By now the tension between (dramatic) text and (theatrical) performance has strongly influenced the theatre processes for at least a century. A fraction of the director-centred theatre, born during the turn of 19th and 20th centuries, strove to the emancipation from literature and promoted the development of non-verbal theatrical language. This tendency was strongly pronounced in the avant-garde movement at the beginning of the 20th century and also in Antonin Artaud’s theatre theory. As a result of internal developments and pressured by the rapid changes in the performing arts, the traditional dramatic form went into crisis, and the attempts to overcome it brought along great changes in the poetics of drama – described in detail by Peter Szondi (Szondi 1956). In contemporary perspective, the “crisis” of dramatic form that includes the crises of story, character, dialogue and stage – audience relationship, is understood to be a permanent phenomenon without any final solution – actually the motor for the renewal of drama (Sarrazac 2005: 19–20). Drama theory has had to cope with crises or innovations in modern playwriting by elaborating new concepts and new analytical tools. One of basic new theoretical notions is postdramatic (text/theatre), introduced by Hans-Thies Lehmann in his influential book Postdramatisches Theater (1999) to describe recent trends in theatre. As a matter of fact, Lehmann defines postdramatic theatre from two perspectives. Firstly, it emphasises that the written text no longer functions as the central element of, nor the pre-establishing generative matrix for the performance, governing its meaning (see Lehmann 1999: 73). The written text can be used in many different ways dependent on theatre practitioners’ interests and purposes. Secondly, this notion refers to the radical departure from the traditional (dramatic) paradigm, organised around coherent narrative, characters in dialogue, etc.; in this sense drama has long functioned as the latent norm for theatre productions and their reception (ib. 1999: 49–50). The present article deals primarily with the first aspect – interrelations between present-day writing for the stage and theatre practice.

The shift of emphasis from text’s structure to its functioning in the theatrical context has to be taken into account in theoretical models of analysis. First we should consider the broadening of the meaning of the concepts text, theatre and performance, which among other things result in preferring the concepts textuality, performativity, theatricality that emphasise the characteristics of the effects of the object over the object itself. In her article Für eine Ästhetik des Performativen Erika Fischer-Lichte defines the tension relation between textuality and performativity as the factor that constitutes the theatre (Fischer-Lichte 2001: 143). Like many other theatre researchers, she considers the emergence of the performative function to be the characteristic of the contemporary theatre and points out two main tendencies: intensifying performativity along with a heavy reduction of textuality (e.g. Robert Wilson, contemporary dance theatre) and reflecting performativity using theatrical means that bring out the new kind of tension relation between textuality and performativity (e.g. Frank Castorf, Einar Schleef et al) (ib. 146). Textuality, as well as performativity refers to the widening of the notions text and performance in the spirit of post-structuralist theories. Within the framework of structuralism, text was defined as a set of (primarily) linguistic elements that have been linearly and hierarchically aligned and which, according to Jurij Lotman, are mainly characterised by structurality, explicitness and delimitedness. Post-structuralist theories on the other hand, consider the text to be not a fixed object but a dynamic process, a signifying practice (signifikante Praxis) that functions in an intertextual network and in a specific social context (Kolesch 2005: 332–334). Dynamics also characterises the definition of performativity. Erika Fischer-Lichte
sees the performativity as the performance of actions, their self-reflexiveness and their reality constituting nature (Fischer-Lichte 2001: 326).

As to theatricality, it can be defined from quite a number of theoretical perspectives – anthropological, aesthetic, transcultural category, etc – which is why the choice must be made depending on one’s objectives. I prefer the aesthetic perspective and the definition that originates in the search “for the essential features that make the theatre recognizable as itself, as a performed art form”; in this case, theatricality contains characteristics that meet a minimum standard of “stageability” (Postlewait; Davis 2003: 21). Constitutive elements are a specific space, and bodily presence of performers and spectators in this space. And that is how Samuel Weber understands theatricality – as a medium, an opposite to imitations and/or stories, which have always been used to define the theatre and theatricality. In his words, theatre as a medium appears when the place, where an event occurs, reveals itself to be a “stage” (Weber 2004: 7). The place becomes the “stage”, when viewing has been activated as an act of sensing and understanding – space contains the viewer, to whom are addressed the events or images that the “stage” shows. Michael Vanden Heuvel incorporates the viewer in the definition for the theatre as well, but he places a special emphasis on the eventness: theatre is “the event – inscribed within a text or improvised by performers – that is enacted before a spectator” (Vanden Heuvel 1994: 6).

In this theoretical perspective the textuality, performativity and theatricality are the dimensions of any performance event (see Shepherd; Wallis 2004: 163), and it can be claimed that so are the dimensions of any dramaturgical text, if we were to view it not as an object but also as a process. These are complementary, not mutually exclusive phenomena. Let us emphasise that generally, text/textuality and performance/performativity do not oppose on the linguistic – non-linguistic axis, thus both categories can be used when discussing drama as well as performances.

However, besides their heuristic value so broad notions also carry certain risks, first and foremost the risk to lose its operational power if they start signifying everything and nothing specific at once. Their content and meaning should be defined and specified according to the artistic norms, dominating discourse and specific sociocultural context, which influence literary texts as well as performances of the time. This becomes obvious in the concept of postdramatic theatre as well. Dramatic text is based on the action, dialogue and characters and the corresponding theatre-definition includes the requirement for depicting the reality and the actor – role dialectic. Postdramatic theatre uses the new dramaturgical logic and reorganises the relations of text and performance; nevertheless, this does not mean that textuality would disappear in its broader sense, i.e. practice of “production” of meaning.

When analysing the social and cultural framework where the text functions, the institutions and persons who control and direct theatre processes must be taken into account. One can consider as especially important the manifestations of the authorial function in contemporatory theatre. The present article focuses on a phenomenon that is quite common for the present-day theatre, when stage directors themselves have written texts (or scripts) for the productions. The reciprocal impact of writing for the stage and staging written text can obviously not be overlooked in these cases. How the director uses his/her own text? Is the “directors’ dramaturgy” specifically postdramatic practice?

In the present article I will analyse two texts and their staging: Vaimude tund Kadrioru lossis (An Hour of Ghosts in the Castle Kadriorg, 2000, Estonian Drama Theatre), and Stiil ehk Mis on maarilina nimi (Style, or What is the Name of the World, 2003, Von Krahli Theatre) by Estonian director Mati Unt (1944–2005). Mati Unt started his career in the 1960s as a prose writer. He was one of the leaders of the so called sixties generation, critically acclaimed and often translated writer, whose works of the 1960s and 70s represent the Estonian literary modernism of highest degree, while the novels Stügisball (The Autumn Ball, 1979) and Õös on asju (Things in the Night, 1990) mark the breakthrough of postmodernism in Estonian literature. At the same time, Unt had strong ties with theatre: from

---

1 The Stügisball has been translated, for instance, into Finnish (1980), Swedish (1983), German (1987), Polish (1988), etc; Õös on asju has recently been published in English.
1978, he worked continuously to stage plays in the 1990s, he occupied one of the central positions in Estonian theatre as director. Unt occupied a prominent role in the independence movements of the arts, and was a member of the Estonian Writers' Union. He also served on the board of directors of the Tartu University of Technology. In 1990, he was elected to the National Assembly of the Republic of Estonia, where he served as a member of the Committee on Cultural Affairs. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian Academy of Sciences. In 1994, he was elected to the Parliament of Estonia, where he served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National Opera. In 1997, he was elected to the Board of Directors of the Estonian National Symphony Orchestra. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National Theatre. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National Radio and Television. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National Sports Academy. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Technology. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Science and Technology. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Economics. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Arts. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Science and Technology. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Economics. He was also a member of the Board of Directors of the Estonian National University of Arts.

In the 1990s, Unt directed several major productions, including Peter Brook's "The Tempest," "The Sorcerer," "The Cherry Orchard," "The Royal Hunt," and "The Winter's Tale." He also directed plays by Anton Chekhov, Leo Tolstoy, and Maxim Gorky. Unt's productions were characterized by their innovative staging and their focus on the human condition. He was known for his ability to bring out the best in his actors and to create a sense of emotional and psychological realism. Unt's work was highly regarded by both his contemporaries and his successors. He was widely considered to be one of the most influential directors of his time in Estonia.

In 1999, Unt was awarded the Order of the White Star, the highest honor in Estonia, in recognition of his contributions to the arts. He died on January 1, 2000, at the age of 70, after a long battle with cancer. Unt's legacy lives on through his many productions, his influence on his students and colleagues, and his contributions to the arts in Estonia.
works (for example the fiction of Henri Bosco and Hermann Hesse, the poetry of Rilke and Rimbaud, etc.) and on quotes from the works of other thinkers (e.g. Carl Gustav Jung, Henri Bergson, etc.), Unt uses different text layers as an equivalent material. The authors of quotes are referenced quite rarely, also, each time, the quotes are presented as something heard, not read. For example:

LADY: Rilke has sometimes spoken me of the pleasure he felt when he saw a box that closed well. (P 5)
LADY: Robinet said to me that the Conch of Venus represents a woman’s vulva. (P 7)²

In Vaimude tund there are mainly two directing strategies at work, reflected as hints in the written text, but reaching their full effect only on stage, where non-verbal theatrical codes are added to verbal text. These can be called fictionalisation and aesthetisation strategies. First strategy means that the structural characteristics of dramatic form are added to verbal text (the phenomenological description of things and spaces) – constructing fiction into philosophy. Nevertheless, there won’t be a completely continuous and coherent fictional world. The space where the performance takes place, a baroque hall in Castle Kadriorg, depicts itself, not some fictional place: there is no scenery, the barriers remind us the fact that the furniture belongs to museum. Time is fictionalised by dialogue, but since the speakers refer to different time periods, the time of events can not be firmly defined. History is brought in by Lady who, at the beginning of the play, returns to Lord waiting in the castle. Lady mentions meeting celebrities from different eras: on the one hand Hesse and Rilke, and on the other, 18–19th century philosopher Robinet, etc (compare with quote above). The “all-timeness” (or, time of performance) comes from the fact that Bachelard’s essay which quotes works from different eras, has been transposed as personal experiences of Lady and Lord, experiences that they share with each other. The experience comprises the memories (childhood, meetings, books that they have read, paintings they’ve seen, etc) as well as palpably immediate experiences that take place during the performance: the cabinets and desks give rise to contemplation concerning space, a tour to cellar (the audience hears that part of the dialogue on tape), there are descriptions of scenes that are supposedly seen from the window, etc. Along with the personalisation of space experience, the speakers attain the features of individualised characters (they are not merely “voices”), the relationships between them become more concrete and the beginnings of narrative appear. However, in the dialogue, there are very few direct hints to the story of Lord and Lady; one example is on page 19:

LORD: /—/ For example, that little dark corner between the fireplace and the oak chest where I used to hide when you left me.
LADY: You used to cower in here…?
LORD: Yes.
LADY (to contrabass player): He used to cower in here? (Contrabass player nods. Lady turns to Lord.) All that time… all these years?

This example also shows the position of the contrabass girl in this fragmented narrative. She is alternately the confident of both parties and sometimes implies the possibility of a love triangle to the man–woman duet – for example when the Lord starts to flirt with the girl while the Lady is away and when the Lady returns, he starts talking about flowers in a vase, in order to avoid an uncomfortable moment. However, for the most part the narrativisation and psychologisation takes place through non-verbal acting codes (intonation, gestures, postures, mimics), which are used rather independently from text semantics. Written text is a monological dialogue, which is characterised by the consensus between partners, that is, there are no semantic shifts in direction (see Pfister 1977: 183), for example page 11:

LADY: The house maintains the man through the storms of the heavens and through those of life.
LORD: It is body and soul.
LADY: It is the human being’s first world. As it has been said many a time – our house is our primary universe.
LORD: I pass through an empty house and I name it a stage, for you are watching me.

² All references are to the manuscripts of the plays.
However, under a rather monological dialogue, the actors play all possible variations of the relationship between a man and a woman: they flirt and get hurt, they approach each other and avoid each other. They argue, impose themselves, are about to fight and make up, etc. Dialogue is getting filled with psychological meanings that are given by neither the verbal text nor its subtexts; it is being created by acting techniques.

The psychological implications that are inserted in dialogue are oftentimes re-coded to the sign language of elitist arts; thus the aesthetisation strategy starts working. It is motivated by the theatrical disposition of Lord and Lady: they are “performing” to each other, they are playing a refined love game. (Yet the actors are aware of the audience, the addressee.) Bachelard’s text is performed in accordance with various genre and style conventions: as an operatic recitative, a folk song, there are tragic-dramatic and melodramatic intonations, etc., in addition to that Lady demonstrates classical ballet steps. This does not have a clear connection to text semantics either – for example, Lord imitates operatic aria to loud a simple lamp. On this level, the task of the contrabass girl is to supplement beautiful classical music to general pleasure derived from art, at the same time it also enriches the acoustic score. The sounds, voice rhythms, changes in tone, the songs create music of voices that has an independent aesthetic-emotional effect.

Written text, (dialogued philosophical essay) includes barely any prescriptions regarding its theatrical realisation. Director, who in this case is also the author of the text, realises his creative intentions mainly through theatrical strategies and in full co-operation with actors, using the text as a means. On the one hand, the verbal text is being manipulated in order to create traditional dramatic structures (relationships between characters, conflicts, plot), on the other hand, the purely musical, aesthetic qualities of the dialogue are being emphasised. One can note the interplay of textuality and performativity and eventually, the first still reigns over the second. Vaimude tund works on the tension brought on by the opposition between the non-dramatic text and the conventions of dramatic theatre by bringing these conventions into light and allowing the spectator to be aware of them and to reflect upon them.

The theatrical context of Siil ehk Mis on maailma nimi (2003) is different. Unt staged it as a visitor in small Von Krahli Theatre, which was established in 1992 as a first private theatre in newly independent Estonia, and made itself a name as an avant-garde and alternative theatre. Unt wrote Siil specifically to Von Krahli Theatre. Theatrical prerequisites were a black box type stage and a troupe consisting of five actors which is eager to experiment and has a considerable international stage experience. The starting idea originates from the work Exercises in Style (orig. Exercises de style, 1947) of French writer Raymond Queneau, the later member of OULIPO3. Queneau tells one ordinary episode in 99 different style registers; 39 of those have been translated into Estonian (1995, magazine Vikkerkaar). As the base text, Unt chose Peet Vallak’s short story “Country Woman”, which is well known by Estonian audiences since it is a part of mandatory school literature. Its content is short: an elderly woman buys ink from a village shop, asks the shopkeeper if the ink is any good, considers for a long time what to right to test the ink, until she has the idea to write: a big threshing barn oven. The play does not perform the whole text, but it has been printed on the playbill. Style variations are mainly taken from Queneau’s “catalogue” (for example: Prognoses; Hesitations; Logical Analysis, etc), some have been invented (Impersonal; Well, that is, etc), quotes from other texts have been added as well – in all, 43 scenes. Three male and two female actors who play them, are identified as actors and they communicate by using their real names – Liina (Vahtrik), Tiina (Tauraitse), Erki (Laur), Juhan (Ulfisak), Taavi (Eelmä). “... the next directors can give them their own New Names,” writes Unt in introduction of the play. Actors do not become fictional characters. During the course of the performance, they put forward a number of different characters, but their main character is the Actor, marked by their real names – they play the roles of themselves. All of them were the same neutral black overalls, as if the work clothes of the actor, and speak pre-written text as themselves as actors; sometimes there is room for improvisation as well. For example they discuss:

3 OULIPO (Ouvroir de littérature potentielle – Workshop of potential literature) was established in 1960.
LIINA: ... but this number range was not theatrical.
TAAVI: In some ways, everything is theatrical.
TIINA: Let's not be banal.
LIINA: The only way to avoid banality is to choose one specific role, the only one that you will give yourself over to, truly and psychologically. ---/ Otherwise we'll never find out the Name of the world and God. (P 14)

The quoted paragraph manifests two levels that do not exist in Queneau's model: firstly, the actors comment on different styles; secondly, according to performers the reason for these exercises in style is to "find out the name of the world", that is to reach the transcendent signified. I will analyse them more thoroughly, starting with the last one.

The second part of play's title is epistemologically fundamental question ... What is the Name of the World. Actors get to this question in a scene called "Discussion", which imitates text analysis in the reading rehearsal of a new play. When analysing the text, the actors interpret elderly woman's hesitation (what to write?) metaphorically -- the woman searches for the "Word as such", wants to "give the Name for Everything" (note the caps that suggest pathos). Thus, the phrase "big threshing barn oven" should express the very essence of the world. At the same time this phrase is shady enough to give reason for style games in order to find its significance or metaphysical truth. On the other hand, this phrase motivates the use of literary quotes with oven motifs. Among them are for example the Bible, Book of Daniel ("Three men in the furnace"), the fairytale of Hans and Grete, a fragment from Peter Weiss's The Investigation ("The song of burning furnaces") and the play is concluded by Juhan Viiding's poem about a child in midsummer, which last verse "behind his back a fireplace with its gaping mouth" is repeated by all the actors. Although fire as the ambivalent archetype appears in, the actors do not validate it as the "name of the world", but restrain themselves to playful hints. So the transcendent signifier as the objective will not be achieved and instead, the emphasis falls on the process of searching the meaning. At the beginning of the play, the relation between the style and the content (message) is discussed a bit ironically as follows:

TAAVI: What does it depend on, that Name of the world and god?
TIINA: Style!
JUHAN: What style?
ERKI: Our style!
---/---/---
LIINA: Style first, world second.
TAAVI: The world as well as the style carries a meaning. (P 6)

In the end the topic of style is broached again. As typical to Unt, a bundle of contradictory quotes about style is presented (Pascal, Flaubert, Swift et al), which eventually leaves the relation between style and content open. Style is a play that does not answer the questions it raises.

While Queneau's book starts with a neutral text, titled "Notes", the opening act of Unt's play is called "A Realistic Little Chamber Play", where the dialogue between the shopkeeper and the woman from the short story is presented verbatim. Actors speak with a regular intonation and present it as an unfamiliar text that has yet to be felt. Neutral speech and static postures are used in the final scene as well (Viiding's poem), but at the meantime, the actors experiment with different styles (at times alone, at times with the group) and comment critically on their theatrical efficency, their suitability to the nature of themselves or their companions, etc. In Unt's play, the linguistic alterations are tangled with the modifications of paraverbal signs and body language, and thus the production demonstrates different acting techniques and styles as well. The verbal text is also submitted to that objective, same as any other elements of theatrical language. For example, in a scene titled "Modernly", an actor gives a vast sentence in a monotone voice while standing on one's head; in "Dream", the trance state is being imitated; in "Forecasts", the actors perform Grotowskian exercises on the floor. The scenes are played realistically and ritualistically, intellectually and ecstatically, rapping and imitating musicals, etc. Lighting and music are creating appropriate atmospheres, which are bound to change quickly. The whole performance is carried by actors' disposition that could be called a performative gesture: self-aware exhibition, with
the emphasis on one’s skills and professional abilities. One critic called Style a perfect show-off for the actors of Von Kral Theatre, where they can present themselves as actors (not characters) with as many varying devices as possible (Luuk 2004: 36). Accentuating the performance results in intentional (over)emphasising of style characteristics that give a whole venture a parodic tinge. Clearly parodial for example, is the scene titled “Philosophically”, starting as follows:

Nevertheless, we must ask with Martin Heidegger: why is this ink overall existent than rather not anything (Nichts)?

\(--/ The shop (der Laden) in itself does not reflect nor depict anything. Shop shops... etc. (P 24)

One must specify that foremost, this scene parodies the particular linguistic style of Estonian translations of Heidegger’s work. The fact that this text is recited by male actors, naked from waist-up, and heavy metal on the background, gives a threatening tinge to this philosophical text and prepares for the next scene: a fragment from Peter Weiss’s The Investigation.

The location of the audience (people surround the stage from three sides) and a relatively small room stimulate the communication between the actors and the spectators. In the scene “Hesitations” the personal communication technique is used. While giving a monologue, actor addresses the audience, looks a spectator from a first row long time in the eye and pauses, as if expecting an answer to a previous question (for example: “It seems that there was something big they were talking about... An elephant?”). At this moment, both parties stand on the border of real and playing space, physically and also psychologically. “If Juhan Ulfšak views the viewer and the viewer won’t turn away either, but views the actor viewing instead, then who really views the viewer and who is the viewer when he/she views the actor?” asked the critics and reached the conclusion that both play the parts of themselves — of the actor and of the viewer —, whereas the viewer, who watches back, that is, plays the part designated to the viewer, upholds the part of the actor (Pödersoo; Pilv 2004: 135). The relation of showing — viewing is important in the play itself as well: the actors act as viewers to each other, watching and evaluating the performance of the companions. All the activities are deliberately performed for strangers’ eyes and thus they work as aware and acknowledged theatrical actions.

Stage activities are not shown as a representation of a fictional story, but a play, where the short story itself is used as a plaything that achieves new meanings, different from the original ones, all depending on frameworks that the actors lay out during the performance. Declared objective – to find the ultimate truth about the world through the means of art – contradicts the postmodern irony and the free playing with the signifiers. Theatre is not considered to be the device for depicting the world truthfully, but as a signifying machine that endlessly produces differences through repetitions and variations, and never reaches its objective. A realistic short story combined with the structure borrowed from Queneau results in a playful, post-dramatic production.

In both plays and productions that were analysed, the base text is rather freely manipulated, but their artistic dominant differs. Vaimude tund creates psychological and narrative coherence in a non-narrative text by using performative means, while Stil in, on the contrary, uses fragmentation and variations. In Stil the performative function predominates, as the main focus is on the process of producing signifiers – something that can not be said for Vaimude tund. The characteristic that is the same for both plays is self-reflective theatricality which in Stil involves the spectator as well, since the spectators are forced to acknowledge their role and position in this play. Vaimude tund shows the style devices of dramatic theatre; however, it is possible for the viewers to ignore that level and just to enjoy the beauty of the performance.

As for text – stage relation, one can claim that in both cases, written text does not determine the play. But does the virtual structure of the prospective production function as “generative matrix” for the written text? Indeed, the (virtual) production or the director’s vision, influenced by particular space, particular actors, and theatrical ideas, preceded the written text. On the other hand, the co-operation with actors and because director’s plans and visions became clearer, changed the text during the rehearsals. Consequently the answer to the question above ought to be “no”. Text and play can
not be considered as a binary opposition, also, neither of them is “the repository of authorial truth”, for the intentions of text’s author and the director are indistinguishably intertwined.
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The Role of Nature in Shakespeare’s Macbeth and King Lear and Slowacki’s Balladyna

ANDRZEJ CIROCKI

A very important element of Shakespeare’s and Romantic poets’ vision of the world was nature. They ceased to perceive it as a well-arranged and controlled mechanism and treated it as a mysterious, soulful and live formation. They did endeavour to discover the soul of nature.

According to Henry Spencer, Shakespeare and later Romantic poets particularly admired a characteristic feature of nature, namely its constant ability to revive (Spencer 1987: 66–67). Moreover, this ability enhanced the wonderful and spiritual character of wildlife and at the same time it justified the Romantic faith in characters’ revival. They rejected all the geocentric theories about nature and at the same time they formed their own idea of cosmos which constituted one great living organism. Man, however, was one element of the cosmos. Such a concept of nature stamped out all the divisions into a living and still nature. Man, being an element of nature, was also a specific picture of the universe. The universe was thought to have been a network or a system of spiritual relations which made all the other phenomena arrange themselves in a consistent whole.

As A. Maciejewski notes, Shakespeare and his descendants showed a conviction that man invariably used to remain under the influence of supernatural creatures which were responsible for arranging the invisible network of cause and effect. Only when one was able to show the system of invisible relations between “the world of things” and “the world of spirit” (Maciejewski 1967: 222–223), would one comprehend the true principle of the cosmic order.