

From Text to Scene: Modern Methods and Staging Strategies

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
ASH-2023-10034964

Volume: 10

Issue: 3

Month: January

Year: 2023

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Received: 17.10.2022

Accepted: 20.12.2022

Published: 01.01.2023

Citation:

Saadati, Amin. "From Text to Scene: Modern Methods and Staging Strategies." *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2023, pp. 12–20.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v10i3>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Amin Saadati

Istanbul University, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0297-192X>

Abstract

This article examines the ideas and practices of directors and writers about the degree of fidelity and non-adherence to the text, reversal, and the use of the text as a preliminary text to present artists' artistic concerns. The degree of fidelity of the theater play to the text and the author raises this question that whether the director will be accepted as the creator of the work or the person who performs it. This article shows that modern theater experts interpret the relationship between the written text and the staged play in different ways. While some directors see their play work as serving the writers and prioritizing their satisfaction, others see themselves as the creator of the work, sees text as one of the elements that can be removed from the theater. Konstantin Stanislavski, Jerzy Grotowski, Vsevolod Meyerhold, Elia Kazan, and Wooster are some of the famous actors whose comments are briefly reviewed in this article. What will become clear in this work is the diminishing role of the author as the sole creator of the work and the progress of the theater towards innovation, diversity of forms, and group work. At the end of this article, the novelty in presenting the text is considered not the death of the author, but a kind of continuation of the text and a revitalization of its various dimensions.

Keywords: Theater, Director, Writer, Text, Mise-En-Scene

Introduction

Since the late nineteenth century and the modernization of theatrical art, the transformation that is the essence of stage art has provoked much controversy. The general notion that the art of theater is a combination of works realizes the substantiation of stage art into a literary form. In other words, director transforms another person's work of art from one form to another with the help of artists; But it is crucial to know, who determines that transform? author? Or a director? And to what extent the product of this conversion must correspond to the original opus. Every time a classic or modern work such as Beckett or Miller or O'Neill takes the stage the importance of this issue becomes apparent; Because every time there is a difference with the text that the audience has read before, the discussion about the director's authority and the writer's rights resumes (Brockett & Findlay, 1973).

Until the late nineteenth century, directors had limited authority in the production process. The director called the "stage manager's" had insignificant role in determining the actors' costumes or stage design. Writers, however, often participated in the production of the play in various forms, including direct acting. For this reason, the change of text during the performance was often done by the author and with his consent; But with the advent of technologies such as light, which allowed for more maneuverability on stage, and with the emergence of ideas such as Wagner's idea of "coherent artwork" that saw the need for a person directing's power or director to create coherence, directors gradually gained more power.

The concept of director Wagner was put into practice by the actors of Meiningen under the supervision of Duke of Saxe Meiningen George II. George II, who directed the actors from 1919 to 1900, was thinking of creating an “absolute illusion” on stage. George II supervised every detail of the scene, paying close attention to the details of time, place, and costume, and following a precise and time-consuming method of rehearsal. He stressed the need for detailed research on the historical period of the play and its specific features before designing the costume. Such scrutiny has made Saxe Meiningen the first Wiki director to be one of the founders of modern theater; But for the greats of theater, directing did not have the same meaning (Brockett & Findlay, 1973).

There are different opinions about the role of the director and whether s/he should be considered the creator of the work or there is only an intermediary between the text and the scene. However, directing theater does not necessarily mean being dependent on someone else’s text or art. Avant-garde schools such as Futurism have distanced themselves from literary texts, and artists such as Bertolt Brecht and Robert Wilson have directed their own plays; But many great playwrights, such as Arthur Miller, have been very cautious in entrusting their work to directors, and playwrights such as Henrik Ibsen or Eugene O’Neill dictate their vision to directors with specific and often long stage instructions. From the point of view of these writers, the director is the only part of the playwright and the performer of the form that s/he has considered for his work. From this point of view, the text has a clear framework that should not be changed as much as possible. In contrast to this view are the artists who believe that the text comes to life in the hands of the director. From this point of view, the text is a generative element that its interpretation and depiction is the responsibility of other actors in the scene, especially the director. For example, “Peter Brook”, one of the greatest contemporary directors ‘believes that directors are always active. Brook likens the text of the play to a piece of cloth. This cloth comes to us not as “a series of messages ‘as what writing almost always offers”” but as a set of stimuli that can produce many impressions, therefore, the director is not limited

to find only one message from the creator of the fabric but is free to have an individual choice from several possible impressions (Luere, 1994). In this way it can be said that in Brook’s thought the text of a play is an open work with different readability; And the specialty of theater is to transfer and present this reading to the present. According to Brook in theater, “truth is always on the move” and to achieve this elusive truth, theater requires a “permanent revolution”, so a kind of constant revelation will be necessary for all the factors and parts of the play; because for this eternal revolution and constant experimentation, stability will only mean death. As the author will mention in the rest of this article, in the opinion of many other modern theater experts, absolute adherence to the stage instructions and points requested by the author can mean the stability and death of the play; so in this way the play is trapped in a form or interpretation and loses its other potentials. On the other hand, treating the text as an open work with different interpretability and arrangement, which leaves the director free to choose the central point of the play, often leads to the author’s dissatisfaction and raises the familiar issue of the author’s death (Luere, 1994).

Method

The methods used by the author in this article include scientific, criticism and comparison. In this context, by referring to the library technique, the life and stage management theories of the great theater directors of the 19th century, such as Stanislavsky, Craig, Meyerhold, Artaud, Grotowski, Elia Kazan and the Wooster Group, as well as their views on the text and the author, their theater books and articles, analyzed and studied.

Text or Performance, Writer or Director

The following part looks at how some great directors and writers perceive the text and the role of the author. At the end of this article, Wooster’s different view of creating and composing text as a group and improvisation will represent modern ways of presenting the play. A style that, although questioning the author’s role in the production of the play, will never indicate his death.

Stanislavsky and his Critics

The quarrel between Konstantin Stanislavsky and Antoine Chekhov is perhaps the most well-known example of a writer-director feud. Working on the play's mezzanine was Stanislavsky's early approach of creating plays. According to David Jones, Stanislavsky was imprisoned in a tower for a month and a half in 1898 to work on the play *mise-en-scène* while performing the Chekhov seagull performance. During this time, he depicted all of the characters' actions and characteristics, and this manner, i.e., the execution of private judgments concerning visual and auditory elements, gave him the title of directing director. Stanislavsky is claimed to have modified his directing approach following the Russian Revolution in 1900, becoming a director who "gave everything for the actor": "But only when we are confident of precisely what it needs and what interests it the most" Jones (1986, p. 43). The play's mezzanine was created in this fashion during rehearsal and in conjunction with the performers. This shift in approach transformed him from a despotic director to a "midwife" (Jones, 1986: 43). This meant that the performers were given greater space and the rehearsals were converted into a laboratory setting.

Stanislavsky, according to Jones, adds a layer of complexity to Chekhov's Seagull scenes by forcing the characters to do things like smoke or arrive and go during the performance. He thought that these exercises were helpful in demonstrating the characters and explaining the play's primary elements. By "rendering," he also alters the pace of the play's text. By "rendering," he also alters the rhythm of the play's text. Stanislavsky provides Chekhov a distinct rhythm by breaking the pattern of the play's scenes, introducing significant pauses, and rearranging the sequence in which the characters arrive (Jones, 1986:23). Stanislavsky decreased "physical activity" as the play advanced toward emotionalism, focusing the play on the characters' connections with one another. Stanislavsky also adds alterations to the sound effects, such as the sounds of birds and dogs in the opening and closing scenes. Despite the fact that the 1909 performance of *Seagull* was a triumph for Stanislavsky and the Moscow's theater art, Chekhov had his reasons for displeasure with Stanislavsky. The accusation that Chekhov's

plays were comedies and that Stanislavsky had converted them into tragedies was perhaps his biggest dissatisfaction: "My characters were turned into sobbing children by Stanislavsky. This was not at all what I had hoped for". Other aspects that irritated Chekhov were excessive "reality" and "naturalistic tools" such as the sound of clocks and animals, but it wasn't only Chekhov who objected to Stanislavsky's strong realism. Stanislavsky's Student Vsevolod Meyerhold, who portrayed Treplev in his performance, was also unsatisfied with Stanislavsky's approach. For Meyerhold, the atmosphere of Chekhov's play was "in the rhythm of his writing," not "in the crickets, not in the barking of dogs, nor in the use of actual doors" (Meyerhold, 1978:32). The inclusion of these components to the performance, however modest, altered the pace and obliterated Chekhov's intended impact.

Gordon Craig, a theater director and thinker, was also a critic of Stanislavsky's approach. Craig compares Stanislavsky's approach to "Elephant and Jaw Trainers," and the actor is working on a book. Stanislavsky's mistake, according to Craig, was in attempting to produce a natural effect. While the play is at its most supernatural and spiritual in the theater, Craig believes that "the right and fair interpretation of the play is the most essential thing in contemporary theater," and that this belief does not restrict the play's staging or the director's maneuvering (Craig, 1983). In Craig's approach, the stage director is the key artist who decides on the majority of the play's aspects, including stage design, lighting design, costumes, and the players' actions. This implies that once the director has mastered transferring the playwright's sense of text to the stage, he is no longer bound by the writer's stage directions. As a result, Craig saw the script as an insult to the director. Similarly, the stage manager does not follow the author's intentions, but rather selects colors and items that he feels would aid in his proper interpretation of the text, before providing the author with the necessary equipment. In such a manner that the two designs work together to produce harmony. The actor who is a part of the storyline is "managed" or "coordinated" with it. This strategy was chosen because, in Craig's opinion, anything or any movement or sound that is put on the stage must be "expressive," and if it fails

to do so, it must be eliminated. Craig also believed that the theater of the future will be devoid of text and playwrights, depending entirely on movement, music, and staging. Craig may be regarded a pioneer in highlighting the director's independence from the written text and the author in this manner.

Theater Language: Meyerhold and Artaud

Vsevolod Meyerhold expands on the writer-director dichotomy by emphasizing players and viewers as additional factors of theatrical interactions. Meyerhold presents two modes of communication between the director and the actor in his book on theater, which reflects his ideas on the director's job. In the first technique, which he refers to as the "theater triangle," he positions the director atop a triangle, with the actor and writer on each side. The audience thereby gains an understanding of both the performer and the writer via the director's work. In the second method, titled "direct line theater," the director absorbs the writer's work, while the actor absorbs the director's creature, which "freely reveals his soul to his audience," with the director acting solely as a "bridge" between the spirit of the art profession and the spirit of the write (Meyerhold, 1978: 50). After absorbing the author's work, the actor stands alone in front of the viewer, and a pure flame is lighted by the combination of these two pure materials, namely the writer's creativity and the spectator's imagination (Meyerhold, 1978:62).

Meyerhold has always placed a premium on audience engagement. He feels that the stage performance is still "incomplete" and can be evaluated only by the audience (Meyerhold, 1978:256). In his approach, obtaining actor engagement is a collaborative effort between the writer and director. Meyerhold thus shifts the production cycle's axis of perception from the writer-director relationship (or text and performance) to the actor-spectator relationship, transforming the former into a kind of partnership, a kind of "us," in order to realize a new relationship: "The writer and director regard all their work in the production as merely laying the groundwork for the two primary forces of actor and spectator theater to work every day during the performance. The writer and director supply just a framework, which should neither constrain or hamper

the performer or audience, but rather inspire them to work in unison. We are directors, and "we, authors understand that what we prescribe during rehearsal is precisely correct: the ultimate manifestation and cohesion of the production is accomplished by the audience and with the actor's involvement" (Meyerhold, 1978:256). Meyerhold proposes that the director employ plastic gestures to help the actor and audience grasp the writer's breadth of vision. He feels that words alone are insufficient means for expression. On the other hand, plastic gestures may convey "deep sentiments" without necessarily matching the words. Meyerhold believes that mold ability (plastic movements) provides a visual dimension to the discourse's aural nature, and that the motions do not have to adhere to the dialogue is distinctive of the current use of plastic movements (Meyerhold, 1978:56). In fact, Meyerhold intended to bring the play's mask, gestures, and gestures back to the stage without dialogue. According to him, these aspects distinguish theater and elevate the actor to the level of artist. Thus, it may be claimed that Meyerhold Theater places a premium on the interaction between performer and viewer and downplays the importance of spoken language. While the author's perspective is retained, Meyerhold utilizes it as a "precursor" to the actor's work and what occurs on stage.

Anthony Artaud, a French writer and thinker, shared Meyerhold's belief that theater should be presented in a novel fashion, with a distinct theatrical quality. "Rather than continuing to depend on sacred and final texts, he said, it is vital to cease theater's slavery by text and to recover the notion of a distinct language somewhere between allusions and thinking (Artaud, 1958). According to Artaud, following a literary text result in a form of theatrical stagnation and deprives the audience of theater with nothing fresh to say. Artaud contrasts between Western and Eastern theater in his book *Theater and Its Companion*, stating that Oriental theater, called "Balinese Theater," is not reliant on words since it visualizes everything via gestures, voice, pantomime, and dance, and as in The scenario that emerges is logical. This disconnection from the written text: "Exhibits the entire mastery of a filmmaker whose creative force transcends words." Western theater, on the other hand, is entirely reliant on the written text

and regards all else as backdrop and subtext. Thus, theater has evolved into a staged presentation of text. Artaud thinks that in order for theater to achieve independence and recognition as a distinct art form, it must have its own language, which he believes is the mezzanine language. Artaud's *mise-en-scène* defines it as "the visual appearance and plasticity of speech" and "as the language of everything that can be expressed and given meaning on a stage apart from speech; everything that is expressed or influenced in space" Or is decomposed by it; thus, by considering mezzo-soprano to be the proper language of "pure theater," Artaud restores to it the plastic and physical properties of theater, which exist in Eastern theater (Artaud, 1958:69).

However, what effect do Artaud's ideas have on the writer-director relationship? For Western theater authors, theater's plastic and physical nature equates to a loss of force. Because in this instance, the "role of speech" has shifted, providing the director with more room. "Changing the function of speech in theater requires us to use it in a physical and spatial manner and to integrate it with whatever else is spatial in the theater and significant in the non-abstract sphere," Artaud explains (Artaud, 1958:72). As this is achievable only on stage, the author must yield to an expert. By creating a creator who "shall be charged with the dual duty of the play and the storyline," Artaud resolves the duality of writer and director. Artaud rejects the text's primacy in performing global classics. Artaud attacks "idolatry of established masterpieces" in "No More Masterpieces," stating, "Past masterpieces are excellent for the past; they are not beneficial for us." We have the right to express what has been said and even what has not been spoken in a manner that is uniquely ours, that is immediate and direct, that is consistent with present emotional states, and that is intelligible to everybody. This is because, in his opinion, "a repeated expression has no value; it does not have two lives;" that "words act only at the moment they are expressed and die afterward;" that "one form cannot be reused after it has been used and desires to be replaced by another; and that theater is the only place in the world where movements cannot be replicated in the same way" (Artaud, 1958:75).

Thus, Artaud regards the presentation of a variable as an integral component of theater's essence and cannot perceive it inside a defined and set framework. According to this concept, adherence to the author's desires is not only achievable at various times, but also not entirely possible in different performances of an interpretation.

Grotowski

Jerzy Grotowski also examined the link between text and theater, as well as between writer and director. Grotowski views theater as an interaction between the performer and the audience. His effort to reduce what he refers to as "rich theater" (which includes literature, architecture, design, acting, and lighting) to "poor theater." The notion of grotesque poverty theater can only be realized by gradually eliminating superfluous elements: "... theater is also feasible without make-up, costume, and set design, without a discrete performing space (stage), without lighting and sound effects, and so forth." Rather than that, he defines theater as "the interaction between the actor and the audience"; hence, according to Grotowski, the text is merely one of the aspects of theater and may therefore be ignored; on the other hand, the text for theater is similar to a myth for the poet. In the sense that the language has the potential to serve as a reproductive factor (Grotowski, 1969:69). According to him, theatrical invention occurs as a consequence of the director's "encounter" with the text, a wave that is highly dynamic but does not obliterate the work's potential. He argues that the same meeting must occur between the actor and the text, a wave in which the actor must discover and generate the text's latent "multiplication" via his body.

The clearest example of Grotowski's interpretation of the text is his staging of Stanislaw Wyspianski's play "Acropolis" in 1960. Grotowski directs this play using a fully altered version of the text. While Wyspianski's narrative resurrects ecclesiastical sculptures and paintings at Easter and reconstructs and narrates Old Testament themes, Grotowski prioritizes the Holocaust and the burning camps in his interpretation. His performance takes place on the night of the resurrection and is surrounded by onlookers and instruments resembling

boxes. The characters spend the majority of the show constructing blinds (box-like structures) that everyone enters at the conclusion; telling myths or gospel stories; and playing roles. They are either interrogated or sent back to work by stopped soldiers, there is no hope, and when they find a savior, their bodies are weak. This results in a nervous laugh. Thus, the Grotowski portrayal departs significantly from the original text; nonetheless, by altering the theme and storyline of this play, Grotowski transforms it into a modern work. His direction of this play is highly active, and Wyspianski's text can only be regarded as an inspiration or "forerunner" for Grotowski.

Kazan and the Author's Service

Ilia Kazan, one of the most renowned and important directors of contemporary American theater, is another man whose perspectives on the writer-director connection are particularly noteworthy. Kazan, like Craig, was opposed to following the author's stage directions. When questioned about the recipe for the Scene, he responds, "Those chicken droppings? It is never read by me. What do you believe I'm doing here? I am the film's director..." (Jones,1986:183); However, Kazan was dubbed "actor-director" and "director-director" throughout his directorial career, since he placed a premium on the playwright's happiness. He thought the director was acting in the best interests of the work and author. Contemporary playwright Robert Anderson sees Kazan's prioritization of understanding the writer's intentions and his feelings about certain lines and situations in the play as what distinguishes him as a director. Anderson asserts that Kazan made no offer to direct his "tea and sympathy" performance. "Because he wanted to 'serve the playwright, to assist the writer in bringing his play to life,'" he questioned (Luere,1994:33). Anderson was not the only writer who expressed satisfaction with his collaboration with Kazan. Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller praised Kazan's direction of their works. This, of course, arises from Kazan's conviction that the author's point of view should take precedence. "Now I'm speaking on the author's behalf... I'm now working on a Tennessee Williams play, and I'm required to see life through his eyes

"Kazan is referring to Tennessee Williams. Williams was similarly pleased of his performance: "This man has not made a single judgement mistake since the program started"(Luere,1994:71-73). Kazan's collaboration with Arthur Miller pleased the author as well, earning him the New York Theater Critics' Award for All My Sons in 1947 and the Pulitzer Prize for The Salesman's Death in 1949; However, Kazan's interest in realizing Miller's desired image did not prevent him from creating the work based on his own personal vision. "Theater is not only a literary medium," he said. "While the author is important, the performers, designers, directors, and technicians collaborate to create the play" (Luere,1994:105). In other words, Kazan shaped his performance around the author and the text before acting.

Kazan might therefore be regarded as the favored director of authors. Edwards Albee's remarks on the text and performance are evocative of Kazan's. Albee, as a writer and director, feels that the play "Manifestation" is something he has previously envisaged and evaluated for performance, and hence should not be altered in practice or for the sake of viewers. He who likes the text asserts that if stage orders are plainly expressed, they should be obeyed; if they are implicitly conveyed, the director should find them; nevertheless, Albee's works do not reflect his own ideas. The flexibility he has when directing Beckett's work contrasts his ideas on the writer's position and the director's authority. Albee supervised Beckett's Krapp's Last Tape and Ohio Impromptu productions. Albee had claimed before to directing Beckett's writings that certain writers did not need the director's assistance since everything in their work was fully drawn. "There is only one genuine, very powerful, very strong, and perfect performance of the play, and it is mine; I saw it while I was writing," Albee said of his work (Luere,1994:110). This perspective has prompted him to exercise extreme caution in permitting his creations to be created.

However, while conducting Ohio's improvisation, Beckett's brief piece, he disregards Beckett's directions and radically alters the play's structure. In Beckett's play, two identical characters, the listener and the reader, sit at the same table, reading a book to one another and sometimes repeating what he has

read as a result of additional strikes to the table. Two non-uniform performers, one white and one black, perform Albee's piece. The text is read three times rather than once, extending Beckett's brief six-minute presentation time to twenty minutes. The characters move about and take on new roles, as the listener reads the novel. Albee also adds purple and green lighting to the picture, which contrasts sharply with Beckett's plain lighting.

Albee's adjustments will undoubtedly have an effect on Beckett's performance. Because the play's central structure mirrors the text read by the reader's character. As previously stated, the play has two characters: the "reader," who reads a book to the "listener," and the "reader." The book's narrative follows a guy who travels to a lonely chamber in order to forget a lover who has vanished from his thoughts; but when he is unable to do so, the lover sends someone to console him. After a period, the two grow more similar; yet he refers to her as his darling. The setting and events mirror the tale the "reader" is reading: a tiny room with a window and two men who seem to be identical, reading books to one another; therefore, the spectator or reader of Beckett's play inexorably identifies "he" of the book with the listener and "consolation" with the "reader." Beckett's play's brevity and romantic overtones also provide him a lyrical air, which avoids the repeat three times in Albee's performance. Additionally, the employment of black and white players elicits interpretations that Beckett most definitely did not intend; yet the additional dimensions that the play discovers in this manner may be regarded a reading of Beckett's text.

Wooster Group

By contrast, filmmakers such as Kazan may make reference to a group called Worcester, which has been represented in plays as fanatical empiricists. Indeed, if the text's fulfillment was significant to Kazan, as Elizabeth LeCompte of the Worcester group asserts, the text must be demolished and recreated. We end this article by assessing this group's performance in presenting some of the world's most well-known plays.

Wooster grew out of the theatrical ensemble founded by Richard Schenker. Elizabeth

LeCompte, the group's director, worked on the play as an assistant and subsequently as director. When Schenker departed the group in 1999, the band was renamed Worcester and placed under LeCompte's command (Callens, 2004:45). According to Lokmpt and his colleagues, the border's writing is not restricted, and there is no need to mimic or adhere to it. This implies that the fundamental element of their performances does not have to be written text; anything may be text and employed as the primary element of representation. The ensemble may employ excerpts from documentaries, classics, interviews, recorded music, dance, and science fiction as text. This freedom from the written play has allowed the ensemble greater room for action and has infused their work with movement. LeCompte describes his interpretation of the book as follows: "However, [for example], Rooney did it spontaneously; and I take that random occurrence and declare that this is inevitable; this is the narrative's commencement." As with anybody else who utilizes a playwright's writing, I use it as a jumping-off point for my own work, and hence am unable to discard it. He created that text by his activity, and so I am required to rearrange [everything]; nonetheless, this is a random element; it is not calculated as the text is conceived. It is an action-text based on an improvisation that may or may not have anything to do with the current subject. I refer to it as a chance to work because it's as if I'm tossing a handful of beans into the air; and when they fall to the ground, I'm forced to create a dance plan around that axis; and I can't modify it until the very last possible time. I use it as a column for defining my rationale. I cannot alter it until another structure, a handful of more beans, contradicts the first" (Savran, 1986: 51); hence, chance is not only a factor in the substance of the plays, but also in their shape. The ability of the text existing in several forms and this degree of articulating it improves the possibilities of meaning and interpretation and invites the spectator's involvement, allowing for a number of interpretations rather than prescribing a certain impression.

This may be a reason why writers such as Arthur Miller are hesitant to commission LeCompte to create their work. According to Sarvan and Louise, LeCompte insisted on Miller include a 45-minute

version of his blacksmithing demonstration with a bit on Timothy Larry in a play titled L.S.D. Miller refused, threatening to sue if the Locomotive group did not immediately cease production on the play (Luere, 145, 1994). Making a long day journey to the night, the fuzzy gorilla, and Emperor Jones by Eugene O'Neill, as well as the three sisters' Chekhov, are among the Wooster group's works that demonstrate their deconstruction of the text. The Wooster ensemble adapts O'Neill's Long Journey to Night for a performance titled Point Judith. Judith Point is divided into three sections: "Sail," "Stu's Party," and "Deer." The lengthy day-night journey is condensed into thirteen minutes for the second half; yet the first and third portions also portray the characters' reality in a separate place. According to Sarvan, while the play's male characters' concerns, aspirations, and tensions are moved to the deck of an oil rig in the first act, Mary Tyrone's desire of becoming a nun is mirrored in the final act, "Monastery." In "Monastery," the male actors who starred in "Sail" reprise their roles as nuns in a short film titled "By the Sea," which depicts the nuns' everyday lives (Sarvan, 1986:136).

There are two major aspects in Wooster's reading of the play that might be seen as the group's criticism of O'Neill's play, which reveals itself in the play itself. The first is the group's allusion to the play's patriarchal environment and the loneliness placed on Mary Tyrone, the play's female protagonist, and the second is Kathleen's marginalization. The role of the nuns in the men, as well as the sexual space and language of the first act, all represent LeCompte's technique for uncovering the patriarchal society of the play. Unlike Mary and the nuns, who are represented by male performers, Kathleen is the only woman depicted accurately in the play. After everyone has left the stage, he enters and vacuums the home in the "Stowe Party" piece. He reappears in the third act of the play while starring in a short film about nuns; therefore, by highlighting Mary's role, the Wooster Group's production dramatically alters the impact of O'Neill's play.

Worcester Theatre Company produced "Brace up," a fresh adaptation of Chekhov's "Three Sisters," in 1994. Worcester compressed or extended the show's major scenes in this version.

On a square stage, the performance was played. Two microphones were placed in front of viewers, numerous televisions were placed in the rear, one of which moved forward throughout the performance, a wheelchair was placed, and a divider was placed. A table evocative to the dining room described by Chekhov is hidden behind the scenes. Television pictures were shown during sequences in which the protagonists were seated and conversing in that room.

At the start of the performance, Kate Waalk, one of the group's key members, recounts the situation from behind the microphone, introducing herself as Masha. While Olga opens the play by providing information about the family's history, Masha begins this performance by inquiring about the family: "When did your father die?" "How was the weather?" Irna, the youngest sister, is portrayed by an elderly actor who opens the scene by reading a passage from his journal about his hobbies. When the Varshnin arrives on the scene, everything comes to a halt. He then looks to the audience and calmly states, "I'm pleased." The remainder of his talk is spoken slowly and set to slow music. Following that, these motions are done at various levels. As the music plays and the actors converse, other characters come, and one of them, Rad, delivers bamboo sticks instead of the flower baskets mentioned in the text, which the visitors use to play and dance. Irena performs Fedotica on a tarpaulin, Indian visuals are shown on low monitors, and Japanese music is aired on television.

Kate Waalk then declares that the first act will not be played and invites actor Chebotkin to summarize it for the audience. At this point, his image has been mingled with that of the original actor who played Chebotkin. When Chekhov writes at the conclusion of the first scene, "Masha is performing Waltz alone," other characters join him and dance. This kind of scene adds to the show's entertainment and excitement. The third and fourth curtains are combined, and only the fourth curtain is summarized. The 1994 production concluded with a retelling of the play's goodbye scene. The 1994 production of the play concluded with a retelling of the varshinin's goodbye scene. Varshinin's short sentences and Chekhov's command for a "long kiss" between

Masha and Varshinin are prolonged to almost 9 minutes, during which Varshinin weeps, requests a handkerchief, and converses with others.

As these justifications demonstrate, LeCompte does not have a textual source of meaning. In the sense that he sees no significance outside of the performance and what occurs onstage; As a result, LeCompte does not study the text in pursuit of meaning or theme; However, despite the text's deconstruction, "Brace up" shows several points from the original text. Indeed, through de-arraying, this performance exemplifies Chekhov's notions about the practical philosopher's class.

Conclusion

With the advent of the director in the late nineteenth century and the expansion of audio and visual presentation possibilities, as well as a shift in literary critics' attitudes toward the text, the text's role as the primary element of theater and the writer's role as the play's creator have shifted. Although the play can be a literary work with a fixed form and meaning, in the world of theater, the play can be considered as a work with different readability and presentation in different forms. As this article shows, while the author's desire and preservation of his text framework has been a priority for some modern theater directors such as Kazan, for others the text is only the starting point, and it is the director who is the creator. In this approach, directors such as Grotowski and Artaud have attempted to liberate the theater from its literary isolation. By shifting the emphasis away from text and speech and onto motions and mezzanines in the theater of the two, the author's function has spontaneously shifted. On the other hand, empiricists like as the Wooster Group have shown that theater can effectively transform

any closed text into an open work when it is reread, distilled, or critically deconstructed. The existence of such performances, as well as those that are faithful to the text and are created with the author's collaboration or through the exact execution of his stage directions, demonstrates that the existence of a new look in the theater world does not necessarily imply the demise of the playwright. Each remake's scene might be a continuation of the playwright's work, a manifestation of his art.

References

- Artuad, Antonin. *The Theater and Its Double*. Alma Classics, 2010.
- Brockett, Oscar Gross, and Robert R. Findlay. *Century of Innovation: A History of European and American Theatre and Drama since 1870*. Prentice Hall, 1973.
- Callens, Johan. *The Wooster Group and Its Traditions*. Peter Lang, 2004.
- Craig, Edward Gordon, and J. Michael Walton. *Craig on Theatre*. Methuen, 1983.
- Grotowski, Jerzy. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. Simon and Schuster, 1969.
- Jones, David Richard. *Great Directors at Work: Stanislavsky, Brecht, Kazan, Brook*. University of California Press, 1986.
- Luere, Jeane. *Playwright versus Director: Authorial Intentions and Performance Interpretations*. Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Meyerhold, Vsevolod. *Meyerhold on Theatre*, translated by Braun, Edward, Methuen Drama, 1978.
- Savran, David. *The Wooster Group, 1975-1985: Breaking the Rules*. UMI Research Press, 1986.

Author Details

Amin Saadati, Istanbul University, Turkey, **Email ID:** saadati.amin.83@gmail.com