

The Case for Dramatic Notation

Burnet M. Hobgood

This paper is dedicated to the memory of a friend and colleague, Bernard Beckerman.

It was written for initial presentation at the Middle America Theatre Conference, March 1988.

In the Milos Forman film *Amadeus*, a telling moment arrives when Salieri looks intently at musical scores composed by Mozart. F. Murray Abraham's face emits concentration as he examines this never-performed music--and hears it, as we know for we hear on the sound track what Salieri's eyes perceive: a beautifully balanced string orchestra performing a passage by Mozart. As if to make certain that we grasp the significance of the moment, the action is repeated: Salieri turns to another score and, again, its music resounds. We feel wonderment, seeing Salieri register amazement at the originality of the music, because it is miraculous that the trained musician's eyes have transformed into glorious aural harmonies the scratches on paper by a vulgar boy.

To most of us these filmed moments possess magic, but to an orchestra conductor such transformations are commonplace. It is of course necessary for the conductor to hear the music in his mind before he decides how his ensemble will play it.

How many theatre directors have watched that film and thought enviously, as I did, how wonderful it would be if we could perform analogous

Lecturer, director and scholar, Burnet Hobgood has written extensively on acting and directing. His most recent work is *Master Teachers of Theatre*, issued by Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.

feats with dramatic scripts. Maybe a few of us can do it, or something close to it, but most of us must conduct careful script study for some time before we can confidently envision the performance of a play's text.

This humbling reminder hardly means that music is superior to drama. It simply means that music has developed better techniques of communication. As anyone with musical skill can testify, the music does not lie merely in the notes of the melody, it is in the whole musical notation of the score. It is by virtue of comprehending all of the musical notation that a Salieri can scrutinize a score new to him and thereupon hear in his mind precisely the sounds the composer intended. It is just a technical achievement, which precedes interpretation.

And yet, do we not possess some means of notation for drama? Dramatic poets have seemed to think so, because--although one seldom hears the fact dwelled upon--playscripts in verse carry remarkably few descriptions or suggestions from their authors as compared with prose texts. Nor is this due to the origin of most verse drama in earlier periods. Maxwell Anderson and T.S. Eliot have in common with Shakespeare an assumption that they need add few evocative or prescriptive words to the dialogue which, when conceived as poetry, can express itself to the sensitive reader.

This paper takes its initiative from the verse dramatist's assumption. To begin with I wish to insist that a poetic text inherently conveys nonverbal as well as verbal information to interpreters; that a text in dramatic verse constitutes something resembling the notation of a musical score. Playwrights who compose only in prose share the assumption to some extent. (Chekhov, for instance, considered that his texts liberally communicated his intentions, whereas Stanislavski found them enigmatic at points; when the perplexed director questioned him, Chekhov would reply offhandedly, "I wrote it all down," and refuse to expand on this.)

However, actors typically assume that their subjective responses to a script will furnish the grounds for their interpretation of it. This attitude on the part of actors stems from their having lost or never learned the skills to discern all of the content that playwrights implant through nuances of writing technique. A technical knowledge about writing can reveal much of how a playwright expects the language of a text to be performed. Since the density of such signs abounds in dramatic poetry, my inquiry into the potentials of dramatic notation will begin with a review of commonly passed-over specifics in dramatic verse, relying chiefly on examples in a play by Shakespeare.

The focus will go next to substantial commentaries in theory and criticism, drawing especially on the contributions of Constantin Stanislavski and Bernard Beckerman, with reference to specific practice in music. The third section of the paper will advance some new but tested formulations, couched in the phenomenological mode which we see more and more employed to explicate dramatic form and theatre practice. This process will lead finally to the case for a dramatic notation that is analogous to musical notation.

I The Discipline of Verse-Speaking

Play reviewers frequently observe that American actors fail to speak dramatic verse, especially that of Shakespeare, with the effectiveness which British actors somehow possess. Although we cannot be certain from their critiques that such reviewers know more about verse-speaking than the actors they comment upon, we Americans concede generally the validity of this point. American actors do not speak verse very well as a rule, and many of them will confess the fault readily enough. The technique they have acquired and understand pays little attention to the discipline of verse-speaking.

But it nevertheless disturbs American players to hear their work pejoratively compared to performances by Britons, probably because they believe that the criticism is both unjust and inaccurate. British actors play verse drama with more skill because they have been exposed to classical drama in performance much more often than their American cousins; they can emulate familiar models that are not as accessible to a native of Illinois or Texas. Still, it cannot be taken for granted that "British training" consistently turns out expert verse-speakers; the television series called "The Shakespeare Plays" proved otherwise; its presentation of *Othello* put on display some quite dreadful renderings of verse. Indeed, in the textbooks on theatre speech which coaches in the British theatre have published recently, we find relatively little about actual techniques for dramatic verse; even John Barton's astute and very useful handbook emphasizes pragmatic performance issues over technical ones.¹ But just as the professional musician needs to hear in his/her mind a technically correct performance of the composer's score before s/he can competently interpret it, so also with verse-speaking; a discipline comes before art is feasible.

One must directly confront the technical aspects of dramatic verse if a method of dramatic notation is the object. The first significant interpreter of Shakespeare in our time, Granville Barker, observed that Shakespeare's own stage directions to actors and directors can be perceived only by those with eyes trained to recognize them in his incredibly sophisticated texts.²

In pursuit of his sage advice, we must deal with prosodic details³ that demonstrate what Granville Barker meant and which, in turn, reveal one avenue to dramatic notation.

We find among American actors and directors today only a slight acquaintance with the particulars of prosody.⁴ Once this was not the case; in past generations teachers of literature required their students to parse and scan poetry when studying it. Nowadays, instruction of this sort occurs only in specialized classes in rhetoric or poetics. A young actor consequently comes to the challenge of classical texts in verse without the tools prosodic analysis affords; s/he endeavors to "make sense of it" in terms of dramatic situation and character, ambience and theme (with help from editorial glosses).⁵

Since Shakespeare happens to have been a superb verse technician and a virtuoso at embodying his intentions in the words of a text, such fledgling actors operate under serious limitations--which ultimately may subject them to severe critiques of reviewers who may know little about verse discipline but who do know when they cannot understand the words being spoken on the stage.

If talented young actors do not learn the craft of clean phrasing before entering the profession, they may pick it up from seasoned professional players. Yet these veterans are not given to green-room talk about their comprehension of syntax, or how they acquire the knack of quickly parsing and glossing a new text, but they do demonstrate the appropriate skills in their work as persuasive communicators.⁶ They will also be seen to respect a dramatist's punctuation, take into account the length of verbal phrases and similar stylistic features, and recognize the importance of figurative language. Once noted and learned, these characteristics of good stage speech will carry the young actor through most tests of playing standard prose drama. But they do not suffice in speaking classical texts. To act the classics, and especially Shakespearian drama, a precision of utterance must be acquired to articulate all the values in the verse; it can be done by conscious emulation of good models or by mastering the verbal technics with which prosody deals.

In his cogent commentaries on poetry in *How Does a Poem Mean?*, John Ciardi takes an indirect route in teaching the precepts of prosody. He relies chiefly on the student's fascination with the charged language of poetry to induce a desire to speak it expressively. He explains concepts such as meter in almost an offhand fashion. By contrast, a direct route is adopted by Paul Fussell in *Poetic Meter and Poetic Form*, which authoritatively explicates the phenomena and conventions of English verse.

Both approaches have their merits. The latter method brings out the critical practices and terminology of the prosodist. My argument is that, regardless of which way we prefer to learn of poetry, we can use the fundamentals of prosody to begin building a system of dramatic notation.

The diacritical markings of prosodic notation furnish an existing set of signs that we can use to assist in the study and rehearsal of dramatic texts in verse. These markings do not achieve the level of communication that musical notation does, and so we will need more than prosodic notation to construct a system analogous to that of music.

Allow me to show what I mean. Exhibit 1 is the first 14 lines of *Romeo and Juliet* II ii, "The Balcony Scene." This text comes from the *Riverside Shakespeare*, which Shakespearian scholars regard as the most reliable one-volume edition for the Shakespeare canon. Before us, then, stands the text with which the two actors in the title roles begin. We will see this bit of text subjected to several sorts of notation, but here it is simply itself: a short passage of remarkable dramatic verse.

Exhibit 1
SAMPLE: DRAMATIC NOTATION
Romeo and Juliet II ii

ROMEO
(Advances)

He jests at scars that never felt a wound.

(Enter Juliet above at her window)

But soft, what light at yonder window breaks?

It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.

Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,

5 Who is already sick and pale with grief

That thou, her maid, art far more fair than she.

Be not her maid, since she is envious;

Her vestal livery is but sick and green,

And none but fools do wear it; cast it off.

10 It is my lady, O, it is my love!

O that she knew she were!

She speaks, yet she says nothing; what of that?

Her eye discourses, I will answer it.

I am too bold, 'tis not to me she speaks.

Exhibit 2
 SAMPLE: DRAMATIC NOTATION
Romeo and Juliet II ii

ROMEO
 (Advances)

He jést| at scárs| thát név'r félt| a wóund. #

(Enter Juliet above at her window)

But sóft,|| w'hát líght| at yóndér wíndów bréaks?

Ít ís| thé éást,|| and Júliét ís| thé sún.

Aríse,| fáir sún,|| and kíll| thé énvyíous móón, /

5 Who ís| álréady síck| and pále| wíth gríef ^

Thát thóu,| hér máid,|| art fáir| móre fáir| thán shé.

Bé nó| hér máid,|| sínce shé| ís énvyíous;

Hér véstál lív'ry ís| bú|t síck| and gréén,

And nóne| bú|t fóols| dó wéar| ít;|| cást| ít óff.

10 Ít ís| my fáty,|| Ó,| ít ís| my lóve!

Ó thát| shé k'new| shé wére!

Shé sp'éaks,|| yét shé| sáys nóthíng;|| w'hát| of thát?

Hér éy'e| díscóúses,| I| wíll áñswér ít.

I á'm| too bóld,|| 'tís nó|t to mé| shé sp'éaks.

15

Prosodic Diacritical Markings/Symbols

Breve: short/unstressed syllables ˘

Acute: primary stress(es) /

Grave: secondary stress(es) \

Straight bar: separates feet in lines of verse |

Macron: for long/prolonged sound —

Double-bar: for caesura(s), a light prosodic pause ||
 Virgule: lengthens/prolongs stress /
 Number sign: for completive terminal juncture (full stop) ##
 Caret: brief pause, appropriate at some enjambments ^

Exhibit 2 presents the same text marked with the diacritical symbols of prosodic notation; below the text these markings are identified and briefly described. Put such a marked text before an untutored young actor, saying "learn how to do this," and we hear a dismayed groan. Introduced by degrees, however, it will be accepted and those who aspire to perform classical drama in the theatre will take to it eventually.

The late Edward Saxon, Professor of Expression and Elocution at Transylvania University in the 1930s and early 1940s, taught prosodic notation by degrees. He had himself learned it while a professional actor in classical stock companies whose leaders included Robert Mantell. (This is not Professor Saxon's scansion and analysis of those 14 lines; it is the work of one of his students.) The prosodic diacriticals capture rather well the verse technics which this kind of notation was devised to depict: slight changes in metrical flow, the placement of caesuras and poetical junctures.

When one of Professor Saxon's charges elected to study a role--Romeo, for example--the old classical actor would urge the young man to learn all he could about the first printings of the play, in the form of Quartos and Folios. Saxon himself asserted that he had learned much from examining these texts. (Today a zealous Romeo would find those printings in facsimile editions that most good libraries hold.) This advice would dispatch our ambitious Romeo for a spot of research.

Exhibit 3 reflects what he would find.

Exhibit 3
 SAMPLE: DRAMATIC NOTATION
Romeo and Juliet II ii

ROMEO
 (Advances)

He jests at scars that never felt a wound^o

(Enter Juliet above at her window)

But soft, what light at yonder window breaks?

It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.

- Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,
 5 Who is already sick and pale with grief,
 That thou her maid art far more fair than she.
 Be not her maid, since she is envious.
 Her vestal livery is but sick and green,
 And none but fools do wear it; cast it off.
 10 It is my lady, O, it is my love!
 O that she knew she were!
 She speaks, yet she says nothing; what of that?
 Her eye discourses, I will answer it.
 I am too bold; 'tis not to me she speaks.
- 15

Informal Notations From Folio 1, Quarto 1 and 2
 (After the style of a critical edition)

Scene division not in Q1, Q2, F.
 Stage directions not in Q1, Q2, F.

2. [at] forth Q2: through F.
 8. [sick] pale Q1.
 10, 11. Not in Q1.
 12. [yet] but Q1, Q2.
 13. [discourses] discourseth Q1.

Marks modern punctuation not in early printings which do use the noted punctuation, when added. ①
 Capitalization in early printings. z

The investigation uncovers more than a first-time textual scholar anticipates. He becomes a textual detective and his perception of this passage changes. He immediately sees that modern editors have added scene divisions and supplied stage directions; they also have removed capitalizations which Elizabethans often used to emphasize key words. Next, he notices verbal

differences: in the second line the fifth word is "forth" in Q2 and "through" in the Folio; in the fifth line Q1 gives "pale" instead of "sick;" the tenth and eleventh lines do not appear in Q1, which offers "discourseth" instead of "discourses" in the thirteenth line.

But the most striking disparity among these texts lies in the punctuation. The early printings have much less punctuation. Textual scholars contend, of course, that Elizabethans used fewer punctuation marks and, when they did punctuate, the marks indicate breath pauses or caesuras. In any case, the text will play more quickly without as many junctures as the modern edition shows. Indeed, our Romeo concludes, the passage has received a lesson in proper modern grammar from the editors. But would he want to present a grammatical Romeo? (Even Q1's heedless Romeo, who forgets two of the lines, would be preferable!)

Determined to aim for a brisk tempo, unless Professor Saxon objects, the young actor reports his discoveries. But the professor expresses a veteran's approval. And the next task he would set for this Romeo discloses that this teacher is an eminently practical man of the theatre: *reduce and simplify the diacriticals so that they may be easily seen on a script the actor will use in rehearsal.*

This instruction considerably alters the appearance of the fourteen lines, as we see in Exhibit 4.

Exhibit 4
SAMPLE: DRAMATIC NOTATION
Romeo and Juliet II ii

ROMEO
(Advances)

He jests at scars that never felt a wound.

(Enter Juliet above at her window)

But soft,|| what light at yonder window breaks?

It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.

Arise_x fair sun_x and kill the envious moon,

5 Who is already sick and pale with grief /

That thou_x her maid_x art far more fair than she_x:

Be not her maid_x since she is envious_x

Her vestal livery is but sick and green,
 And none but fools do wear it, cast it off;
 10 It is my lady, O it is my love;
 O that she knew she were! ^
 She speaks, || yet she says nothing, what of that?
 Her eye discourses, I will answer it;
 I am too bold, || 'tis not to me she speaks.

15

Adaptation of Prosodic Notation For Rehearsal

Cancels modern punctuation; note replacement, if any ×
 Heavy Macron (underlining) for primary stress(es)
 Light Macron (underlining) for secondary stress(es)
 Double-bar for caesura(s) ||
 Caret for brief pause, esp. at enjambment ^
 Virgule lengthens, prolongs stress /

(Note: This scansion adopts many details from early printings, esp. the punctuation; e.g., the period at end of line 1. But it discards other details, e.g., keeping the question mark at end of line 12. It also retains the stage directions and scene division, which are in the purview of the director.)

Now the light and heavy macrons that mark stresses jump off the page to an actor's eyes and the sparse punctuation intimates a driven, excited Romeo. But the teacher urges his student to contemplate the verse further before performing it. He instructs that each line moves at a slightly different rate, as a result of unique stress patterns: the eleventh line, which shows only one primary stress and one secondary stress, moves quickest while the twelfth, which has two primary and secondary stresses together with two caesuras, calls for a relatively slow tempo. When the point sinks in to the young actor, the professor observes: "Each line has a distinct rhythm and pace, which is part of the content given to the passage by the poet." Doubtfully the student objects that audiences will never notice such slight details. The teacher concedes this, then adds: "But it will be clearer to them on a first hearing than it would be if you ignored the verse technics and brought out only the

meanings of the words." Indeed, clarity of spoken performance is the most important benefit of an actor's technical study of verse.

Persuaded, our Romeo studies the passage again, looking for other guides to performance in the text which, as Granville Barker asserted, come directly to an actor from the hand of another experienced classical actor, Will Shakespeare. His eye lights on the eleventh line again. It puzzles him because it has only six syllables; isn't that wrong? No, he's told, it is a "short line."⁸ To the veteran of the classical stage, a short line is a signal from the author and the player must decide what it means. Saxon would contend that it may anticipate a piece of stage business, an exit or entrance, or it may be a "written-in pause." Under this coaching, the actor examines the lines once more, and declares that it must be there to allow for Romeo's reaction when he sees Juliet's lips move. His teacher accepts the idea, and goes on to speak of other less noticeable features in the speech which years of performance craft have taught.

The lessons learned in the demanding experience of classical stage performance seem reinforced by illuminating examples. For one, in recordings of modern poets reading their own work, the attentive listener will note their "marking" caesuras (with slight pauses or vocal changes) and treating similarly the unpunctuated line-endings (enjambment) which prosodists consider do not need notation. For another, highly respected verse-speakers like John Gielgud will be found doing the same in recordings.

Recourse to the species of advice and teaching represented by Professor Saxon enables a more complete appreciation of the discipline of verse-speaking. The first steps in the process constitute its *technical phase* whose business is to study the verse in order to accumulate as much accurate data as possible on the text that will be performed. It is conceivable that a widely read actor or director, who is acquainted with classical drama through seeing it competently performed, could achieve the nuances of rhythm and meaning that technical study lends verse-speaking. But working through this technical phase is a surer path to take than the intuitive emulation of good models.

Upon completing the technical phase, the actor will enter the *interpretive phase*. Discussion of this aspect remains problematical, despite the tons of critical writing devoted to it. Professional actors everywhere recognize what we mean by notation, since they have done it themselves in informal jottings and markings--which have such an unsystematic character that a player frequently cannot recall a year later what the signs originally told him/her. But few critics or actors have confidence about the merits of interpretive commentary. This is the realm of theory and criticism, where once respected views on drama undergo "deconstruction" by a later generation and collapse into a shambles of mere opinion.

Yet it is possible to enter that realm and further pursue the notation goal, still relying on the dramatic text for practicable aid.

II Practical Dramaturgy for Rehearsal

The ingenious Germans have given us the term "dramaturgy" to denote the strategies and inferences which theory and criticism develops in the interpretation of texts. Evidently the working theatre finds the term acceptable, because one finds increasing acceptance of dramaturgy as a word to stand for the efforts that precede and lie behind the techniques of performance, the necessity for which the professional actor and director respect. Given this, the job of the theatre critic who hopes to assist the working theatre with issues of interpretation is to devise dramaturgical means that will enable the practitioner to do better what s/he already may do well.

Assuming that notation can become such a means, we must ask what does our technical analysis *not* tell us about a dramatic passage which could conceivably be conveyed by other kinds of notation? In making this inquiry, we do well to bear in mind that professional musicians, who also do not despise technique, depend upon an accessible notation which facilitates interpretation without standing in the way of original renderings of music. It behooves us as well to re-examine the notions of the theatre teacher who has exerted an unrivalled influence on dramatic performance, Constantin Stanislavski. These instructive guides may shed light on how to develop a practical dramaturgy which will function effectively and be understood in the rehearsal hall.

Stanislavski understood the fecklessness of giving performers instruction in dramaturgy. He did not present his theories in conventional arguments, because he knew actors would never sit still for it. Instead, he told stories centering on a small group of actors in training with a masterful teacher-artist named Tortsov. Unhappily, he told so many of these stories that only a handful of actors has read them all--and knowing all of them helps greatly in fully comprehending any one of them. This explains why we see actors fix on some major point in one of Stanislavski's didactic narratives, while they ignore other lessons the Russian master taught.

It is a commonplace among theatre professionals that Stanislavski defined modern acting; he wrote its "grammar," as many of them have asserted. Be that as it may, Stanislavski never seems to get credit for his related achievement of setting definitively a model for teaching and training actors. In his "pedagogical novels" beginning with *An Actor Prepares*, his Tortsov absorbs aspirant players so fully in exercises, games, drills, and specific interpretive tasks that they don't realize he is conditioning them to accept the theory which lies behind it all. We acknowledge the impact which his teaching has had upon modern acting, but even so we overlook the substantial fact that Stanislavski showed us how to convey dramatic theory to young people with theatrical talent. Ever since Stanislavski established his model, the most successful and influential teachers have followed it, even when they disagreed with aspects of his underlying theory.⁹

Directors and acting teachers follow Stanislavski because, of course, the Tortsov model works. Only in recent years have cognitive scientists begun to discover why it works so well.¹⁰

Before cognitive science made its entrance into the intellectual arena in the 1970s, preceding psychologists and philosophers had questioned the common proposition about artists: i.e., painters and actors and musicians don't think--they intuit. The precursors of cognitive science replaced that explanation with another: artists think--but they think differently ("non-discursively," as Susanne K. Langer put it in *Philosophy in a New Key and Feeling and Form*). Briefly, this new position teaches us that artists think in terms of images, feelings, and tones which they transmute into expressive forms.

Ahead of his time in this and other respects, Stanislavski employed a similar understanding when he invented the Tortsov model. To recapitulate that model, the teacher engages the minds of actors in tested demonstrations of his performance theory; the students personally experience and verify for themselves the value of his precepts, which he (Stanislavski) then has Tortsov explicate. He probably expected that the students would retain the experience and forget most of the explication; it still happens today. But the Moscow Art Theatre master clearly saw that a theoretical principle needs to be presented to incipient theatre artists with an immediacy, an apparent simplicity, and an imaginative flexibility which allows the students to grasp, apply, and justify it during a working process. The key to the teaching strategy rests in the keen knowledgeable ability of the master teacher.

To transfer the merits of this strategy into the realm of dramaturgy, it follows that we need to create an analogue to deal with criticism and theory in the preparation of performance or in the classroom.

Ordinarily, theorists and critics of the drama do not admit the pertinence of such an analogue. They customarily address themselves to other theorists and critics--kinds of address which will leave most actors and theatre practitioners cold and uninterested. If we would influence practical work in theatre, and make dramaturgy relevant there, we must learn from Stanislavski's teaching strategy. We must learn even to deny theoretical presumptions, as Bertolt Brecht the Director denied Bertolt Brecht the Theorist in rehearsals of the Berliner Ensemble.¹¹

We can begin construction of an analogue by literally taking pages out of Stanislavski's book *An Actor Prepares*, at the point when the subject is play analysis. Tortsov shows the class how to divide a drama into small pieces, and then to give each piece an evocative title (in largely nominative language); next, he has them select the infinitive of a concrete verb to express the momentary thrust of the dramatic action in this little piece. Eventually, the seventh chapter of *An Actor Prepares* stipulates, they will do the same for larger segments of the drama. As the first section of *Creating a Role* demonstrates, finally as actors they will give the whole play a subjectively

chosen title and a phrase centering upon a concrete verb's evocation of the whole dramatic action; i.e., the "super-objective."

Actors the world over have mastered this means of analyzing a play and have found it extremely useful. For the most part dramaturgy has passed over it, probably because the significance of the concept underlying this tactic was not perceived. When seriously taken, however, that concept demands attention.

Stanislavski proposes here that small, momentary dramas ("small actions") interlink to comprise larger dramatic units, which in turn compose still larger units (the acts of a play) and they, in turn, constitute the whole work. In studying a script, an actor is to name each of these parts and choose the infinitive of a concrete verb to invoke the dramatist's intention. This process of script study accumulates until the actor creates (in his/her list of titles and verbal phrases) the "score of the role." This score amounts to a valuable summary of the actor's interpretation of the drama.

Perhaps familiarity with this device in dramatic analysis has caused us to give token recognition of its usefulness without inquiring further into its validity; that is, we tend to say that is something actors like to do and give it little thought. But it merits critical attention, if only because in "the score of the role" and "the score of the play" Stanislavski consciously formed an analogue to musical practice and its notational system. He does not point this out and, because his own education did not equip him to presume that he was proposing a theory, he left out the most interesting part.

At length we have learned, however, what he left out: that the infinitive of the concrete verb an actor chooses for this score needs always to convey future import.¹² The implications arrest the attention of the dramaturge. Since Schiller, dramaturgy takes it for granted that the dramatic is the mode of the present tense--a "perpetual present tense," as Thornton Wilder put it. Stanislavski's underlying theory replaces that notion with the concept of an impending future. Wittingly or not, dramatists create characters who aspire toward an intently desired future condition and the score of the role charts the course a character pursues on a moment-by-moment basis. In Jackson Barry's shrewd summative gloss, s/he "strives." Susanne K. Langer, in her study published in 1953, *Feeling and Form*, unfolds the pertinence of this new dramaturgic principle:

Drama, though it implies past actions (the "situation"), moves not toward the present, as narrative does, but toward something beyond; it deals essentially with commitments and consequences. Persons, too, in drama are purely agents--whether consciously or blindly, makers of the future. This future, which is made before our eyes, gives importance to the very beginnings of dramatic acts . . . It has been said repeatedly that the theater creates a perpetual present moment; but it is only a present filled with its own future that is

really dramatic. A sheer immediacy, an imperishable direct experience without the ominous forward movement of consequential action, would not be so. . . . the dramatic is the mode of destiny.¹³

Other implications of some value to dramatic theory, which the "system" works out carefully, need not detain us.¹⁴

A demonstration will help to clarify this concept of dramatic action. Let us turn again to the opening of *Romeo and Juliet* II ii. These fourteen lines comprise, in Stanislavski's dramaturgy, a "small action" or a little dramatic unit. By common consent the large dramatic unit in the play's structure is "The Balcony Scene." But what shall we name this smallest of the twenty units which link to each other to create the entire scene? If it must have a title, one which would catch both the contrasts and the central metaphor of the passage would be: "Sunrise by Moonlight."

The second requirement the System places on an interpreter, we recall, is the selection of the infinitive of a concrete verb which implies a future; this must be done for each small and large action unit, in order to take its place in the score of the role. To simplify the demonstration, we will not seek a verbal phrase for Juliet, who in the System would be perceived as active in the unit, although she does not speak; we will concentrate on Romeo. As we contemplate his aspirations in the passage, we begin to see what many actors have seen: it isn't as easy as it looks to settle upon the right words. We try several infinitives and dismiss them as not sufficiently telling; they do not express Romeo's desires with enough specificity and consequentiality. Finally, we satisfy ourselves that the best we can do prior to the tests of rehearsal is "to make contact." Our infinitive-based verbal phrase becomes: "Romeo wants to make direct contact with Juliet." The phrase is satisfactory because, as with the majority of verbal phrases for small units in a Stanislavskian score, it states the action theme of the tiny drama within the tragedy although the character does not fulfill it; i.e., Romeo does not, in the course of the unit, make direct contact with Juliet, even if that is his aspiration, but this "objective" informs the performance of the speech Shakespeare has given the character.

The process of making the score for the Romeo character is under way. The Stanislavskian actor will conduct this study for every unit in which s/he appears; experience shows that this will bring him/her to rehearsal very well prepared, by contrast with actors who do not use the Stanislavskian "break-down."

The demonstration provokes a question: Given that an actor will do this methodical study of a role's text, would a dramaturge do an analysis in such minute detail? The question of itself causes us to realize that a dramaturge's interests in a script lie typically with concerns about the play as a whole, whereas an actor's interests lie typically with the moment-by-moment specifics. Yet it is reasonable to suggest that a dramaturge would at least respect the actor's work, if s/he recognized the validity of the theory underlying it; i.e.,

that the actor's score furnishes a parallel to the notation for an elaborate piece of music. Certainly anyone interested in the potentials of dramatic notation would be curious to find if musicology recognizes related concepts.

It is logical, then, to consult the standard authoritative reference to which musicians defer, *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. In it we find:

The concept of notation may be regarded as including formalized systems of signalling between musicians and systems of memorizing and teaching music with spoken syllables, words or phrases.¹⁵

The beginning of this lengthy disquisition on musical notation establishes as fact a dependence upon concentrated verbal phrases to convey meanings to interpreters of music--a practice with which Stanislavski, a fairly accomplished musical amateur, was well acquainted. The first statement in this Grove entry also reminds us of the image of Salieri perusing scores composed by Mozart in the Milos Forman film.

The most recent edition of Grove goes on to advise us:

As a means of communication, [notation] preserves music over a long period; it facilitates performance by those not in contact with the composer; it makes possible a complexity of interaction between large numbers of performers that could not be achieved by aural means . . . it presents music as a 'text' for study and analysis, and offers the student the means of bringing it to life in his mind when no performance is possible; and it serves the theorist as a medium by which to demonstrate musical or acoustical laws.

We must acknowledge that musical notation carries out this impressive list of accomplishments. A similarly effective mode of communication should be a desideratum in dramaturgy.

The reference informs us that a musician considers all signs in a score as notational elements. For the purposes of a system of dramatic notation, let us adopt a convention, which allows for the authorial identity of the dramatist's dialogue (distinct from other signs or markings imposed on a text by a publisher, printer, or whomever): *dramatic notation* will denote all signs or expressions that interpreters use in scrutinizing a playwright's text.

Aware now that Stanislavski knowingly borrowed the conception of script study for actors from music, we need to know whether and how music theory sheds additional light on possibilities for dramatic notation.

A search in musicological writings encounters impedance. The Grove reference addresses the musically adept, and many of its distinctions serve to cloud rather than illumine interpretive issues in theatre. Authors of music theory who address the general public could be more helpful. Such a work is

Willi Apel's *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, which yields in its notation entry this provocative observation:

A fully developed system of notation must be so designed as to clearly indicate the two main properties of musical sound: its pitch and its duration.

The first words of Apel's sentence describe the desirable end, "a fully developed system of notation." The other words which catch the eye of one seeking dramaturgical means are, naturally, "two main properties."

In the 1968 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, another musicologist concurs with Apel on the necessity of representing in notation the relationship of pitch and duration "of musical sounds that are successive and those that are simultaneous." The *Britannica* adds that "even the most sophisticated notations only approach exactitude."

These strictures in music theory might seem impossible in drama, since no theorist has celebrated two main properties in dramatic action. But we have only to think of the plays of Shakespeare or Chekhov to recognize equivalents to musical phenomena that are "successive" and others that occur "simultaneously." And even though music commenced the invention of its notation system in the fourteenth century, we are advised and warned that notation only approaches exactitude; that is to say, who can say precisely what distinction should be made between a composer's notation of "piano" and another of "pianissimo"? It means that notation may be expected to operate descriptively; it need not be definitive.

Earlier, we concluded that the problem of dramaturgy consists in not communicating as effectively to practitioners as musicians can do through their notation. To put it another way, a musical score can be read and performed competently by an intellectual lackwit, if s/he possesses what a cognitive scientist has termed "musical intelligence." John Lahr is only one of many who has commented upon actors' inability to win an "intellectual" grasp of profound dramatic material (Bert Lahr's lack of comprehension of *Waiting for Godot*), but who could perform it brilliantly after adequate rehearsal. In the same coin, we can say that a remarkable dramatic critic, A.C. Bradley, altogether missed crucial ideas in his discussions of Shakespeare's works because he lacked some faculty to imagine how certain plays in the canon work in performance.

Stanislavski's method of dividing a play into its pieces, in order to discover the nature of minutiae in the unfolding dramatic action, cuts through the verbiages of dramaturgy. It yields a critical instrument that actors understand and can use despite the fractious circumstances which arise in rehearsal halls. Stanislavski's liberal borrowing from music theory leads us to examine fundamental features in musical notation. Having tested the refinements which prosodic notation can lend to the interpretation of dramatic

texts, we are encouraged to consider further a method of dramatic notation that satisfies the demands of notation systems and contributes to the analogy of the Tortsov model.

This inquiry finds what it seeks, I submit, in Bernard Beckerman's seminal theoretical contribution, *Dynamics of Drama*. In the first chapter of his book, Beckerman arrives at definitions of terms, in which he essentially embraces the concept of drama as action. He elaborates upon it in considerable detail, offering a critical account which one must admire for its impressive grasp of historical theory on the one hand and for its genuine comprehension of the working theatre on the other. We of the theatre must acknowledge our indebtedness to him for asserting and proving the validity of the theatre as an art, for hacking his way through forests of theorist's obtusities, and emerging with formulations that convince by their acumen and practical aid to our work in the volatile medium of theatre.

Yet for all its sophistication and persuasive process, *Dynamics* falls short in one way that Beckerman did not anticipate: the people of the working theatre did not understand or respond to it. Though that was disappointing, it does not mean that his work went for naught. We can use his propositions in continuing efforts to discover useful elements in the means of dramaturgy.

One of the most suggestive ideas in *Dynamics* appears in Beckerman's elucidation of *Hedda Gabler*. Writing about the constant flux of action in the drama, he specifies "tendencies" that are "reactive" or "active." He observes:

No drama consists wholly of active or reactive tendencies. Even within brief units of action qualities of both activeness and reaction always exist. How, then, can we distinguish one tendency from another? Distinctions are based on emphasis, the active segment depending upon continuing pressure, the reactive segment upon an initial charge that sets off a chain response. It is a matter of the *kind* of energy exerted to reach the crux.¹⁶

At another point in his book, Beckerman writes of "contrasting vectors." One type of vector, he says, "promises confrontation" when the "action moves toward a crux." That is what he specified in the quoted passage above as the active tendency. The other type of vector he distinguishes points "not toward a confrontation but toward some sort of sustained emotional release." That is the crucial import of the reactive tendency. In sum, he seeks here to discriminate among predominating properties of dramatic action. And, in the jargon of the rehearsal hall, he succeeds in establishing a polarity recognized there: the difference between "action" and "reaction."

Beckerman's insight holds great critical value. Note his discursive strategy: in discriminating among the properties of drama, he chooses to describe rather than define. As we know, the conventional discursive strategy in dramaturgy is the objective, omniscient mode of deduction. "I hold such-

and-such principle to be so," or "I define so-and-so to be this or that," and in those terms, by comparison of actual instances with the deduced principle or definition: "It follows that such-and-such meets/ does not meet the criteria." Deduction is a powerful instrument in reasoning.

But at this juncture in his argument Beckerman relies upon accurate observation and the inductive mode of thought. He is in distinguished company in this decision, the company of empirical thinkers from Aristotle to Einstein. Empiricists use both modes, turning to the inductive to deal with details and to the deductive to generalize upon all observed instances.

A review of the foregoing citations from musicologists reveals why Beckerman elects the inductive. Problematical phenomena in music defy adequate definition; ninety-nine out of a hundred musicologists prefer to describe accurately in dealing with such mysteries as rhythm and melody. They adopt, in short, a phenomenological approach to treat the indefinable. We need to learn from the theorists in the senior critical field of the performing arts.

There is a semantic problem, however. How can we clearly communicate with each other about these aspects of drama when we make double usage of one word: action? *We* know what we mean when we say something like: "In this moment of the action Romeo reacts to Juliet's action"--but eventually the double-usage will make for confusion. I will argue that we need two nouns as terms which are mutually exclusive in meaning to represent the distinction Beckerman identifies in what he is careful to call "dramatic activity."

This inquiry proposes two words for that office. The first comes to the mind of any student who profited from study of Francis Fergusson's *The Idea of a Theater*. In his discussions Fergusson proposes "histrionic sensibility" as a quality required to understand dramatic action; it is, he writes, "a form of perception" peculiar to drama and theatre. Hence, I nominate *perception* as a dramaturgical term to stand for what Beckerman describes as the "reactive tendency." For its companion term, a word which enjoys a special status in American rehearsal halls seems appropriate to designate the "active tendency": *choice*. Actors frequently say that they find themselves fumbling with a dramatic moment until they discover a telling choice which illuminates the moment for them.

In musical notation, we have found, a "fully developed system of notation" must have the capacity to indicate "two main properties." In his theoretical discourse, Beckerman distinguishes them, and to facilitate their clear usefulness this inquiry substitutes these terms. The implication should be evident.

This is to propose that a dramatic action consists of choices and perceptions. Dramatists of talent conceive a play as a dialectic featuring these two properties or tendencies. In the theatre we express the intentions of dramatists by personifying one or the other in the push-and-pull of performance energies.

A system of dramatic notation that deals descriptively with elusive phenomena in dramatic texts, and reinforces a search for an analogue to the Tortsov model, becomes feasible if we can find a way to represent clearly these significant distinctions.

III Tests of a Dramatic Notation System

History can make fools of us all, they say, if we overlook the meanings in what has passed before our own time. More than a few historians may well be embarrassed by the fascinating accounts Joseph Roach gives in *The Player's Passion*. Through his research into the conceptions of the human body and its emotions which reigned from the Renaissance to the middle of the nineteenth century, Roach reveals some authentic meanings of dramatic passages and of observations made by witnesses of historical performances. He enables us to correct misconstructions and biased assumptions passed on by less careful historians.

In spite of our best efforts to transmit to succeeding generations a picture of our theatre today, the ephemerality of the most memorable moments on the stage will plague us. Although we keep in mind the proven merits of musical notation--its preservation of music over long periods, its facilitation of communication among performers, its capacity to bring to life compositions not yet played--history will throw a veil over the theatre of our time which only occasional interpreters can lift. It could even make fools of us for presuming to try to annotate artistic endeavors.

In sum, there is a limit to what a system of notation can do. Sir George Solti has on the conductor's podium the music for Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, and it has the same form and detail that Lorin Maazel uses to lead another orchestra. Why, then, when the Beethoven work is performed does the Chicago Symphony sound like an ominous storm and the Cleveland Symphony sound like a reasoned debate among fervent patriots? The interpretations stand in contrast, of course. Even the comparatively comprehensive system of musical notation does not apparently limit the interpretive range of Solti or Maazel.

This point must be made since there are theatre practitioners who distrust the idea of dramatic notation for fear it will constrict interpretive freedom. An adequate notation system for drama, just as for music, would assist rather than constrict interpretation; it identifies specifics more exactly, it does not perform them. If somehow a dramatic notation system becomes established and playwrights employ it after the manner adopted by composers of music, interpreters would ignore it at some peril to their reputations among the knowledgeable. In the case of a particular production with a particular purpose, authorially endorsed notation could be passed over in whole or part, but that decision should be made in full awareness of the author's expressed intentions. Scholars in music, some of whom devote much time to recovering

the original notation of certain scores, can point to numerous examples of artful alteration of musical works by gifted performers, for one reason or another. So far this problem appears in the theatre's domain chiefly in relation to changes in a dramatist's text; to be sure, if a dramatic notation system won acceptance, it would figure to support the views of playwrights.

Notation facilitates, first, a technical comprehension of aesthetic materials; second, it illustrates for the interpreter the results of his/her study of the text. It won't mis-lead the interpreter unless s/he mis-uses it. A prosodist can scan Romeo's line thus:

It is my *lady*, O it is my *love*!

And it can still be performed by the actor thus:

It is MY lady, Ooooh! it is MY love.

No one will arrest the actor, and some may even praise him for his originality. He will have changed poetry into prose, and taken away an inherent power in Shakespeare's writing. The chances are, of course, that such maulings of the Bard stem from ignorance of verse technics instead of knowing rebellion: ignorance gives license, we may say.

Regrettable instances aside, it is appropriate to ask, what would dramatic notation assist one to see and what would it identify? Forgetting for the moment Beckerman's discernment of two tendencies in dramatic action, but remembering that he resorted to the descriptive procedure of an empiricist, what would dramatic notation describe? This inquiry concludes that it would describe what a dramatic text embodies in each particular passage: *discernible behavior*. The dramatist's inventions in a script are of two kinds--the words of dialogue which audiences hear and complementary dramatic activity which audiences sense and see. It is the business of interpretation to render both kinds of invention in tangible, expressive forms, and "discernible behavior" conveys as much, empirically speaking. We are dealing with the "symbol system" of drama, according to the philosophical project of Nelson Goodman, whose innovative book *Languages of Art* has influenced many theorists in interpretation.¹⁷

From this empirical perspective, then, the dramatist's gift is an innate sense for the invention of discernible behavior. A few succeed in displaying this gift more resonantly than others. The texts that dramatists create require, in turn, public performance before their content can be fully realized. Some performances succeed in fulfilling a dramatic text better than others. The reason for the successful performances arises primarily from the way actors derive their interpretations of a text from their understanding of what it embodies, which they then transform into *expressive behavior*.

Most of us can claim that we have encountered more interesting definitions of acting than this. But "expressive behavior" is not a definition; it is an empirical description of what actors do on the stage. The journeyman actor exhibits expressive behavior only at dynamic moments in a drama; virtuosos like Kean reserve their greatest effects for favorite or climactic scenes; the finest actor-artists emit very nearly a consistent stream of modulated expressive behavior. We count just a few in this last category--the Duses, the Chaplins, the Chaliapins and that is the level all others strive to attain.

Dramatic notation can help, in the same sense that good voice placement, a fluently conditioned body, and an attuned sense of proportion can help to attain artistry in acting. The concept of notation advocated in this essay points to a technical phase in textual analysis, then to an interpretive phase. Finally there is the work of application, and to appreciate the tasks it entails we will turn again to Bernard Beckerman.

In the interests of unambiguous communication in the rehearsal hall, this dramaturgical investigation proposes Perception and Choice as terms to stand for Beckerman's discrimination of contrasting major tendencies in dramatic action. It remains to explicate in more detail what those terms signify.

In the passage from *Dynamics of Drama* cited earlier, Beckerman observes in commenting on the two tendencies that "it is a matter of the *kind* of energy." In a subsequent essay he illuminates what he means.¹⁸ He speaks there of "the connective energy that transforms data into information" from which inferences can be drawn. He illustrates the point:

The actor playing Macbeth must say the words agreeing to kill Duncan. He has no other choice unless he writes a new play. But he must act moment to moment as though Macbeth *could* reject Lady Macbeth's urging. Thus, in the face of Lady Macbeth's insistence, the actor must project a continuous stream of energy that registers his resistance to her words. That is, as we are aware of her energy, we must also be made aware of an explicit or implicit counter-energy. Such energy and counter-energy in an exchange must, furthermore, allow spatial and temporal incompletions and irresolutions.¹⁹

This is vivid. Just as effective scansion notes the relative force of stresses in a line, Beckerman is telling us that a relative degree of energy modulates the strength in what here has been called a Perception or Choice.

The piece of a dramatic text embodying a Choice imparts a decision in the making; the energy is aggressive or insistent, which dramatizes a vital import: the character knows fully what s/he is doing. By contrast, the text embodies a Perception when it shows a character in a process of response;

the energy moves inward, into the psyche, from "an initial charge that sets off a chain response."

Propositions of this sort about interpretation of dramatic texts need to be tested in a rehearsal laboratory, as Stanislavski abundantly proved. The propositions presented here have for some years undergone such tests in a succession of classroom laboratories: those tests would obviously not bear mentioning if they failed to manifest some merit in the notions in question. The actors involved in these tests favored the following terse summaries of the two sides in the theatrical dialectic: *Choice denotes a decision* (voluntary). *Perception evokes inference* (involuntary). Less tersely, the character in the first state has an awareness of what s/he says and does, while the character in the second state speaks or acts before being aware of it.

After many trials and associated errors, the laboratories settled upon a simple marking of the text at the point when a new dramatic tendency appears: a small circle for a Choice, a small triangle for a Perception. As in musical notation, these marks mean that the represented kind of energy will prevail for the particular character until a new notation signals another stimulus.

The experimental process eventually referred to concepts of prosodic notation, and this query emerged: Now that it is possible to specify the kinds of dramatic energy, can the notion of relative stress be incorporated into the notation? After much disputation, the most practicable means of realizing this intention turned out to be simply filling in the small circle or triangle according to the degree of energy foreseen.

The laboratory consensus held that the Stanislavskian notations for textual units could also be included. This brought the laboratory a surprising discovery, as a consequence of debates over precisely when a small unit began or ended. The debates centered on momentary surges of dramatic energy within an established small unit; it was as if Beckerman's identification of modulations in dramatic energy had sensitized us to notice fluctuations in the energy flow that we had not sensed before. Such a change occurs in *Romeo and Juliet* II ii at the end of the first line (when Romeo sees Juliet), and another occurs after the short line (when Romeo thinks Juliet's lips have moved). Dubious that we had in fact found a previously unremarked manifestation in dramatic dialogue, we examined many other passages in Shakespeare's plays and in the plays of other dramatists, in prose and verse: this small phenomenon appeared persistently, particularly when the kind of energy within a unit shifted, i.e., from a Perception to a Choice. It was initially a startling feature of discernible action in texts, but it seemed to be undeniably present in what a physicist might call the microstructure of the moment-by-moment dramatic process. We decided finally to invent a term to designate these little changes in the dramatic energy: *Shift(s)*.

Returning to the start of the second scene of the second act in Shakespeare's *Lamentable Tragedie*, the last exhibit offers the several dramaturgical means in the system of dramatic notation that we have so far developed.

Exhibit 5
 SAMPLE: DRAMATIC NOTATION
Romeo and Juliet II ii

ROMEO
 (Advances)

Sunrise by Moonlight
 'To make direct contact
 with Juliet'

- He jests at scars that never felt a wound.
 (Enter Juliet above at her window)
- △ But soft, what light at yonder window breaks?
 It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.
Arise_x fair sun_x and kill the envious moon,
- 5 Who is already sick and pale with grief /
 That thou_x her maid_x art far more fair than she.
- △ Be not her maid, || since she is envious_x,
 Her vestal livery is but sick and green,
 And none but fools do wear it; cast it off_x: >
- ▲ It is my lady, || O_x it is my love!
 O that she knew she were! > ~
- She speaks, || yet she says nothing_x || what of that?
 Her eye discourses, I will answer it.
- △ I am too bold, || 'tis not to me she speaks.
- 15

Dramatic Notation System

Light ruled line marks boundaries of unit ———

Shift >

Unstressed Perception ▲

Heavily stressed Perception ▲

Unstressed Choice ○

Slightly stressed Choice ●

Point of action in Short Line ~

NB: When actors/directors gain experience in using this and/or similar notation, they simplify it further by reducing the prosodic notation (asserting they sense it as a matter of course).

With the notation complete, the actor/director proceed with the application phase, *considering how to perform what s/he has found through textual study*. For the notation does not tell how to perform pieces of text; it merely identifies the discernible behavior and scans the text after the manner of prosody. The actor/director has yet to find ways to transmute these data into expressive behavior. Neither the title and the verbal phrase or the Perception and Choice marks show the player what to do, although they suggest that something needs to be done. Indeed, the notation may change in the course of rehearsal, in response to the interpretations of other actors and the comments of the director (it is wise to do the notation in pencil to ease making these changes, we found). Stanislavski gave a name to this "fine tuning" in rehearsal: Adaptation.

Fortunately, it worked outside the classroom laboratory, in rehearsals of productions staged over the last ten years. Participants in the laboratory found it especially helpful in preparing productions of plays by Shakespeare, Chekhov, and Ibsen.

As to the last exhibit, your or my assent to this particular notation is not the point, since it can be changed. Every interpreter will do a slightly different notation for a given scene, just as every good actor will perform a role in his/her own style. The practical value of this dramatic notation lies in the benefits to the player or director. Clearly, it enables a very specific order of textual study--"homework," actors term it.

Could this system of dramatic notation be employed to record the characteristics of a specific performance, in pursuit of the purposes of theatre semiotics? That remains to be seen. It has not as yet been put to that test.

Might the formulations and premises on which the notation founds itself serve to enhance or complement dramaturgy? No such claims are made for it. The system grew out of an investigation of prosodic notation and Stanislavski's conception of the score of a role and of a play. At this point in time, the case for this form of dramatic notation depends upon its utility alone, not upon its theoretical validity.

One cannot help pointing out, however, that the experiments in the classroom laboratories which tested the system suggest that it meets requirements of the Tortsov analogue. That potential needs to be explored further. We must acknowledge that the system doesn't treat all aspects of textual study in drama as thoroughly as musical notation does. It gives the actor and

director an apparatus with which s/he can start to envision with some precision the particulars that performance will bring alive.

This is not the time to recount the rewards one realizes from applying a system like this to the study of different texts by one dramatist, or texts from various historical periods. The work that has been done in this direction has yielded fascinating results, illuminating especially problems in style. This kind of notation appears to allow feasible discussions of rhythms in a play or performance; in other words the discussions could not be fairly described as abstract; they are rather "hands-on," specific considerations of textual nuances. Those who have used the system nod in recognition when they hear about the classroom laboratory which argued heatedly for a week about the notation for Hamlet's first soliloquy. It is indeed a pleasure to an ex-student of Edward Saxon, to an admirer of Granville Barker and Stanislavski, and to a colleague of Bernard Beckerman to observe such concern over the niceties in a dramatic masterwork.

On that note, the case for dramatic notation at this point in its development can be left for further debate or embellishment.

University of Illinois, U-C

Notes

1. The reference is to textbooks written admirably in most respects, by people like Kristin Linklater and Cicely Berry. John Barton's *Playing Shakespeare*, drawn in large part from a U.K. television series, relates more directly to issues raised by this paper.

2. See especially Granville Barker's *Prefaces to Shakespeare*.

3. The *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Alex Preminger ed; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, give the most comprehensive recent treatment to prosody and related subjects. This essay relies on its descriptions and discussions.

A broad and useful review of prosodic concerns is offered by Chard Powers Smith in *Pattern and Variation in Poetry*. New York: Scribner's, 1932.

4. Robert Benedetti's acting textbook, *The Actor at Work*, is among the few that deal with the analysis of dramatic verse.

5. Some schools and professional theatre companies insist upon technically correct verse-speaking; e.g., the American Conservatory Theatre (San Francisco), The Guthrie Theatre, Hartford Stage, the Stratford Festival. Directors of these theatres have told me that at auditions they first eliminate actors who do not speak verse competently.

6. An example of the seasoned actor's knowledge comes when Alec Guinness, in *Blessings in Disguise*, reports Martita Hunt's coaching. Guinness writes (54-55): "She put a swift stop to my amateur, cliché-ridden attitudes, my frequent false emphasis, and helped me to think, as an actor, what I was speaking. (Very rarely do I rely on any rule of thumb but Martita gave me one, at that time, which has stood me in good stead. Unless there is a reason to the contrary, she taught me that, in speaking, the verb, which is the driving force of a sentence, should have first importance, then the noun, and that the adjectives and adverbs would take care of

themselves and that personal pronouns should never be emphasized except in special circumstances.)" In short, Ms. Hunt gave him a lesson in parsing.

7. *The First Folio of Shakespeare* ("The Norton Facsimile"), Charlton Hinman ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1968

Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto: A Facsimile Edition of Copies found primarily in the Henry E. Huntington Library, Michael J.B. Allen and Kenneth Muir eds. Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1981

8. The honored Cambridge don, George Rylands, in his respected *Words and Poetry* (London: Hogarth Press, 1928) gives generous attention to Shakespeare's short lines as "a particular point in versification" (166-169). In fact, one of Rylands' instances is the fifth line in *Romeo and Juliet* II ii.

Another view of short lines appears throughout Richard Flatter's *Shakespeare's Producing Hand: A Study of his Marks of Expression to be found in the First Folio*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1948.

See also Fredson Bowers' "Establishing Shakespeare's Text: Notes on Short Lines and the Problem of Verse Division" in *Studies in Bibliography*, Vol. 33, Univ. of Virginia Press, 1980. As a textual scholar Bowers appreciates several values of short lines with regard to the style in which verse passages are printed. He makes no reference to the significance classical actors see in them.

9. Consider, for example, the ideas and work of Michel Saint-Denis, who explicitly disputed Stanislavski's thinking (see *Theatre: The Rediscovery of Style*); consider as well the teaching of Lee Strasberg, who knowingly altered Stanislavski's theory (see Robert Lewis, *Method or Madness?* and Elia Kazan, *A Life*). Both of these famous acting teachers used regimens seemingly patterned after Stanislavski's; i.e., occupying students wholly with a variety of tasks and improvisations as a means of demonstrating an implicit theory. In the case of Saint-Denis, the theory is one Jacques Copeau derived from Diderot. In the case of Strasberg, The Method stems from illusionistic strains in Romanticist thought and Zola-esque naturalism.

10. See Howard Gardner's *Frames of Mind*, esp. Chap. 9. Gardner is a cognitive scientist with a keen interest in the arts. *Frames of Mind* presents his theory of Multiple Intelligences.

11. In the last chapters of *Bertolt Brecht: Chaos According to Plan*, John Fuegi vividly reconstructs Berliner Ensemble rehearsals in which this denial occurred repeatedly. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

12. Elsewhere I have reviewed the crucial importance of "aspect" in Russian verbs and their relationship to Stanislavski's System. See my "Central Conceptions in Stanislavski's System," *ETJ* May 1973.

13. *Feeling and Form* 307. Because the English translation of *An Actor Prepares* did not deal with the significance of Russian verb aspects, Ms. Langer did not know that her analysis of the dramatic modes paralleled Stanislavski's.

14. An intriguing, little-known fact is that "motivation" is not a term in Stanislavski's System. Rather, the equivalent operative term is "aspiration." The dramatic character continually aspires toward the "super-objective."

15. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Vol. 13. Ed. Stanley Sadie; London: Macmillan, 1980. See Notation entry, 334. Other citations from the same source appear below.

16. *Dynamics* 97.

17. Fergusson, *The Idea of a Theater* 236.

18. *Languages of Art* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.) See also Goodman's *Ways of Worldmaking*.

19. "Theatrical Perception," *Theatre Research International*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (May 1979) 162.

**THE
SOUTHERN
QUARTERLY**

A Journal of the Arts
in the South

Special Issues

Women and Textiles in the Nineteenth-Century South

Edited by Anita Stamper

Fall 1988 (\$4)

Erskine Caldwell

Edited by Edwin T. Arnold

Spring 1989 (\$4)

Subscriptions \$9 (one year); \$16 (two years)

The Southern Quarterly
University of Southern Mississippi
Southern Station, Box 5078
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5078