creates devices of its own for a flash-like representation of the literary and dramatic symbolism and metaphoric imagery.

The main accent in the article is on the issues of adaptation without dialogues, on replacement of the original text by voice-over commentaries and non-mimetic representations of Shakespearean characters through drawings, puppets or brushstrokes… Unconvincing screen animated deaths as well as the radical reshaping of the tragedy into … a comedy are also addressed.

The articles reviews the movies *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Jiri Trnka, 1959), *The Tempest* (George Dunning, unfinished), *Bottom's Dream* (John Canemaker, 1984), *We Called them Montagues and Capulets* (Donyo Donev, 1985), BBC series of 12 animated adaptations by Russian directors (1992–1994), *Lion King* (Roger Allers, Rob Minkoff, 1994) among others.

FRANCO ZEFFIRELLI'S „ROMEO AND JULIET" AS A *CROSSOVER FILM* MODEL

Ingeborg Bratoeva-Daraktchieva

This paper examines Franco Zeffirelli's adaptation of „Romeo and Juliet" (1968) from two perspectives: from the viewpoint of the *crossover film* development in the late 1960's, and through the lens of the general discussion about literary adaptations on screen. The introduction of the text exposes this debates, relating to *crossover film* as a cultural form, from Thomas Elsaesser's labeling it as a „form of cinematic prostitution", towards a more balanced view to its capacity of making the important transition from minority to mainstream film-audiences. A short review of the experiments of Franco Zeffirelli with Shakespearian texts (on stage and on screen) underlines the unique contribution of the Italian director to the formation of a modern approach to literary adaptations. Adapting time-honored literary texts to the attitudes of a mass-media-dominated cinema audience, Zeffirelli developed a style of new realism, which affected the principles of cinema adaptations for the next decades.

The core of the article offers an elaborate analysis of Zeffirelli 's film „Romeo and Juliet" (1968), a case-study of this remarkable model of *crossover film*. The review is based on examination of the principal elements of the movie, which distinguish it from the then established tradition of Shakespearian adaptations. The director demonstrates a skilled implementation of the entire visual potential of cinema, operating with different shots, spectacular angles, dramatic montage techniques, visualization of metaphors, authentic period details etc. In its conclusion, the paper underlines the correlation between this new developed style of literary adaptation and the outstanding cultural reception of the film.

SHREWISH LABOURS OF THE UNTAMED BULGARIAN THEATRE POSTERS

Nenko Atanasov

Bulgarian theatre took interest in Shakespeare's plays as early as the first years following the Liberation of this country from the Ottomans thus incorporating Bulgarian cultural arena in the European one.

The earliest examples of theatre posters in Bulgaria—invitations and programmes of the late nineteenth century—had just an illustrative function and their creative value boiled down to the aesthetics of the type. These specifics, variously modified, lived on until the early 1960s when the first Shakespearean poster in Bulgaria was made. Asen Stareishinski, an academically trained painter, pioneered theatre poster here being among the first to venture out into Shakespeare's universe.

In the 1970s and the 1980s, each of the active poster artists made works after Shakespeare's emblematic tragedies and comedies with Dimiter Tasev, Ludmil Chekhlarov, Bozhidar Yonov, Ognian Funev, Gancho Ganev, Dimiter Traichev, Galina Gencheva, Georgi Zumbulev, etc., excelling in this respect.

An analysis of the significant moments of the history of Shakespearean posters in Bulgaria shows its evolutional importance to the public mindsets on theatre posters as such.

SHAKESPEARE FOREVER! ADAPTATION AS RE-CONTEXTUALIZATION IN BRITISH CINEMA OF THE 90S OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Mariana Lazarova

The object of the research focuses on cinematographic traditions and their transformations in the context of the specific conjuncture of the 90s', tracking the impact of these processes on the poetics of film adaptations of Shakespeare's plays. Two cinematic traditions are traced: tradition of ontological cinema and dramatic and theatrical tradition as per formative art and kind of revival of the Decadence. Theoretical-historical approach is applied to outline the merits of Sir Lawrence Olivier for the evolution of acting techniques and film art. The text also highlights the contribution of Harold Pinter and Tom Stoppard for the update of film form and content through „the de-dramatization" of theater performance and emancipation of visual expression in line with the principles of the alternativeness and intertextuality of post-modern art.

Re-contextualization and re-temporalisation, the use of meta-narrative and meta theater, the principle of language games and the cultural paradigm of ‚remix' culture are regarded as major dramatic adaptation techniques in the films of Peter Greenaway, Derek Jarman, Oliver Parker, Kenneth Branagh and John Madden. Conclusions are made that Shakespeare is no longer the general code. Rather, he is kind of literary drug that encourages the authors to express their hidden "selves". Shakespeare just like the Bible, he belongs to everyone and at the same time evokes very personal, even intimate interpretations.

Формат 60x84/8 ● Печат: СД „Симолини"