

The paper deals with different forms of the performance text, still a new phenomenon in contemporary theatre, which requires new instruments for its analysis. The structural transformation of the written text into the performance, including the role of the spectator in it, confirms the fact that the performance text does not simply mean a new kind of the written text – and even less a new type of theatre text, but rather an essentially changed hypertext. Instead, the performance text could also be called an open text of the performance, in the sense that it requires spectators to become its active co-writers. Can we, therefore, define the performance text as a *scenic écriture*, collective writing, hypertext, stretch text, or even *écriture corporelle*? Furthermore, how can it be translated from stage to page to be preserved for future studies?

The performance text is impossible without its author(s). Therefore, the paper deals with the performances of The Wooster Group, Motus, René Pollesch, Joris Lacoste, Milo Rau and Oliver Frljić, who are all constantly producing performance texts with their actors, without separating the process of writing from directing.

Keywords: contemporary theatre, performance art, theatre play, theatre directing, performance text, hypertext, dramaturgy, crystal image, storytelling, archive, repertory, performer, actor, narrator, theatre spectator

Aleksandra Jovičević is a full professor of performance studies at the Department of History Anthropology Religion Arts Performance (SARAS) at La Sapienza University of Rome and the director of the Master in Video Editing, Digital Storytelling for Live Performance at the same university. Her book, *Orson Welles and Theatre: Shakespeare and Beyond* (2022), has just been published by Bulzoni Editore in Rome, for whom she is also a curator of the book series *Politics and Aesthetics of Performance*. Aleksandra Jovičević is a visiting professor at the Belgrade University of Arts, president of the Dragan Klaić Fellowship Foundation, and a member of the scientific committee of the research project *INCOMMON. In praise of community. Shared creativity in arts and politics in Italy (1959–1979)*, funded by the European Research Council (ERC Starting Grant 2015) and hosted by IUAV, University of Venice.

aleksandra.jovicevic@uniroma1.it

From Stage to Page: New Forms of the Performance Text

Aleksandra Jovičević
La Sapienza University, Rome

1.

For centuries, the theatre was accused of being exceptionally logocentric. The theatre play or drama was seen as a primary producer and transmitter of meaning and represented the main source of understanding a theatre production. It also represented a basic document for the history of the theatre. Yet, theatre and drama are two different phenomena, and their relationship to each other remains unresolved. According to Bernhard Dort, the unification of text and stage never really took place, always remaining a relationship of oppression and compromise (173). Especially the contemporary theatre confirms that a harmonious relationship between them is impossible but instead that there is a perpetual conflict between text and scene. Being a latent structural conflict of any theatrical practice, this inevitability can now become “a consciously intended principle of staging” (Lehmann 145). There is a significant distinction between two forms of texts: one that precedes the production (i.e., a play, dramatic text or any kind of written text) and the other that follows the production (text of the performance or the performance text). Therefore, instead of “asking what a dramatic text is, and what are the types of existing dramatic texts (a question as vain as it is desperate), it would be better to observe what we can do with texts, how *mise en scène* and performance art handle them” (Pavis 248).

For a few decades now, a dramatic text has completely emancipated itself from the stage and became a literary genre just for reading. It is no longer seen as an “authority” that controls and governs the process of staging and/or as the central and most important element of the theatre production. It is defined as something out of which the staging process departs as a source of conception and inspiration, but it can also stand on its own as an independent literary form. On the other hand, the performance text is seen as the final result of the theatre production, where the bodies of actors, the space, and the props have appeared in particular materiality, and thus its written form has become redundant or overpassed. During the rehearsals, the actors must internalise any kind of text and then externalise a new kind of text, the performance text. This

always happens in traditional or experimental theatre, regardless of whether the text is performed in full, with cuts and changes, or interspersed with additional material. The actors must seize and incorporate the text, or the texts, and embody them so that something other than the written text is created – first the text of *mise-en-scène* and then the performance text.

We could conclude that this tension or rupture with the theatre play started with Brecht's creation of epic theatre. In his analysis of Brecht's epic theatre, Walter Benjamin noted that dialectical images are by no means solely linguistic images because the text is no longer a basis of that performance but "a grid on which, in the form of new formulations, the gains of that performances are marked" (2). Thus, the function of the text in epic theatre is not to illustrate or advance the action but, on the contrary, to interrupt it and proceed "by fits and starts, in a manner comparable to the images on a film strip" (Ibid. 21). Epic theatre introduced a new way of writing that came closest to what we now define as a montage or collage of different texts or an anti-linear, fragmentary dramaturgy. Most importantly, it introduced how the performer's body creates meaning and, finally, the codes of meaning produced by the performance text. Brecht was probably the first who introduced the ontological status of live performance in his work by extensive use of Model books. These books came closest to what we today define as the performance text. However, any attempt to reproduce exactly how they were annotated always differed from the original production, becoming new performances and thus had nothing to do with Brecht's originals.

Hence, the time and space of the performance (*here and now*), its social and cultural context, and the relationship between performers and spectators are all interwoven in a texture and cannot be separated, constituting the text of the performance. A written and/or verbal text is then transformed into the performance text, which includes performers, their movements, their "body language", their reductions or deformations of the linguistic material (pauses, silence, shouts, murmurs), their relationship to the space and time of the performance, as well as to the spectators, including all the material elements used: costumes, props, lighting, screens, microphones, etc. The presence of human and sometimes animal, hybrid and cyborg bodies, gestures and voices also transform the written language into a "language" of tones, words, sentences and sounds that form a scenic composition through different forms of dramaturgy (visual dramaturgy, sound dramaturgy, actors' dramaturgy, and/or spectators' dramaturgy, etc.).

The structural transformation of the written text into the performance, including the role of the spectator in it, confirms the fact that the performance text does not simply mean a new kind of the written text – and even less a new type of theatre text,

but rather an essentially changed hypertext. Roland Barthes defines the theatre as “a kind of cybernetic machine” which, as soon as the curtain rises, emanates a variety of simultaneous messages, some of which persist over time (scenography), while others change continuously (words and gestures). This informational polyphony, this thickness of the signs, is a fundamental characteristic of theatre, which constitutes one of the most difficult challenges for the semiotic analysis. Thus, a whole performance could be seen as a text, where every structured combination of signs, regardless of what sort of signs they are, are seen as a text. From a semiotic perspective, however, the written text and the text of the performance are two different sign systems. Each has specific characteristics and limitations that influence its means of expression. Therefore, several questions arise about the function and role of the performance text because any kind of text is incomplete when it comes to the performance.

The performance text could also be defined as a *piecing together* of different elements, material and conceptual alike, that *exist only during a performance*, in the very *act of performing*, during an *event*, performance, or in *representation* that produces different performance texts, which Alain Badiou calls *theatre-ideas* (72). This also means that theatre-ideas could not be produced by any other instruments or at any other place; none of the elements by itself could produce theatre-ideas or even the text of the performance itself. The theatre-ideas *come forth* only in the (brief) time of its performance, of its representation. Therefore, all performance texts could be defined as “open” texts since they require the spectators to become active co-writers. Can we, therefore, define the performance text as a *scenic écriture*, collective writing, stretch text, or even *écriture corporelle*? Furthermore, how can it be traced from stage to page to be documented and archived for future studies?

Is the performance text a final document of the staging process or an entirely new kind of text? No matter how much the practitioners, theorists and critics are trying to describe the creation process from page to stage, something always remains lacunose and cannot be revealed. Perhaps a fairly recent concept used in the theatre studies – “*Genetics*” (a term borrowed from the study of literary manuscripts to describe the genesis of a text from an idea up until the moment of publication), could be applied to describe and apprehend this processes (Pavis 82). According to Pavis, in the case of the theatre, genetics is concerned with the creation of the text of the performance, from the study of everything that precedes the production, from a written text and/or texts, through the text of *mise-en-scène*, to the performance text, precisely all that is finally presented to the public.

Still lacking the right terms to describe this process from stage to page, perhaps we can turn to theories outside of the theatre. For example, the concept of “crystal image”

can come to the rescue when defining the performance text. Not only stage directions, the space, lights, sound, the set and costumes, but also the bodily co-presence of the performers and the public; altogether, they create that which could be defined as a crystal image. Deleuze examines how time discloses itself through the semiotic dimension of cinema. Subsequently, Deleuze identifies three distinctly different senses of cinematographic time: 1) time as the movement of image; 2) the movement of time-image; and 3) the appearance of time itself. In the cinema, the crystal image is a shot that fuses the past of the recorded event with the presentness of its viewing. Instead, in the case of the performance text, we could speak about the fusion of the presentness of viewing and its recollection in the future. Both in the theatre and cinema, the crystal image is an indivisible unity of the virtual image and the actual image. Based on the strength of this method, the main objective is two-fold: to demonstrate that the performance text could be approached not only as a special kind of semiotic phenomenon but to further our understanding of the materiality and completeness of the performance. Precisely, because contemporary theatre increasingly extends its borders with the help of visual and sound effects, and with the combination and juxtaposition between video and digital projections with the live presence and/or *liveness* of the performance, it has to refer to the performance text as a quality that can reflect and testify its crystal image.

2.

There are many texts used in the landscape of the contemporary theatre, such as scenic essays, political speeches, theoretical texts, discursive novels, epic poems, i.e. different texts that offer a public reflection on particular themes instead of traditional theatre plays. Theoretical, philosophical or aesthetic texts are taken out of their familiar context and reintroduced in different productions. Companies and directors use the stage to “think aloud” publicly or to exchange their ideas with the audience. In this kind of work, one can also find the actors who are more absorbed in different social and political debates than in their presentation, as in the works of The Wooster Group, Motus, Rimini Protokoll, Forced Entertainment, as well as in the productions of René Pollesch, Falk Richter, Joël Pommerat, Milo Rau, Joris Lacoste and Oliver Frljić, to name a few artists, who are all constantly making performance texts with their actors or companies and who do not separate the process of writing from directing. “I do not write plays, I write performances [...] the text is what comes afterwards, and what remains after the theatre” (Pommerat cited in Pavis 250).

In his famous document *The Ghent Manifesto*, Milo Rau states,

One: It's not just about portraying the world anymore. It's about changing it. The aim is not to depict the real, but to make the representation itself real.

Two: Theatre is not a product, it is a production process. Research, castings, rehearsals and related debates must be publicly accessible.

Three: The authorship is entirely up to those involved in the rehearsals and the performance, whatever their function may be – and to no one else.

Thus, the contemporary theatre “becomes more presence than representation, more shared than communicated experience, more process than product, more manifestation than signification, more energetic impulse than information” (Lehmann 85). This is certainly true for the works of René Pollesch, where, for example, one can witness a public debate among the actors about a given subject rather than a real theatre production. In all Pollesch's plays, there is neither a story, nor characters, nor a possibility of identification. Pollesch's characters become objects of total capitalisation, multiple interfaces and a presentation of the neoliberal society. In productions, actors are more like performance artists because their provocative presence and the liveness of their performing come to the forefront, more so than representing a character would do. The actors confront the audience, talking about their own existence, seeking to transform their ideas/texts into life so that the audience may be entirely “drawn” into those texts, which are usually theoretical and non-representational.¹ Therefore, the actors take a specific risk, like in performance art, because they never know how the audience will react to their performance and how they will end – Pollesch's performances deliberately seem unfinished, even like failures.² A typical Pollesch show is characterised by a fluent, chatty dialogue that combines the technological and neoliberal jargon with the philosophical language and high-energy performances from a group of charismatic actors whose creative input during the rehearsal process effectively makes them co-authors, like in *Life on Earth Can be Sweet, Donna* (2019).³

This principle of *polyglossia* proves to be universal for most of the contemporary theatre. It is asserted on several levels, “playfully showing gaps, abruptions and unsolved conflicts, even clumsiness and loss of control” (Lehmann 147). Most of the time, the audience is made aware of the physical, motoric act of speaking or reading the text itself as an unnatural, not self-evident process, like in some

1 Pollesch has written more than hundred plays in a thirty-year career – an average of two per season – and had directed nearly all of them.

2 In his play, *Pablo in der Plusfiliale* (*Pablo at a Plus Supermarket*, 2004), Pollesch used a selection of writings by a number of economics experts on the grey economy in Third World Countries.

3 The starting point was Donna Haraway's *A Cyborg Manifesto* (1985).

works of The Wooster Group. They carried out a similar experiment in their famous production of *Hamlet* (2007–2013), based on the film *Hamlet*, directed for television by John Gielgud in 1964, with Richard Burton in the title role. The Wooster Group, in its distinctive style of “dance with technology”, used the film as a kind of reference text and, projecting it alongside the stage action of the actors, created the live interaction in a sort of “very sophisticated form of karaoke”. Thus, the show constitutes an emblematic example of the increasingly widespread practice of interaction between audiovisual technologies and knowledge incorporated in the theatre, a hyper-media show based on the highly refined use of the most up-to-date audiovisual technologies.

This sort of “karaoke” was already used in the theatre by the Italian author-actor Carmelo Bene, whose favourite technique was a kind of playback that often replaced dialogue in his shows. Bene was also famous for his detractions of different texts, a process defined by Deleuze as *amputation* (85). In the process of subtraction, Bene took away from classical plays the action, dialogue, characters and even the diction, so Deleuze rightly wondered, what was left? Everything, but in a new light, with new words, new pronunciations, new sounds, new gestures, new stage and audience relationships. There was no longer any dialogue but simultaneous and successive voices superimposed and transposed, enclosed in this temporal space of variation. The Italian critics have “accused” Bene of carrying out a work of “aphasia” on the language (whispers, stammering or deformed diction, barely perceived or deafening sounds), and an impediment work on things and gestures, practices that hinder movements instead to facilitate them, gestures that are too rigid or excessively weak, accessories that move with difficulty.

Similarly, French author-director, Joris Lacoste, started an ongoing project, *Encyclopédie de la Parole*, in 2002. With a group of poets, musicians, scientists, visual artists, theatre and radio directors, dramaturgs, choreographers and curators, Lacoste has ever since been collecting audio fragments of what is said or uttered in public and private. Lacoste’s work is deeply about language, not about what is said and what it means, but about how it sounds. “All the work I’ve done is based on speech, but we never use texts. We use the recordings themselves, as a kind of score. Including the pauses, silences and rhythms in what is being said” (Lacoste in Ramaer). During the performance, the language does not organically reside in the performer’s body but remains outside as a foreign body. Out of the gaps in speech emerge stuttering, failures, accents and flawed pronunciation that mark the conflict between body and word. The linguistic material and that of the staging interact with the theatrical situation, understood comprehensively by the concept of the performance text.

Even if the term “text” here is somewhat imprecise, it does express that each time occurs a connection and interweaving of (at least potentially) signifying elements. In fact, according to Pavis, the texture is a theatrical expression because it links the scenes, dialogues and all the materials brought into the space/time of a production/performance (251). As in texture, when only by touching it can we understand its materiality. We only believe in the performance text after we have been witnessing its spatial-temporal disposition, rhythmic quality, as well as its visual and sound aspect. The experience of seeing, listening, witnessing, perceiving and interpreting leads us to an aesthetic experience and the creation of meaning. Textuality, according to Pavis, is how verbal, visual, sonic, musical and rhythmic matter is used by authors and actors and then picked up by spectators and critics.

Sometimes, the actor is completely in charge, turning herself into a *narrator* (Pavis 147). In the production *MDSX*, by the Italian theatre group Motus, based on Jeffrey Eugenides’ novel *Middlesex*, the actor Silvia Calderoni inserts her autobiographical work, so the spectator is never sure what is her own text and what is the text of the novel. To this, Motus also added quotations from Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble* and *Undoing Gender*, Donna Haraway’s *A Cyborg Manifesto*, Paul B. Preciado’s *Manifeste Contra-sexuel* and other bits of the kaleidoscopic universe of Queer. However, Calderoni is alone on the scene, embodying and undoing her gender, using her own body to tell a story of violence, pain, confusion and acceptance. Thus, she challenges the tradition that tends to separate theatre from storytelling, the actor from a storyteller. She moves without warning from the role of the narrator-commentator to that of the character, without any dramaturgical justification, except for that of telling the story.

Then, one could ask, who is the real author of the text of the performance? For example, when not deconstructing a classical text, Oliver Frljić is presenting his own performance texts that are sometimes based on facts and sometimes on invented narratives. In several interviews, he stated that he is very sceptical towards theatre – for him, theatre is fake as a medium, and he feels embarrassed most of the time watching people on stage. It is interesting to note that Frljić, like Pollesch, is never concerned with what can be defined as a successful performance. On the contrary, most of his productions seem unfinished, a kind of mis-performance, a sort of bad amateur theatre, strongly influenced by performance art. The connoisseurs of performance art can recognise many citations from the works of Joseph Beuys, Carolee Schneemann, Marina Abramović, Vito Acconci, Paul McCarthy, etc. The audience has a similar reaction to his productions as it had to these performances: they are disgusted, they protest or leave the theatre, but they are never indifferent. Frljić himself claims:

When I started to think about the arts, of what and of how could do things, performance art was my first choice because of at least two things. First, it was available, you didn’t need anything: it was like conceptual art, you need your idea,

you have yourself as performer, you can perform whenever you want, etc. I prefer the original politics of performance art: no repetition, no rehearsing and no recording. So the only trace of each performance is an experience shared between you as a performer and the audience (Frlijić et al.).

Nevertheless, what are these traces, and how they can be tracked and conserved? The central goal of such a reflection should be to analyse with precision the creation and meaning of the performance text as a new and unavoidable theatre tool that enlarges the definition of contemporary theatre. In her seminal book, *The Archive and the Repertoire*, Diana Taylor provides a new understanding of the vital role of the performance (in this case, for the history of the Americas). She argues that different performances, from plays to official events to grassroots protests, must be taken seriously to store and transmit knowledge. Taylor reveals how the repertoire of embodied memory – conveyed in gestures, the spoken word, movement, dance, song and other embodied practices – offers alternative perspectives to those derived from the written archive. By examining several performances in South America and the United States, Taylor exemplifies how people participate in producing and reproducing knowledge through performing it. Therefore, if performance could be a form that comes closest to the conditions under which we could understand our own experience, becoming a repertoire that “enacts embodied memory”, then the performance text could serve as its archive. Precisely, the embodied knowledge of the repertoire becomes the performance text in which different political, social and cultural positions are safeguarded in a kind of archive.

Many of the abovementioned live collaborative practices are made to motivate the audience to join in and activate the social context in which these practices unfold. According to Boris Groys, the tendency towards collaborative, participatory practice is undoubtedly one of the main characteristics of contemporary art and, we could add, contemporary performance. “Emerging throughout the world are numerous artists’ groups that pointedly stipulate collective, even anonymous, authorship of their artistic production” (Groys 200). However, only a few postmodern performance artists have tried to regain common ground with their audience by enticing them out of their passive roles using political or social engagement. This decision by the artists to give up their exclusive authorship would seem primarily to empower the viewer. “This sacrifice ultimately benefits the artist, however, for it frees him from the power that the cold eye of the uninvolved viewer exerts over the resulting artwork” (Ibid.).

This leads us back to Brecht, according to whom the most successful theatre will be the one that enters into a risky association between artists and spectators. It aims to realise the intellectual as well as emotional abilities of the spectators, looking for that which may be created in a new context of the performance. This position cannot

and may never be neutral. On many occasions, Brecht stressed that “the audience is a collection of individuals, capable of thinking and reasoning, of making judgments even in the theatre; it treats them as individuals of mental and emotional maturity, and believes it wishes to be so regarded” (78). Viewed in this way, the text of the performance comes closest to what can be defined as the “efficacy” of the performance, which means that the “real” essence of the performance is communicated by its public impact and not by the text itself.

Brecht’s demand that authors should not “supply” the theatre with their texts but instead change it has been realised far beyond his imagination. The strong urge of contemporary artists like Pollesch, Rau or Frlić to make their art useful could be seen historically as a new position and requires a new theoretical reflection. Their thesis is more or less similar: the theatre rejects the written text as a foreign body, as a “world outside the stage”. The central goal of such reflection should be to analyse the meaning and political function of the performance text with precision. Only then can this dilemma over the performance text be settled and such productions generally accepted, even if outside the mainstream theatre.

It should not be forgotten that the current consideration of the performance text was prompted by the transformations introduced in the theatre in the 1960s. Environmental theatre, participatory theatre, theatre of images, non-verbal theatre, documentary theatre, performance art, happenings, assemblages, social theatre, etc., all contributed to creating the performance text. Furthermore, scientific disciplines such as semiotics, theatre anthropology, theatre sociology, aesthetics and performance studies all offered valuable instruments for analysing the performance text. However, to invent a more substantial theory of the performance text, we need to create a new theoretical framework based on the common ground between artistic practice and theory. Without treating it as a side effect of the performance but as its vital component, a thorough study of performance text can contribute to a more complex dialogue in contemporary theatre. The development of such a theory could also contribute to how we look at performances and performance texts in the past. The performance text cannot exist without the performance, which is directly related to artistic practice. Therefore it is not enough to simply acknowledge its existence but to recognise its ability to transform contemporary theatre.

- Badiou, Alain. *Handbook of Inaesthetics*. Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. *Essais critiques*. Seuil, 1981.
- Bene, Carmello and Gilles Delleuze. *Sovrapposizioni*. Quodlibet, 2002.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Understanding Brecht*. Verso, 2003.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht on Theatre*. Translated by John Willet, Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Brently B. "Looks It Not Like the King? Well, More Like Burton." *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/theater/reviews/01haml.html>. Accessed 2 Feb. 2022.
- Dort, Bernard. *La Représentation èmancipée*. Actes Sud, 1988.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Semiotics of Theatre*. Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Frlić, Oliver, Agata Adamiecka-Sitek and Marta Keil. "Whose National Theatre Is It?" *Polish Theatre Journal*, vol. 1-2, no. 3-4, 2017, <http://www.polishtheatrejournal.com/index.php/ptj/article/view/80/530>. Accessed 2 Feb. 2022.
- Groys, Boris. *Introduction to Antiphilosophy*. Verso, 2012.
- Lehmann, Hans Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*. Routledge, 2006.
- Pavis, Patrice. *The Routledge Dictionary of Performance and Contemporary Theatre*. Routledge, 2018.
- Ramaer, Joost. "We never use texts. We use the sounds of people talking as a kind of score." *Culturebot*, 18 Nov. 2015, <https://www.culturebot.org/2015/11/24966/we-never-use-texts-we-use-the-sounds-of-people-talking-as-a-kind-of-score>. Accessed 2 Feb. 2022.
- Rau, Milo. "The Ghent Manifesto." *NT Gent*, <https://www.ntgent.be/en/about/manifest>. Accessed 2 Feb. 2022.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and Repertory: Performing Cultural Memory in Americas*. Duke University Press, 2003.

Prispevek obravnava različne oblike uprizoritvenega besedila, kar je še vedno dokaj nov pojav v sodobnem gledališču, ki terja nova orodja za analizo. Strukturna transformacija zapisanega besedila v uprizoritev, vključno z gledalčevo vlogo pri tem, potrjuje dejstvo, da uprizoritveno besedilo ne pomeni preprosto nove vrste zapisanega besedila, še toliko manj pa novo vrsto gledališkega besedila, temveč prej neke vrste bistveno spremenjen hipertekst. Uprizoritveno besedilo bi lahko poimenovali tudi odprto besedilo uprizoritve v smislu, da zahteva od gledalcev, da tudi sami postanejo aktivni so-pisci. Bi lahko potemtakem uprizoritveno besedilo definirali kot *scenic écriture*, kolektivno pisanje, hipertekst ali celo *écriture corporelle*? In kako bi ga bilo mogoče prevesti z odra na papir, da bi ga tako ohranili za prihodnje študije? Uprizoritveno besedilo ne more obstajati brez svojega avtorja (ali avtorjev), zato prispevek obravnava uprizoritve skupin The Wooster Group in Motus in pa Renéja Pollescha, Jorisa Lacoste, Mila Rauda ter Oliverja Frljića, ki vsi nenehno proizvajajo uprizoritvena besedila skupaj z igralci, pri tem pa ne ločujejo procesa pisanja od režije.

Ključne besede: sodobno gledališče, performans, gledališka igra, gledališka režija, uprizoritveno besedilo, hipertekst, dramaturgija, kristalna podoba, pripovedovanje zgodb, arhiv, repertoar, performer, igralec, pripovedovalec, gledališki gledalec.

Aleksandra Jovičević je redna profesorica performativnih študij na Oddelku za zgodovino, antropologijo, religijo in uprizoritvene umetnosti (SARAS) na univerzi La Sapienza v Rimu ter predstajnica magistrskega programa za videomontažo, digitalno pripovedovanje zgodb za živo uprizorjanje pri isti univerzi. Pred kratkim je pri založbi Bulzoni v Rimu objavila knjigo *Orson Welles and Theatre: Shakespeare and Beyond* (2022), zanjo pa dela tudi kot urednica knjižne zbirke Politika in estetika uprizoritve. Aleksandra Jovičević je tudi gostujoča profesorica na Beograjski umetniški univerzi, predsednica Štipendijskega sklada Dragana Klaića ter članica znanstvenega odbora pri raziskovalnem projektu INCOMMON *In praise of community. Shared creativity in arts and politics in Italy (1959-1979)*, ki ga financira Evropski raziskovalni svet (začetna štipendija 2015), gosti pa ga IUAV, Univerza v Benetkah.

aleksandra.jovicevic@uniroma1.it

Z odra na papir: nove oblike uprizoritvenega besedila

Aleksandra Jovičević
Univerza La Sapienza, Rim

1.

Gledališče so dolga stoletja obtoževali izjemnega logocentrizma. Gledališka igra ali drama je veljala za primarno točko produkcije in prenašalca pomena, kot taka je predstavljala glavni vir razumevanja gledališke izvedbe. Predstavljala je tudi temeljni dokument zgodovine gledališča. Vendar pa ni treba posebej poudarjati, da sta gledališče in drama dva povsem različna pojava, njuno medsebojno razmerje pa še danes ostaja nerazrešeno. Kot pravi Bernhard Dort, nikoli ni zares prišlo do poenotenja besedila in odra, njuno razmerje je vedno ostajalo na ravni zatiranja in kompromisa (173). Še posebej sodobno gledališče potrjuje, da je harmonično razmerje med obema nemogoče, prej bi lahko rekli, da je prisoten nenehen konflikt med besedilom in odrom. Kot latentni strukturni konflikt vsake gledališke prakse lahko ta neizbežna danost dandanes postane »zavestno hoteno načelo insceniranja« (Lehmann 145). Med obema oblikama besedil obstaja pomembna razlika: prva predhaja izvedbo (se pravi igra, dramsko besedilo ali pač kakršno koli zapisano besedilo), druga pa sledi sami izvedbi (besedilo uprizoritve ali uprizoritveno besedilo). Namesto da se »sprašujemo, kaj je dramsko besedilo in kakšne vrste dramskih besedil obstajajo (vprašanje, ki je prav toliko jalovo kot obupano), bi bilo bolje opazovati, kaj lahko z besedili naredimo, kako jih uporabljata režija in performans« (Pavis 248).

V zadnjih desetletjih se je dramsko besedilo povsem emancipiralo od odra in postalo literarni žanr, namenjen zgolj branju. Nič več ne velja za »avtoriteto«, ki nadzira in obvladuje proces inscenacije in/ali kot osrednji ter najpomembnejši element gledališke izvedbe. Definirajo ga kot nekakšno predlogo, s katero se proces inscenacije začne, kot vir koncepta in navdiha, lahko pa velja tudi za samostojno in neodvisno literarno obliko. Po drugi strani pa uprizoritveno besedilo velja za končni rezultat gledališke produkcije, kjer telesa igralcev, prostor in rekviziti nastopajo v svoji partikularni materialnosti, zato sama zapisana oblika postane odvečna ali sploh prezrta. Kakršnokoli besedilo že imajo, ga morajo igralci med vajami ponotranjiti, potem pa pozunanjiti v novo vrsto besedila, uprizoritveno besedilo. Do tega pride

vedno, tako v tradicionalnem kot v eksperimentalnem gledališču, ne glede na to, ali je besedilo uprizorjeno v celoti ali s črtami in spremembami ali prepleteno z dodatnim gradivom. Igralci morajo besedilo ali besedila vzeti in inkorporirati ter jih nato utelesiti tako, da ustvarijo nekaj drugega od zapisanega besedila – v prvi vrsti besedilo režije, potem pa še uprizoritveno besedilo.

Lahko bi sklepali, da se je ta napetost oziroma prelom z gledališko igro začel z Brechtovo stvaritvijo epskega gledališča. V analizi Brechtovega epskega gledališča je Walter Benjamin opazil, da dialektične podobe še zdaleč niso zgolj lingvistične podobe, saj besedilo ni več podlaga tovrstne predstave, temveč »mreža, na kateri se v obliki novih formulacij označijo pridobitve same predstave« (Benjamin 2). Tako funkcija besedila v epskem gledališču ni več, da ilustrira dejanje ali ga poganja, temveč nasprotno, da ga prekinja, pa tudi, da se odvija »v izbruhih in trzljajih, na način, primerljiv s podobami na pasici filma« (Benjamin 21). Epsko gledališče je uvedlo nov način pisanja, ki se je še najbolj približal temu, kar danes definiramo kot montažo ali kolaž različnih besedil oziroma nelinearno, fragmentarno dramaturgijo, in kar je še pomembnejše, predstavljanju načinov, kako telo performerja ustvarja pomen, in navsezadnje tudi samim kodom pomena, ki jih proizvaja uprizoritveno besedilo. Brecht je bil verjetno prvi, ki je v svoje delo uvedel ontološki status nastopanja v živo s pomočjo obsežne uporabe t. i. *Modellbücher*. Te knjige so se še najbolj približale temu, kar danes definiramo kot uprizoritveno besedilo. Vendar pa se je ob vsakem poskusu, da bi jih reproducirali natanko tako, kot so bile zabeležene, vedno izkazalo, da se razlikujejo od izvirne izvedbe, in tako so nastale nove predstave, ki niso imele nobene zveze z Brechtovimi izvirniki.

Tako so čas in prostor predstave (tukaj in zdaj), njen družbeni in kulturni kontekst ter razmerje med nastopajočimi in gledalci prepleteni kot v nekakšnem tkanju ter jih ni mogoče ločiti in skupaj sestavljajo besedilo uprizoritve. Napisano in/ali verbalno besedilo potem preobrazijo v uprizoritveno besedilo, ki vključuje nastopajoče, njihovo gibanje, njihovo »telesno govorico«, njihove redukcije ali popačenja jezikovnega materiala (pavze, tišine, krike, mrmranje), njihov odnos do prostora in časa uprizoritve pa tudi do gledalcev, vključno z vsemi uporabljenimi materialnimi elementi: kostumi, rekviziti, lučmi, zasloni, mikrofoni itd. Prisotnost človeških in včasih živalskih, hibridnih in kiborških teles, gest in glasov prav tako preobraža zapisani jezik v »jezik« tonov, besed, stavkov, zvokov, ki oblikujejo scensko kompozicijo z različnimi oblikami dramaturgije (vizualna dramaturgija, zvočna dramaturgija, dramaturgija igralcev in/ali dramaturgija gledalcev itd.)

Strukturna transformacija zapisanega besedila v uprizoritev, vključno z vlogo, ki jo imajo v njej gledalci, potrjuje dejstvo, da uprizoritveno besedilo ni enostavno neka nova vrsta napisanega besedila, še manj pa neka nova vrsta gledališkega besedila,

temveč prej nek bistveno spremenjen hipertekst. Roland Barthes gledališče definira kot »neke vrste kibernetški stroj«, ki takoj, ko se zavesa dvigne, začne oddajati celo vrsto sočasnih sporočil, pri čemer nekatera vztrajajo v času (scenografija), druga pa se nenehno spreminjajo (besede in geste). Ta informacijska polifonija, gostota znakov, je temeljna značilnost gledališča, kar tvori enega najzapletenejših izzivov za semiotično analizo. Celotno uprizoritev tako lahko pojmujeemo kot besedilo, v katerem je vsaka strukturirana kombinacija znakov razumljena kot besedilo ne glede na to, za kakšne vrste znakov gre. Vendar s semiotičnega gledišča zapisano besedilo in besedilo uprizoritve predstavljata dva različna znakovna sistema, vsak s svojimi lastnimi specifičnimi značilnostmi in omejitvami, ki vplivajo na njuna izrazna sredstva. Tako se porodi množica vprašanj o funkciji in vlogi uprizoritvenega besedila, saj je, ko je govora o uprizoritvi, vsako besedilo, pa naj bo kakršno koli, vedno nepopolno.

Uprizoritveno besedilo bi lahko definirali tudi kot lepljenko različnih elementov (tako materialnih kot konceptualnih, ki *obstajajo izključno med uprizoritvijo*, v samem dejanju uprizarjanja, med *dogodkom*, uprizoritvijo, ali v *reprezentaciji*), ki proizvajajo različna uprizoritvena besedila, kar Alain Badiou imenuje gledališke ideje (72). To pa med drugim pomeni, da gledaliških idej ni mogoče ustvariti z nobenim drugim orodjem in na nobenem drugem kraju, pa tudi, da nobeden od elementov ne bi mogel proizvesti gledaliških idej samostojno, kaj šele besedila same uprizoritve. Natančneje, gledališke ideje se porodijo izključno v (kratkem) času uprizarjanja, predstave. Potemtakem bi lahko vsa uprizoritvena besedila definirali kot »odprta« besedila, v smislu, da od gledalcev terjajo, naj postanejo aktivni so-pisci. Bi lahko potemtakem uprizoritveno besedilo definirali kot *scenic écriture*, kolektivno pisanje ali hipertekst, ali celo kot *écriture corporelle*? In kako bi mu lahko sledili z odra na papir, da bi ga tako dokumentirali in arhivirali za prihodnje študije?

Je uprizoritveno besedilo končni dokument procesa insceniranja ali povsem nova vrsta besedila? Ne glede na to, kako zelo se praktiki, teoretiki in kritiki trudijo opisati proces prenašanja s papirja na oder, vedno ostane nekaj luknjičastega, česar ni mogoče razkriti. Morda bi lahko za opis in razumevanje teh procesov uporabili koncept »genetike« (Pavis 82), ki je v teatrologiji še dokaj svež (gre za termin, izposojen iz študij literarnih rokopisov; tam opisuje genezo besedila od same ideje pa vse do trenutka objave). Kot pravi Pavis, se v kontekstu gledališča genetika ukvarja z ustvarjanjem besedila uprizoritve, od študija vsega, kar predhaja sami izvedbi, od napisanega besedila in/ali besedil prek besedila režije pa vse do uprizoritvenega besedila, se pravi, natanko vsega tistega, kar je nazadnje predstavljeno publiki.

Ker še vedno manjkajo pravi termini za opisovanje tega procesa prenašanja z odra na papir, se nemara lahko obrnemo k teorijam izven gledališča. Tako si lahko pri definiranju uprizoritvenega besedila na primer pomagamo s konceptom »kristalne

podobe«. Ne samo didaskalije, prostor, luči, zvok, scenografija in kostumi, temveč tudi telesna soprisotnost nastopajočih in občinstva, vse to skupaj tvori tisto, kar bi lahko definirali kot kristalno podobo. Deleuze preučuje, kako se čas razkriva prek semiotične dimenzije kinematografije. Nadalje Deleuze identificira tri izrazito različne smisle kinematografskega časa: (1) čas kot gibanje podobe, (2) gibanje časa - podobe in (3) pojavljanje samega časa. V kinu je kristalna podoba posnetek, ki zlije preteklost posnetega dogodka s prezentnostjo ogledovanja le-tega. Ko gre za uprizoritveno besedilo, pa bi namesto tega lahko govorili o zlitju prezentnosti ogledovanja in spominjanja le-tega v prihodnosti. Tako v gledališču kot v kinu kristalna podoba pomeni nedeljivo enotnost virtualne podobe in dejanske podobe. Glavni cilj, ki temelji na odlikah te metode, je dvojni: pokazati, da je mogoče k uprizoritvenemu besedilu pristopiti ne le kot k posebne vrste semiotičnemu fenomenu, temveč da pri tem še poglobimo razumevanje materialnosti in celovitosti uprizoritve. Prav zato, ker sodobno gledališče vedno bolj širi svoje meje s pomočjo vizualnih in zvočnih učinkov ter s kombiniranjem in zoperstavljanjem videa in digitalnih projekcij živi prezenci in/ali živosti same uprizoritve, se mora nanašati na uprizoritveno besedilo kot kvaliteto, ki lahko odraža in priča o njegovi kristalni podobi.

2.

Namesto tradicionalnih gledaliških iger se na terenu sodobnega gledališča uporablja cela vrsta besedil, na primer scenski eseji, politični govori, teoretska besedila, diskurzivni romani, epske pesnitve, se pravi različna besedila, ki nudijo javno refleksijo o specifičnih temah. Teoretska, filozofska ali estetska besedila so iztrgana iz običajnega konteksta in ponovno uvedena v različne izvedbe. Skupine in režiserji uporabljajo oder za »glasno razmišljanje« v javnosti ali da z občinstvom izmenjujejo ideje. V tovrstnih delih naletimo tudi na igralce, ki so bolj zatopljeni v raznorazne družbene in politične debate kot v lastno predstavitev, to velja na primer za dela skupin The Wooster Group, Motus, Rimini Protokoll, Forced Entertainment pa tudi za predstave Renéja Pollescha, Falka Richterja, Joëla Pommerata, Mila Raua, Jorisa Lacoste in Oliverja Frljića, če naštejemo le nekatere izmed umetnikov, ki nenehno ustvarjajo uprizoritvena besedila skupaj z igralci ali skupinami in pri tem procesa pisanja ne ločujejo od režije. »Jaz ne pišem iger, pišem performanse [...] besedilo je tisto, kar pride kasneje in kar ostane po gledališču« (Pommerat, nav. po Pavis 250).

V slavnem *Manifestu iz Ghenta* Milo Rau izjavi: »1) Ne gre več zgolj za portretiranje sveta. Gre za to, da ga spremenimo. Namen ni orisati realnega, temveč narediti reprezentacijo samo realno.« Rau razglasi tudi, da »2) [g]ledališče ni produkt; je proces produkcije. Raziskave, avdicije, vaje in s tem povezane debate morajo biti javno dostopne« ter »3) [a]vtorstvo je v celoti prepuščeno tistim, ki sodelujejo na vajah in

v uprizoritvi, ne glede na to, kakšna je njihova funkcija – in nikomer drugemu«. ¹ Tako sodobno gledališče »postane bolj prezenca kot reprezentacija, bolj deljena kot pa komunicirana izkušnja, bolj proces kot produkt, bolj manifestacija kot označevanje, bolj energetski impulz kot informacija« (Lehmann 85). To vsekakor velja za dela Renéja Pollescha, kjer smo, na primer, namesto prave gledališke predstave lahko priče javni razpravi med igralci o določeni temi. V nobeni od Polleschevih iger ni mogoče najti ne zgodbe, ne likov, ne možnosti identifikacije. Pri Polleschu liki postajajo objekti totalne kapitalizacije, večkratnih vmesnikov in predstavitve neoliberalne družbe. V njegovih predstavah so igralci bolj umetniki performansa, saj v ospredje stopi njihova provokativna prezenca in živost njihovega nastopanja, bolj kot bi to lahko dosegli z reprezentiranjem likov. Igralci se soočajo z občinstvom, govorijo o lastni eksistenci in poskušajo preoblikovati svoje ideje/besedila v življenje, tako da bi občinstvo povsem »vpotegnili« v ta besedila, ki so po navadi teoretska in nereprezentacijska. ² Igralci torej do neke mere tvegajo, tako kot pri performansu, saj nikoli ne vedo, kako se bo občinstvo odzvalo na njihovo uprizorjanje in kako se bo končalo – Pollescheve uprizoritve namenoma delujejo kot nedokončane, celo spodletele. ³ Za Pollescheve predstave je značilen tekoč, klepetav dialog, ki združuje tehnološki in neoliberalni žargon s filozofskim jezikom, visokoenergetske nastope skupine karizmatičnih igralcev, katerih ustvarjalni prispevek med procesom vaj dejansko pomeni, da postanejo soavtorji, kot na primer v predstavi *Življenje na zemlji* je lahko sladko, *Donna* (*Life on Earth Can be Sweet, Donna*) (2019). ⁴

Tak pristop, t. i. *polyglossia*, se je izkazal kot univerzalen za večino sodobnega gledališča in se potrjuje na več ravneh, »igrivo prikazuje vrzeli, prekinitve in nerazrešene konflikte, celo nerodnosti in izgubo nadzora« (Lehmann 147). Občinstvu večinoma jasno kaže fizično, motorično dejanje govorjenja ali branja samega besedila kot nenaraven, nesamoumeven proces, kot na primer v nekaterih delih skupine The Wooster Group. Tak eksperiment so izpeljali v slavni izvedbi *Hamleta* (2007–2013), ki je temeljila na filmu *Hamlet* z Richardom Burtonom v naslovni vlogi, ki ga je leta 1964 za televizijo režiral John Gielgud. The Wooster Group je v prepoznavnem slogu »plesa s tehnologijo« uporabila film kot nekakšno referenčno besedilo in ga projicirala sočasno z odrsko aktivnostjo igralcev, kar je ustvarilo nekakšno živo interakcijo ali neke vrste »zelo sofisticirane oblike karaok«. Predstava je emblematični primer vse bolj razširjene prakse interakcije med avdiovizualnimi tehnologijami in znanjem, vključenimi v gledališče. Gre za hipermedijsko predstavo, ki temelji na zelo prefinjeni uporabi kar najsodobnejše avdiovizualne tehnologije.

1 <https://www.ntgent.be/en/about/manifest>

2 Pollesch je v tridesetletni karieri napisal več kot sto iger – v povprečju dve na sezono – in skoraj vse tudi sam režiral.

3 V igri *Pablo in der Plusfiliale* (*Pablo v veleblagovnici Plus, 2004*) je Pollesch uporabil izbor iz spisov cele vrste ekonomskih strokovnjakov za sivo ekonomijo v deželah tretjega sveta.

4 Izhodišče za to predstavo je bil *Manifest o kiborgih* (*A Cyborg Manifesto*) Donne Haraway (1985).

Takšne »karaoke« je v gledališču uporabljal že italijanski avtor-igralec Carmelo Bene, čigar priljubljena tehnika je bila neke vrste »playback«, ki je v predstavah pogosto nadomeščal dialog. Slovel je tudi po omalovaževanju različnih besedil; gre za proces, ki ga je Deleuze definiriral kot *amputacijo* (85). V tem procesu odvzemanja je Bene iz klasičnih besedil črtal vso akcijo, dialoge, like in celo dikcijo, tako da se je Deleuze upravičeno spraševal, kaj sploh še ostane. Odgovor je: vse, vendar v novi luči, z novimi besedami, izgovarjavo, z novimi zvoki, novimi gestami, novimi razmerji med odrom in občinstvom. Ni šlo več za dialog, temveč za sočasne in zaporedne glasove, nanesene in prenesene drug čez drugega in zaprte v časovni prostor variiranja. Italijanski kritiki so Beneja »obtoževali«, da izvaja »afazijo« jezika (šepetanje, jecljanje ali popačena dikcija, komaj zaznavni ali oglušujoči zvoki) in ovira stvari in geste, da uporablja prijeme, ki otežujejo gibanje, namesto da bi ga lajšale, geste, ki so pretoge ali pretirano šibke, dodatno opremo, ki jo je težko premikati.

Podobno je tudi francoski avtor-režiser Joris Lacoste leta 2002 začel projekt, ki še kar traja, z naslovom *Encyclopédie de la Parole*. S skupino pesnikov, glasbenikov, znanstvenikov, vizualnih umetnikov, gledaliških in radijskih režiserjev, dramaturgov, koreografov in kuratorjev Lacoste vse od takrat zbira zvočne fragmente, izrečene ali izjavljene tako v javnem kot v zasebnem življenju. Lacostovo delo je globoko povezano z jezikom, a ne s tistim, kar je izrečeno ali kar naj bi to pomenilo, temveč s tem, kako zveni. »Vsa moja dosedanja dela temeljijo na govoric, vendar pa nikdar ne uporabljamo besedila. Same posnetke uporabljamo kot nekakšno partituro. Vanjo vključujemo premore, tišine in ritme v tem, kar je izrečeno« (Lacoste v Ramaer). Med uprizoritvijo jezik ni organsko umeščen v telo nastopajočega, temveč ostaja zunaj njega, kot tuje telo. Iz vrzeli v govoru vzniknejo jecljanje, spodrsaljaji, naglasi, napačne izgovarjave, ki označujejo konflikt med telesom in svetom. Jezikovno gradivo in gradivo inscenacije sta v interakciji z gledališko situacijo, celostno razumljena s pomočjo koncepta uprizoritvenega besedila.

Čeprav je termin »besedilo« na tem mestu nekoliko nenatančen, vendarle izraža dejstvo, da vsakokrat pride do povezave in prepletanja (vsaj potencialno) pomenskih elementov. Pravzaprav je, kot pravi Pavis, tekstura gledališki izraz, saj povezuje prizore, dialoge pa tudi vse materiale, ki jih vnesemo v prostor/čas uprizoritve/izvedbe (251). Kot pri teksturi, ko lahko njeno materialnost razumemo samo tako, da se je dotaknemo, tudi v uprizoritveno besedilo verjamemo šele potem, ko smo priče njegovi prostorsko-časovni razpostavi, ritmični kvaliteti pa tudi vizualnim in zvočnim vidikom. Izkušnje gledanja, poslušanja, pričevanja, zaznavanja, interpretiranja nas vodijo k estetski izkušnji in stvarjenju pomena. Kot trdi Pavis, je tekstualnost način, kako avtorji in igralci uporabljajo verbalno, vizualno, zvočno, glasbeno in ritmično snov, ki jo potem izluščijo gledalci in kritiki.

Včasih igralci povsem prevzamejo pobudo in postanejo *pripovedovalci* (Pavis 147). V predstavi *MDSX* italijanske gledališke skupine Motus, ki temelji na romanu *Middlesex* pisatelja Jeffreyja Eugenidesa, igralka Silvia Calderoni vstavi svoje lastno avtobiografsko gradivo, tako da gledalec ne more biti prepričan, kaj je njeno lastno besedilo, kaj pa besedilo romana. K temu pa je Motus dodal še navedke iz knjig *Težave s spolom (Gender Trouble)* in *Izničenje spola (Undoing Gender)* pa tudi *Manifest o kiborgih* Donne Haraway, *Manifeste Contra-sexuel* Paula B. Preciada in druge delčke kalejdoskopskega kvirovskega univerzuma. Vendar pa je Calderoni na prizorišču sama, ko uteleša in izničuje svoj spol, uporablja lastno telo, da bi povedala zgodbo o nasilju, bolečini, zmedenosti in sprejemanju. S tem izziva tradicijo, ki je nagnjena k ločevanju gledališča od pripovedovanja zgodb, igralcev od pripovedovalcev. Calderoni brez opozorila prehaja iz vloge pripovedovalke - komentatorke v vlogo lika brez kakega vidnega dramaturškega razloga, razen tega, da pove zgodbo.

Zato je povsem na mestu vprašanje, kdo je pravi avtor besedila uprizoritve? Kadar Oliver Frlić ne dekonstruira kakšnega klasičnega besedila, pogosto predstavlja lastna uprizoritvena besedila, ki občasno temeljijo na resničnih dejstvih, včasih pa na izmišljenih pripovedih. V več intervjujih je že izjavil, da je precej skeptičen do gledališča, da mu gledališče kot medij deluje lažno in da mu je pogosto čuti zadrego, kadar gleda ljudi na odru. Kot zanimivost lahko omenimo, da se, tako kot Pollesch, tudi Frlić nikdar ne ukvarja s tem, kar bi lahko opredelili kot uspešno predstavo. Ravno nasprotno, večina njegovih uprizoritev daje vtis nedokončanosti, nekakšne zgrešenosti, kot bi šlo za nekakšno slabo amatersko gledališče pod močnim vplivom performansa. Poznavalci performansa lahko v tem prepoznajo številne citate iz del Josepha Beuysa, Carolee Schneemann, Marine Abramović, Vita Acconcija, Paula McCarthyja idr. Tudi občinstvo se na njegove predstave odziva podobno, kot se je na takšne performanse, s tem, da se zgražajo, protestirajo ali zapustijo gledališče, nikdar pa niso brezbrizni. Sam Frlić zase trdi:

Ko sem začel razmišljati o umetnosti, o tem, kaj in kako bi lahko delal, je bil performans moja prva izbira, in to najmanj iz dveh razlogov. Prvič je bil zelo dostopen, saj za performans ne potrebuješ ničesar: to je tako kot pri konceptualni umetnosti, potrebuješ samo lastno idejo, potem pa si sam svoj performer, nastopiš lahko, kadar hočeš itd. Najbliže so mi izvorna načela performansa: nobenih ponovitev, nobenih vaj, nobenega snemanja. Tako je edina sled vsakega performansa samo izkušnja, ki si jo kot performer deliš z občinstvom. (Frlić)

Toda kaj so ti sledovi in kako jih je mogoče izslediti in ohraniti? Osrednja naloga takšne refleksije bi morala biti natančna analiza ustvarjanja in pomen uprizoritvenega besedila kot novega in neizogibnega gledališkega orodja, ki razširja definicijo sodobnega gledališča. V vplivni knjigi *Arhiv in repertoar (The Archive and the Repertoire)* Diana Taylor ponuja novo razumevanje ključne vloge performansa

(v tem primeru gre za zgodovino obeh Amerik). Trdi, da je treba različne vrste uprizoritev, od iger do uradnih dogodkov in množičnih protestov, jemati zelo resno, kot načine shranjevanja in prenašanja znanja. Taylor razkriva, kako repertoar utelešenega spomina, ki ga podajamo z gestami, govorno besedo, gibanjem, plesom, pesmijo in drugimi utelešenimi praksami, ponuja alternativne poglede na spomine, izpeljane iz zapisanega arhiva. Taylor preuči več performansov iz Južne Amerike in ZDA kot vzorčne primere tega, kako ljudje sodelujejo pri produkciji in reprodukciji znanja s tem, ko ga uprizarjajo. Če je potemtakem performans oblika, ki se še najbolj približa razmeram, v katerih bi lahko razumeli svoja lastna izkustva, ko postanemo repertoar, ki »udejanja utelešeni spomin«, bi lahko uprizoritveno besedilo služilo kot arhiv za to. Prav utelešeno znanje repertoarja postane uprizoritveno besedilo, v katerem se različne politične, družbene in kulturne pozicije ohranijo kot v neke vrste arhivu.

Mnoge izmed zgoraj omenjenih sodelovalnih praks v živo imajo namen motivirati občinstvo, da se pridruži dogajanju, in aktivirati družbeni kontekst, v katerem se te prakse odvijajo. Kot pravi Boris Groys, je nagnjenost k sodelovalni, participatorni praksi zagotovo ena glavnih značilnosti sodobne umetnosti, lahko bi dodali tudi sodobnega performansa. »Po vsem svetu se pojavljajo številne umetniške skupine, ki se pri svoji umetniški produkciji poudarjeno poslužujejo kolektivnega, celo anonimnega avtorstva« (Groys 200). Vendar pa je le peščica postmodernih performativnih umetnikov poskušala ponovno doseči skupni imenovalec z občinstvom tako, da so jih zvalili iz pasivne vloge s pomočjo uporabe političnega ali družbenega angažmaja. Pričakovali bi, da bo ta odločitev umetnikov, da se odrečejo izključnemu avtorstvu, v prvi vrsti opolnomočila gledalca. »Toda konec koncev je ta žrtev umetniku v korist, saj ga odreši moči, ki jo ima hladen pogled neprizadetega opazovalca ob ocenjevanju modernega umetniškega dela« (Groys 200).

To pa nas privede nazaj k Brechtu, ki je menil, da je gledališče lahko najuspešnejše, kadar vzpostavi tvegano povezavo med umetniki in gledalci. Namen tega je uresničiti tako intelektualne kot emocionalne zmožnosti gledalcev v iskanju tistega, kar je mogoče ustvariti v novem kontekstu uprizoritve. Takšno stališče ni in ne more nikdar biti nevtralnno. Brecht je ob številnih priložnostih poudaril, da je »občinstvo kolektiv posameznikov, sposoben mišljenja, sklepanja in razsojanja, tudi v gledališču; obravnava jih kot posameznike, ki so duhovno in čustveno dozoreli, in verjame, da tudi sami želijo, da jih tako obravnavajo« (Brecht 78). Če pogledamo s tega zornega kota, se besedilo uprizoritve še najbolj približa tistemu, kar bi lahko definirali kot »učinkovitost« uprizoritve, kar pomeni, da »resnično« bistvo uprizoritve podaja njen javni vpliv, ne pa samo besedilo.

Brechtova zahteva, da avtorji gledališča ne smejo »zalagati« z besedili, temveč da

ga morajo spremeniti, se je uresničila do takšne mere, da si tega ne bi mogel niti predstavljati. Močna potreba sodobnih umetnikov, kot so Pollesch, Rau ali Frlić, da bi svojo umetnost naredili koristno, bi lahko, zgodovinsko gledano, razumeli kot novo stališče, ki terja tudi novo teoretsko refleksijo. Njihove teze so si bolj ali manj podobne: gledališče zavrača napisano besedilo kot tuje telo, kot »svet zunaj odra«. Osrednji cilj tovrstnih refleksij bi moral biti čim natančnejša analiza pomena in politične funkcije uprizoritvenega besedila. Samo tako bi bilo mogoče razrešiti dilemo glede uprizoritvenega besedila. Nedvomno bo tak pristop postal splošno sprejet, pa čeprav izven okvirov institucionalnega gledališča.

Ne smemo pozabiti, da so trenutne razmisleke o uprizoritvenem besedilu spodbudile preobrazbe, ki so jih v gledališče uvedli v šestdesetih letih dvajsetega stoletja. Okoljsko gledališče, participatorno gledališče, gledališče podob, neverbalno gledališče, dokumentarno gledališče, performans, hepening, kolaž, družbeno gledališče itd., vse to je prispevalo k stvarjenju uprizoritvenega besedila. Poleg tega so nove znanstvene discipline, kot so semiotika, gledališka antropologija, gledališka sociologija, estetika in performativne študije, ponudile uporabna orodja za analizo uprizoritvenega besedila. A če naj pridemo do bolj substancialne teorije uprizoritvenega besedila, bo treba ustvariti nov teoretski okvir, ki bo temeljil na skupnem izhodišču umetniške prakse in teorije. Temeljita raziskava uprizoritvenega besedila, ki ga ne bo imela zgolj za stranski učinek uprizoritve, temveč kot ključni element le-te, lahko prispeva h kompleksnejšemu dialogu o sodobnem gledališču. Razvoj takšne teorije bi lahko prispeval tudi k našim pogledom na uprizoritve in uprizoritvena besedila iz preteklosti. Uprizoritveno besedilo ne more obstajati brez same uprizoritve, kar je neposredno vezano na umetniško prakso. Potemtakem ni dovolj, da zgolj pripoznamo njegov obstoj, ampak moramo prepoznati njegovo zmožnost, da preobrazi sodobno gledališče.

Prevedel Jaka Andrej Vojevec.

- Badiou, Alain. *Handbook of Inaesthetics*. Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. *Essais critiques*. Seuil, 1981.
- Bene, Carmello, in Gilles Deleuze. *Sovrapposizioni*. Quodlibet, 2002.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Understanding Brecht*. Verso, 2003.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht on Theatre*. Prevedel John Willet, Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Brently B. »Looks It Not Like the King? Well, More Like Burton.« *New York Times*, www.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/theater/reviews/01haml.html. Dostop 2. feb. 2022.
- Dort, Bernard. *La Représentation émancipée*. Actes Sud, 1988.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Semiotics of Theatre*. Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Frljić, Oliver, idr. »Whose National Theatre Is It?« *Polish Theatre Journal*, let. 1-2, št. 3-4, 2017, www.polishtheatrejournal.com/index.php/ptj/article/view/80/530. Dostop 2. feb. 2022.
- Groys, Boris. *Introduction to Antiphilosophy*. Verso, 2012.
- Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*. Routledge, 2006.
- Pavis, Patrice. *The Routledge Dictionary of Performance and Contemporary Theatre*. Routledge, 2018.
- Ramaer, Joost. »We never use texts. We use the sounds of people talking as a kind of score.« *Culturebot*, 18. nov. 2015, www.culturebot.org/2015/11/24966/we-never-use-texts-we-use-the-sounds-of-people-talking-as-a-kind-of-score. Dostop 2. feb. 2022.
- Rau, Milo. »The Ghent Manifesto.« *NT Gent*, www.ntgent.be/en/about/manifest. Dostop 2. feb. 2022.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and Repertory: Performing Cultural Memory in Americas*. Duke University Press, 2003.