

Making the Invisible Visible: Peter Brook's Productions of *The Tempest*

Peter Brook's seminal influence on theatre after World War II is universally acknowledged. Already a decade ago a critic predicted:

If at the turn of this century Constantin Stanislavsky was the great patriarchal figure not only of Russian but of world theatre, there is little doubt that Peter Brook will dominate the close of this century when he will be seventy five. Brook is among those who see that deep change is necessary but he no longer believes that conventional theatre can provide such change¹.

Since his controversially discussed *Marat/Sade* of 1964 and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* of 1970, both of which established Brook as the most daring among the directors of the RSC, and after the subsequent foundation of the International Center for Theatre Creation (ICTC), Brook's productions have been received as both courageous and sensitive efforts to stake out the theatrically possible. *Orghast*, which he directed at Persepolis in 1971, *The Conference of the Birds* which premièred in 1973, *The Tragedy of Carmen* in 1981, as well as the spectacular *Mahabharata*-project of 1985 have been acclaimed as landmarks of contemporary theatre. With these productions Brook also helped to pave the way for an understanding of the experimental work of younger innovative directors such as Ariane Mnouchkine, Pina Bausch, or Robert Wilson. In 1990, the ICTC made headlines again with *The Tempest*. Although this production premièred at Zürich, it had been prepared at the Théâtre des Bouffes du Nord in

Paris which since 1974 has served as the home base of Peter Brook's international company.

However, a survey of the most favourable reviews which *The Tempest* received in 1990, as well as on its subsequent tour, still leaves one wondering. The reviews give the impression that after many years of exploration of what theatre can be, the mature director Brook eventually did turn to what is considered by many as Shakespeare's most mature play, to the Bard's farewell to the stage and to his legacy to the world. What is never mentioned though is that Brook has directed no other play more often than *The Tempest*. There is not only the production of 1990. Brook staged *The Tempest* as early as 1957, and in the same year he took this interpretation of the play to the Théâtre des Nations Festival at Paris. Altogether, Brook has directed *The Tempest* four times; after 1957 again in 1963. Both these productions were done for Stratford and the meanwhile founded RSC respectively; both were transferred to London subsequently. Thereafter, Brook returned to *The Tempest* in 1968, in the same year in which he published his seminal study *The Empty Space*. He staged this version of *The Tempest* because Jean-Louis Barrault had asked him to contribute a Shakespeare production to the Théâtre des Nations-Festival, and it is then that the history of Brook's "French" or rather "non-British" approaches to *The Tempest* did begin.

The gap of more than two decades which was to follow thereafter encompasses the years in which Brook experimented with the ICTC. In this phase he expanded his concept of a "holy theatre" – the seminal ideas of which he had outlined in *The Empty Space* – into the understanding of performance as a "communion" between actors and audience, as an attempt to make the invisible visible². And it is because of this that the 1990 production of *The Tempest*, the return to his favourite Shakespeare play, gains in weight. There is no need to stylize the 1990 production into the sum and summery of Brook's work. However, against the background of the previous stagings, *The Tempest* of

1990 does provide the unique possibility of tracing Peter Brook's development as a director within a clearly defined frame of reference.

Already in *The Empty Space*, Brook has said of *The Tempest* that to him it is Shakespeare's "complete final statement, and that it deals with the whole condition of man"³. His high esteem of Shakespeare's last play becomes even more apparent in an ironic "Open Letter to William Shakespeare", published in *The Shifting Point*. In the "open Letter", Brook ridicules those reviewers who in line with a supposed public taste advocate neither *King Lear* nor *The Tempest* but *As You Like It* as Shakespeare's best play:

I suppose that bit by bit I should have been preparing myself to realize that *The Tempest* was your [i.e. Shakespeare's] gravest mistake. I of course had wrongly held that it was your finest play; I had imagined it to be a *Faust* in reverse, the last in your final cycle of plays about mercy and forgiveness, a play that is throughout its length a storm, reaching calm waters only in its final pages. I had felt that you were in your right mind when you made it hard, craggy and dramatic. I felt that it was no accident that in the three plots you contrast a lonely, truth-seeking Prospero with lords crude and murderous, with greedy and darkly wicked clowns. And I felt that you had not suddenly forgotten about the rules of playwriting, such as the one of "making every character like someone-or-other in the audience," but you had deliberately put your greatest masterpiece a little farther away from us onto a higher level⁴.

Brook's praise is generous, but it is also evident that this praise is rooted in a director's perspective. *The Tempest* with its three concurrent plots is seen as a major challenge to any director, even more so because of its "higher level", its supposed remoteness which demands to be interpreted and mediated in the act of performance. If the "Open Letter to William Shakespeare" does explain why Brook was to take up this challenge four times, his but recently published memoirs *Threads of Time* do provide an additional clue. At the age of twenty-one Brook had been asked by the now legendary impresario Sir Barry Jackson to direct *Love's Labour's Lost* for the Stratford season of 1946. That season was to

be opened by *The Tempest*. Brook, aware of his as yet limited experience in directing, took advantage of the possibility to watch a fellow director at a costume rehearsal:

- Standing in the shadows, I was overwhelmed, both dazzled and at the same time secretly jealous as the actors proudly demonstrated their new clothes and one brilliantly coloured confection of velvet and lace followed another. [...] Yet on the first night of *The Tempest*, seeing the overdressed figures in front of the elaborately painted scenery, I realised that nothing in the theatre has any meaning out of its context in performance. Now that they were in action, the dresses had mysteriously lost all their beauty and had become an ugly impediment to the play, until the text was drowned like the great realistic galleon of the opening scene. This was an important lesson⁵.

At the very beginning of Brook's career at Stratford and thereafter with the RSC, and tied to the experience of *The Tempest*, there is the recognition that the ornate, realistic "Granville-Barker"-style of doing Shakespeare⁶ had to be discontinued. Already as early as 1946, for his production of *Love's Labour's Lost*, Brook claims to have thought of a Shakespeare-play not as "an enormous skein of interrelated words" but as a "set of images"⁷. However, as evidenced by his early productions of *The Tempest*, the austere images which he eventually was to create in 1990 were as yet unthought of.

After his debut at Stratford, Brook waited for eleven years before he tried his hand at *The Tempest* for the first time. The Shakespeare plays he directed in between include *Romeo and Juliet*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Titus Andronicus* and *Hamlet*. In retrospect it is difficult to conceive of Brook's first *Tempest* as trail-blazing. Fairness requires though not to judge this production out of its contemporary context. On the brink of the millennium, it is not easy to remember the theatrical setup which Brook entered in 1944 after five short war-time terms in modern philology at Oxford. There was as yet no Arts Council to support experiments, nor an English Stage Company which encouraged

young directors as well as emerging young playwrights. British post-war theatre was uninhibitedly commercial. Innovative artistic commitment on the side of the directors was restrained by impresarios who had to make sure that the money invested would yield the expected returns. Fifty years later, Mrs Thatcher was to speak of "arts organizations as businesses" which should increase their turnover by "getting out there and selling"⁸, and to recall this hostile attitude towards artistic experiment. Moreover, dated technical prerequisites impeded new approaches as well. Only a few theatres had revolving stages, and the picture-frame stage with its transparent fourth wall was still universally taken for granted. Indeed, as late as the seventies, when the new National Theatre on the South Bank was under construction, there was a heated discussion as to whether a proscenium stage should be included or not. The calcinated realism of the well-made play, to which the Shakespeare productions did abide as well, dominated the post-war stage.

According to his memoirs, Brook did not challenge this setup outrightly. He did not enter the theatrical scene as a revolutionary, which then would have been suicidal in any case. As evidenced by the above quotes, he felt the necessity of change and renewal. How these were to be achieved though he himself was not sure of as yet. The 1957 *Tempest* gave evidence of this indecision, even more so because Brook produced it as "director's theatre". He himself took over the entire *mise en scène*; he was responsible for the sets, the costumes, and the lighting, as well as the choice of music. Recalling his Stratford experience, Brook had no realistic stately galleon dragged onto the stage in the opening scene. The storm-tossed ship which succumbs to Prospero's magic was indicated by a swinging mast-head lantern only. However, this sparing use of realistic detail was counterbalanced by flying streamers which graphically suggested seaweed and the eerie underwater world evoked in Ariel's "Full fathom five thy father lies" (*Tempest*, I, 2, 397). Nor did Brook challenge the requirements of stage realism in

the scenes thereafter. Although he mildly questioned the "willing suspension of disbelief" by having the sets quite often changed in view of the audience, Brook employed conventionally realistic decor and costumes to create a cavernous, tangled world as an expressive background for the "introspective and obsessive" Prospero he had envisaged⁹. A contemporary critic's comment, "never [was] the scenery more obtrusively scenic"¹⁰, was quite appropriate.

Although quite a number of reviewers did not take to Brook's sombre interpretation of Prospero, even they acknowledged that John Gielgud was the ideal cast. However, this too added to the impression of a predominantly conservative production. Unaffected by anything even remotely related to what Lee Strasberg was then exploring at the Actor's Studio, Gielgud gave Prospero in the best rhetoric tradition of the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art. In his study of Brook's productions, Jones characterizes the *Tempest* of 1957 adequately by stating that it "was thoroughly traditional and dignified, embodied best in the performance of John Gielgud as the magus who loses his magic charms but gains human wisdom."¹¹.

The *Tempest* of 1963 was produced for the meanwhile founded RSC, of which Brook had become Peter Hall's co-director a year earlier. Brook staged the play in collaboration with Clifford Williams. Clive Barnes, who reviewed the production for *The Daily Express*, voiced the impression of many fellow critics when he stated that this collaboration of two directors had failed to produce a lasting impression. Partly, this may have been a consequence of Brook's numerous other engagements in that year, engagements which tied him more to Paris than to Stratford. At Paris he directed a French production of Arden's *Serjeant Musgrave's Dance*, co-directed with Francois Darbon, Hochhuth's *The Representative*, and staged *King Lear*. All this did not leave much time for a reconsidered and innovative approach to *The Tempest*. The RSC production earned some tempered praise for its

pictorial and decorative effects, and the musical score by Raymond Leppard was favourably mentioned as well¹². In terms of Brook's permeation of the play though, 1963 did not mark an advance.

However, when Brook was to return to *The Tempest* in 1968, the changes in his approach were significant. These changes were due to various interrelated developments and influences. The 1968 production gives evidence of the political unrest outside of the theatres in France, and, much more moderately though, in Britain. At the same time it mirrors the increasing need on the side of the directors to create theatre for a post-war generation whose aesthetic susceptibility was to be more and more preconditioned by the cinema and by TV. Both aspects had begun to shape Brook's work in the sixties. Although Hochhuth's *The Representative* with its wooden dialogues and clumsy construction is utterly unsuitable for theatrical experiment, in terms of Brook's biography the Paris production of this play indicates the beginning of Brook's involvement with overtly politically committed theatre. *The Representative* was to be followed by the aesthetically much more demanding *Marat/Sade* at the Aldwych, the RSC's London base, and, two years later, by *US*, the RSC's controversial comment on the war in Vietnam. Both the *Marat/Sade* and *US* have to be seen against the background of Brook's exploration of Artaud which he had undertaken together with Charles Marowitz and which had resulted in the 1964 "Theatre-of-Cruelty" season. Then it seemed to many critics that the already renowned Shakespeare-director Brook was leading the RSC away from its proper territory. His memoirs give evidence though that in these experiments he always kept Shakespeare in mind:

[...] although theatre theory had never interested me much and I found in Artaud's extreme visions very few of the specifics that practical work demands, both Marowitz and I admired the burning intensity of the positions Artaud took in relation to the safe theatre of his day. Our own Shakespeare theatre was playing comfortably to tourists in a reassuring

way, but in many of us there was a nagging suspicion that this was very far from the daring of the Elizabethan age, with its passionate enquiry into individual and social experience and its metaphysical sense of terror and amazement¹³.

From *Marat/Sade* onwards Brook began to revise his role as a director. Peter Weiss's play-within-a-play, enacted by the inmates of the asylum at Charenton, allowed for new forms of actor-participation in the production. The actors, who were supposed to be madmen and madwomen as well as the protagonists in the play directed by the Marquis de Sade, were not "cast" any longer by the director. Instead, they were asked to experiment with character traits until they found modes of expression which linked their particular "madness" to their role in the play-within-the play. Similarly, in *US*, for which there was no fixed script because the playwright Charles Wood left the project in mid-rehearsals, the actors were given even more freedom in developing their part. Brook encouraged them to improvise their personal response to the Vietnam war, and thereafter he created the performance out of these responses. Conservative reviewers condemned the production and raged about the final symbolic gesture, the burning of a butterfly, which, however, was of paper. What they failed to notice though was that both *Marat/Sade* and *US* were conscious efforts on the side of Peter Brook to transform the RSC into a group theatre. Brook was not only trying to break away from the Stratford traditions. From the late sixties onwards, he envisaged a company such as Jerzy Grotowski's, whom he had called upon to advise on the production of *US*.

However, the RSC was still a very British company, relying on actors whose cultural background was British. And even if RADA no longer sneered at Strasberg's "The Method", its graduates were trained for a career in British theatres. As evidenced by *The Empty Space*, Brook though had moved beyond that. He did not think any longer of theatre as but a medium of intra-

cultural communication. His “Holy Theatre” which was supposed to make the invisible visible was to transcend the borderlines of national cultures. That audience reaction could be lastingly confined by indigenous culture, race or creed was no longer acceptable. Brook’s “Holy Theatre” was meant to both express and to appeal to the universal rather than the particular.

Brook felt he could overcome the limits which the “Britishness” of the RSC imposed on his ideas when he began to rehearse the production commissioned by Barrault with an international company:

In Paris in 1968, I stepped tentatively into a new experiment without realising how far it would take me in the future. [...] the work we had begun in London with the Theatre of Cruelty had already revealed some surprising resources within the human body. But those bodies had all been British, and now like an Elizabethan explorer I wished to discover continents remote from my native land¹⁴.

One of the decisions which resulted from this exploratory approach was to have a young Japanese actor, Yoshi Oida, whom Brook had met in Barrault’s office, play Ariel – in spite of Oida’s but very limited command of Shakespeare’s language – “no more than two or three words in basic English” –, as Brook remembers¹⁵. Even if, according to Brook, Oida was capable of expressing the “invisible” in Ariel – the decision to cast a central part in *The Tempest* with an actor who was not trained to render Shakespeare’s verses adequately (at least by British standards) also indicates that from 1968 onwards Brook’s productions would consciously subordinate the dramatic text to the non-verbal expressivity which an actor is capable of.

In the production of 1990, Oida, who has stayed with Brook since 1968, was to play the “honest old councillor” Gonzalo. However, measured against this production, both the achievements and the shortcomings of *The Tempest* of 1968 do stand out. The international company which Brook formed in Paris encompassed

members of the RSC as well as of the Living Theatre; supplemented by a few chance additions such as Oida, and a couple of French as well as some migrant Canadian actors. The rehearsals took place in an empty space of the Mobilier National, a warehouse for government furniture. Due to the international cast, a text-based rendering of *The Tempest*, even in a severely cut version, was out of question:

The “text” which Brook selected for workshop purposes was *The Tempest* but “translated” into a new hourlong “adaptation”, in reality an original creation based loosely on some buried and not-so-buried themes in the play : magic, dreams, ambition, pride, violence, and hate. The director, no longer bound by his customary interpretive function, goes beyond the text to something of his own authorship¹⁶.

When Brook took this adaptation to London, by the very choice of location he made it clear that he was to discontinue the Stratford conventions. Instead of using the Aldwych he decided to perform at the Roundhouse, a former railroad building that had been used to reverse engines. Within the empty space of this venue he installed a huge circus-like canvas tent. The spectators were given a choice of seats. There were so-called “safe” seats, bordering the various places of action, and there were seats mounted on movable scaffoldings which could be rolled right into the midst of the performance. Thus, the seats were conceived of as physical equivalents of the passive audience of theatre as it used to be, as well as of the new, participating audience which the new playwrights and the new generation of directors alike sought after.

However, not only in this the *Tempest* of 1968 radically abandoned the picture-frame stage. Before the performance started, the actors – dressed in work clothes, except for Ariel who wore a kimono, and Prospero, who wore a karate suit – did their warming-up exercises and their voice training among the audience. Out of these exercises they rushed onto the stage to perform the shipwreck and to begin the play. During their performance,

Shakespeare's text was quoted but in excerpts; reduced to the purple passages mostly, and even those were rendered ametrically:

Brook's mirror to *The Tempest* proved more a distorting lens, capturing hidden gesture and action, under, over, and against the Shakespearean text¹⁷.

This evaluation is substantiated by Leiter:

They treated Shakespeare's text as so many words and images which they felt free to alter, mutilate, rearrange, and cut at will; the method was reminiscent of Marowitz's collage *Hamlet*. A scrambled plot, newly devised character relationships, startling time shifts, choral chanting, words as sound effects rather than as symbols of meaning, incantations, overt sexual imagery, acrobatics, disparate costumes, Grotowski face masks [...] – all were features of this much criticized experiment¹⁸.

In comparison to the "safe", traditional Shakespeare productions done at Stratford, Brook's *Tempest* was provocative. However, an aesthetically consistent production it was not. In his eagerness to demonstrate how very differently Shakespeare could be staged, Brook just tried to do too much at the same time. Moreover, he did not really follow his own inspiration but tried to create scenic images which expressed Jan Kott's interpretation of *The Tempest*. In 1961, Kott, a professor of literature at the University of Warsaw, had published his essays on Shakespeare in a volume entitled *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, which was to become the bible of many directors for the next decade and a half. Nothing of what Kott had argued was really new to Shakespeare scholars. However, Kott's delineation of Shakespeare's "dark side", the misogyny of the comedies, the wheel-of-fortune-pattern of the histories, the "existential" despair the Polish critic read into the tragedies, all this appealed to directors, especially British directors, who were tired of eulogizing the Bard as the great humanitarian. Kott's chapter on *The Tempest* is the longest in his study; not so much a consistent interpretation but a series of impressions which deconstruct the concept of the wise magician in

favour of the play's raw and grotesque elements. Brook's *Tempest* tried to recreate these divergent impressions, at the price of the consistency the production. In the course of this, Brook also took advantage of the abolition of theatre censorship in Britain in 1968. Kott's accentuation of the crude physicality that can be found in *The Tempest* became a central part of Brook's rendering. This is perhaps best exemplified by the love at first sight between Miranda and Ferdinand. In line with the "animalistic" dimension which Kott had discovered in Shakespeare's love-plots, the first encounter of these lovers-to-be is stripped of all the romanticism which Shakespeare wrote into act one, scene two. In the Roundhouse, for Miranda and Ferdinand it was to meet and mate.

During the twelve years which were to follow, Brook welded his company out of the haphazard international team he had started with. Only after he had scored the initially mentioned successes, he ventured to stage *The Tempest* again. The memoirs give a succinct description of how for three years Brook and his company toured the world in search for new forms of expression, before he decided to settle down at the Bouffes du Nord. According to Brook, the African tour of 1972 was the most formative experience. He and his company would enter a randomly chosen African village and would spread a carpet on a public square. That was to be the stage. Then the actors would begin to improvise, and out of these improvisations a performance would grow. If the villagers expressed their understanding of what they were seeing, the company had passed its test – the performance had become a communion. Throughout the African tour, the ICTC company explored visual rather than verbal communication and deliberately sought that communication on a very basic level.

In *The Tempest* of 1990 Brook invoked the experiences of the African tour in many ways. A rectangle of white sand, surrounded by dark sand, designated the island stage which, apart from one single rock, was an empty space. Out of this sand, Ariel playfully formed cakes for Gonzalo, visible signs of the friendship which

Prospero still extends to the old councillor – and which Gonzalo, in the pursuit of his dream of an ideal state, was to destroy again.

The contrast of colours used for the stage was mirrored in the costumes. While the inhabitants of the island were clothed in white or light-coloured floating gowns, the shipwrecked wore narrow, straight dark coats which were expressive of the confining world which still shaped them, the world which Prospero not only had left behind but had overcome on his island. Moreover, Brook had no qualms about employing race to enforce this basic colour contrast. Prospero and Ariel were played by the two African actors Sotigui Kouyaté and Bakary Sangaré, Miranda, underscoring her status “in between”, by the Indian actress Shantala Malhar-Shivalingappa. The only white inhabitant of Brook’s Island was Caliban, embodied by the small-statured German actor David Bennet. Caliban’s affinity to the white shipwrecked, his thirst for power, was thus given visual expression. Moreover, with Yoshi Oida playing Gonzalo, race was again employed to designate the honest councillor’s ambivalent position among the Caucasian actors who played the courtiers.

By making use of the possibilities of casting, Brook effortlessly deconstructed traditional as well as more recent clichés associated with *The Tempest*. In the wake of the post-colonial debate, over and over again productions, Jonathan Miller’s of 1970 having been one of the first, had exposed Prospero as a white colonialist who has no qualms about the exploitation of the native islanders. Brook’s casting of a black Prospero and a white Caliban made it clear that another post-colonial reading of the play was not his concern. The issue of colonialism was not totally discarded though: when Ariel fooled around with the wooden model of the ship he had bewitched, he playfully balanced it on his head – and evoked in his triumph an image of his suppression. After all, Prospero too had arrived by ship. However, this passing reference did not detract from the deeper affinity between Prospero and Ariel which Brook’s

production accentuated. Ariel was not the light and blithe spirit that was so often given by boyish actresses. In Brook's view, Prospero and Ariel were fellow magicians, although the physical contrast between the tall, lean, and regal Sotigui Kouyaté and the equally tall, but sturdily-built Sangaré underscored the difference between master and servant at the same time¹⁹.

If *The Tempest* of 1968 called for an audience literally prepared to move along with a fast moving action, *The Tempest* of 1990 presupposed an audience prepared to contemplate. In terms of quantity, there was more of Shakespeare's text in the 1990 production than there was in 1968. Brook did not use the original text though. His actors conversed in a colloquial French translation by Jean-Claude Carrière which sought not to detract the attention from the visually performed. Visual perception, perhaps best exemplified in the contemplation of a painting, presupposes silence. Because of this, picture galleries are not the place for animated chatter. Brook heeded this. Not only that the sand on the stage silenced the movements of his mostly bare-footed actors: Scenes which had been played out as dramatic heightenings in the earlier productions, such as Prospero's subjection of Caliban, now were reduced to gestures. Prospero but raised his staff, and Caliban succumbed.

Moreover, the rogues Trinculo and Stephano, who provided drunken comic relief not only for Elizabethan audiences, were so subdued at Zurich that they would not have given offence in any fashionable bar along the Limmat. One of the critics did not fail to notice that at least two actors – Sotigui Kouyaté and David Bennet – were most expressive not in their gestures but with their eyes. However, the perhaps best example of Brook's deliberate toning down of the actionism of 1968 is the already referred-to opening scene. In the former hippodrome at Zurich, Ariel did not attempt to evoke the full force of a hurricane. Sangaré created the storm through nothing else but the shaking of a wooden pipe full of pebbles, while the ship's crew tossed wooden rods above

Gonzalo to indicate the power of the waves which were breaking over the doomed vessel. As a critic put it: "destruction, pain of death, despair. The terror of all that is plainly visible, although nobody sweats or shouts"²⁰.

At Zurich, Brook did not visualize the contradictory and volatile interpretation of Kott, but his own, now consistent understanding of *The Tempest*. According to the critics, this resulted in a production which was gripping because complexity was achieved through simplicity. Moreover, as vouchsafed by the critics again, in the terms of Brook the communion between stage and audience was achieved. When *The Tempest* was performed at Frankfurt, a young woman in the front row, while watching attentively, like Ariel began to play with the sand under her feet - unconsciously expressing participation and involvement at the same time²¹.

However, as much as *The Tempest* of 1990 may be considered an advance on the 1968 production, what both approaches shared was a focus on the predominant and overt themes of the play which were rendered visually. This dominance of the visual over the text also defines the demarcation line between the first and the latter two productions. In an interview which he gave to *Theatre Quarterly*, Brook stated, "I do not believe in the word much today, because it has outlived its purpose. Words do not communicate, they do not define"²². Although there was more of Shakespeare's (translated) text in the production of 1990, because of its consistency the visual impact was stronger than in 1968.

One hesitates to call this "Shakespeare light", since even renowned Shakespeare translators do judge many lines of Shakespeare as virtually untranslatable for contemporary audiences. Nor can any production whatsoever claim to have done justice to the totality of a Shakespeare play - Shakespeare scholars will always point at what has been, what had to be omitted. Maybe because of this, Brook's visualizations of *The Tempest* are perhaps an adequate way of mediating Shakespeare to audiences which

otherwise would not venture to see a Shakespeare play at all. Nor can the dedication and the artistic competence of Brook's interpretations be questioned. However, for the minority of those who, while listening to Shakespeare's verses, can imagine the worlds he created on an empty Elizabethan stage, even such dedicated approaches as Brook's will remain but an approximation.

Bernhard REITZ
Université de Mayence

Notes

- 1 Roose-Evans, James. *Experimental Theatre from Stanislavsky to Peter Brook*, London, Routledge, 1990, p. 193.
- 2 Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space*, London, Penguin, 1976, p. 80.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- 4 Brook, Peter, *The Shifting Point: Theatre, Film, Opera 1946-1987*, New-York, Harper & Row, 1987, p. 74.
- 5 Brook, Peter. *Threads of Time: A Memoir*, London, Methuen, 1998, p. 37.
- 6 Brook, Peter, *The Shifting Point*, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 76, p. 78.
- 8 Banks, R. et al. *The Arts: The Next Move Forward. A Plurality of Riches, A Plurality of Funding*, London, The Conservative Political Centre, 1987, p. 10.
- 9 Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*, Oxford UP, 1994, p. 83.
- 10 Walker, Roy. "Unto Caesar: A Review of Recent Productions", *Shakespeare Survey* 11, 1958, p. 135.
- 11 Jones, Edward Trostle. *Following Directions: A Study of Peter Brook*, New York, Peter Lang, 1985, p. 108.
- 12 *Ibid.*
- 13 Brook, Peter. *Threads of Time*, *op. cit.*, p. 134.
- 14 *Ibid.*, pp. 142-43.
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 Jones, Edward Trostle. *Op. cit.*, p. 109.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 110.
- 18 Leiter, Samuel L. *From Belasco to Brook: Representative Directors of the English-Speaking Stage*, New York, Greenwood Press, 1991, p. 232.

- 19 Henrichs, Benjamin. "Shakespeare, Zauberkönig und Volksfeind." *Die Zeit*, 21 September, 1990.
- 20 Stadelmaier Gerhard. "Einfach ein Wunder", *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17 September 1990, (my translation).
- 21 Hs. "Sanft säuselnde Luft", *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 2 May 1991, p. 10.
- 22 Bernard Kenneth. "Some Observations on the Theater of Peter Brook", *Theater* 12, 1980, p. 74.