

Way off Broadway and Way out of the Classroom: American Students De-, Re-, and Per-forming the French Dramatic Text

Les Essif

ADFL Bulletin Vol. 27, No. 1 (Fall 1995), pp. 32–37

ISSN: 0148-7639

CrossRef DOI: 10.1632/adfl.27.1.32

Copyright © 1995 by The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages

All material published by the The Association of Departments of Foreign Languages in any medium is protected by copyright. Users may link to the ADFL Web page freely and may quote from ADFL publications as allowed by the doctrine of fair use. Written permission is required for any other reproduction of material from any ADFL publication.

Send requests for permission to reprint material to the ADFL permissions manager by mail (26 Broadway, New York, NY 10004-1789), e-mail (permissions@mla.org), or fax (646 458-0030).

Way off Broadway and Way out of the Classroom: American Students De-, Re-, and Per-forming the French Dramatic Text

Les Essif

AT THE end of the fall semester in 1993 the students in my intermediate-level French theater practicum performed a “version” of Alfred Jarry’s *Ubu roi*. Before I discuss the pedagogical program that led to the performance, let me begin with a confession: many, if not most, of my student-actors did not speak their French lines without an accent. In fact, a couple of them had rather thick accents. Yet, before you pass judgment, I submit that their speech was thoroughly comprehensible to native and nonnative speakers alike; they *performed* their lines with a fluency and facility that a diplomat might envy. They were performing French language with American bodies, re-creating the language as they re-created the French text, which served more as a poetic point of departure than as a procedural blueprint of performance. The French instruction within this performance project succeeded because the students’ attention was directed not to French at all but to performance. Voilà: an approach to teaching foreign language that has more to do with creativity than with replication or precision.

I believe our primary undergraduate mission, simply stated, is not to produce French speakers *per se* but to prepare and encourage nonnative French speakers to enter into a culture in which they can eventually become not Francophones but highly competent communicators, with or without much of an accent. Properly introduced, theatrical performance is not simply a tool but an essential step in this preparation, an essential rite of passage, if you will. So I focus this essay—as I did my class—not so much on French language teaching through theater as on theater through French language. I place the emphasis on theater for the following reason: I believe that, as second-language acquisition research indicates, students will acquire greater proficiency in a foreign language through an instructional approach based on a combination of subject-matter emphasis (also understood as content-based instruction) and the *parole* concept. Theatrical per-

formance is the ideal vehicle for this combination. According to Janet K. Swaffar, the 1980s gave birth to a multidimensional paradigm shift in foreign-language learning. On the one hand, educators moved away from purely linguistic basic-language courses and toward an earlier introduction to subject-matter emphasis, in which students learn substantive information through the target language instead of focusing on the grammar and vocabulary skills themselves.¹ On the other hand, the language component of the curriculum shifted from the teaching of *langue* to a more learner-sensitive teaching of *parole*. Abandoning the “notion that teaching comprehensive linguistic rules would result in comprehensive second language skills” (*langue*), educators began to embrace “*authentic input-language creation*” as a goal (55):² Instead of presenting replication of a “normed language” as a goal, the new *parole* paradigm would stress creativity within a functional, communicative context. Teachers would divert the curricular focus from the vocabulary and grammar in themselves to the students’ imaginative use of them in concrete situations.

In fact, the *parole* concept goes hand in hand with subject-matter emphasis, especially when the subject matter is theatrical performance instead of, for example, culture, literature, or business. This is because theater is—or was meant to be—based on a kind of *parole* concept, on a notion of focused, creative, holistic, communal language production. Through my experience with theater, I am convinced that performance—which has been used

The author is Assistant Professor of French in the Department of Romance Languages at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. This essay is based on a paper presented at the 1994 MLA convention in San Diego.

in some fashion by all foreign language teachers—can inspire a far more fundamental and engaging *parole* situation (i.e., a functional context for language) than other kinds of subject matter inspire; it has a special and absolutely crucial effect on the imaginations of foreign language learners. If we transform performance from a mere technique into the content or meaning of the class, if we persuade the students that we are more concerned with their abilities to involve their bodies in a communicative context than with the purely linguistic component itself, the students will derive more than linguistic knowledge of French; they will acquire an extralinguistic awareness of how to *perform* French, how to get their bodies to speak it, through broad experimentation with the communicative context.

Theatrical performance is essential to human culture, more essential than other symbolic acts, than other forms of symbolic communication such as writing and discursive speaking or purely narrative orality. Most of us would readily identify performance as a mimetic act. Mimesis, we know, has been considered a first principle of both performance and education. Yet performance has its own intrinsic, autonomous value, which has more to do with fulfillment than with imitation. Cultural theorists like the semiotician Erika Fischer-Lichte tell us that theater is a “cultural system” and that it is more than just one cultural system among others: it is “a cultural system *sui generis*, one that is significantly different from other cultural systems because of the special functions which it alone fulfills” (1). Fischer-Lichte goes on to explain theater’s special functions in semiotic terms. From her semiotic point of view, theatrical performance has a special way (a special circumstance, a special code) to generate meaning: the meaning production, the encoding act of the performers, is inextricably connected to the “reader” of the meaning (the decoder of the act, the spectator in the audience) (1–12). Despite her recognition of the uniqueness of theater, Fischer-Lichte’s perspective has its limitations. Theatrical performance is more than an act of representational meaning creation; it is unique simply as an encoding and enacting cultural experience wherein the performers or encoders themselves function as readers—or, more appropriately, as “sensors”—of their own act. Semioticians are generally more concerned with the referential than with the experiential, more concerned with what happens at the level of the interpretation of signs, the decoding, than with what occurs within the realm of the encoders. For this reason, Fischer-Lichte does not believe that performance can exist without an audience: “The audience is in fact a constitutive part of theater—without an audience there can be no performance” (7).³ The anthropologist Victor Turner would evidently disagree on this point. Since he regards theatrical performance as a social ritual, Turner has a much more performer-centered point of view. In fact, for him, performance is a natural step toward the completion of an experience.

Turner, who sees “ritual essentially as *performance, enactment*,” says that, true to its etymology, performance (from the Old French *parfourmir* ‘to complete, carry out, or accomplish thoroughly’) is the proper finale or consummation of any experience in life (79).⁴ There is nothing gratuitous or “high culture” about performance; on the contrary, it is a vital step in the human attempt to create form. So not only is performance in our blood, but if we abstract it or suppress it from those developmental processes that define us as human, we are in some way not whole; we run the risk of not becoming fully developed. All great cultural “texts,” from the Bible to American political leadership, inspire *mise-en-scènes* in the form of passion plays or *Saturday Night Live* comedy sketches. While the audience—the role we most often play—derives mostly a vicarious experience in the form of an entertainment, through their consummating act the performers themselves reap the lion’s share of direct, consummate experience.

Academic programs in foreign languages have long ignored or even suppressed this function of performance. For the last several years, however, a variety of performance exercises have crept into more and more instructional methodologies of at least intermediate French-language texts.⁵ Still, it is not enough to ask students to perform a canonic text or create a sketch based on an everyday situation. While there is nothing wrong with this approach, we should go further in giving performance its due by structuring language, culture, and literature classes around performance, by transforming the method into the subject matter.

But how do we adapt performance techniques to our academic programs comprehensively? More specifically, how do students of a foreign language become performers of that language, especially when their classroom-stage is so ineluctably American? I have some definite ideas about one way to get them to perform, ideas that I can begin to explain by agreeing with the celebrated Brazilian theater practitioner Augusto Boal, who says that “anyone can do theater, even actors!” and that “one can do theater anywhere, even in theaters” (*Jeux* 20; my trans.). I respect his implication that the more one distances oneself from theatrical stereotypes—the professional stage and actor—the more authentic and profound the theatrical experience one can have; the more “real”—not more realist but more natural, less commercial—theatrical performance becomes. Likewise, the more we can disengage the student of foreign languages from the typical, verbally oriented reading-writing-discussing format and the more we can disincline the student from acquiring a self-conscious attitude toward the practice of foreign language, the more authentic and holistic the learning experience.

The answer is not as simple as adding plays to a given foreign language curriculum and getting a group of students to memorize and recite long lines from the French

dramatic canon. On the contrary, as Turner suggests, performance runs deeper than the re-presentation of a dramatic text. It runs so deep that today, after centuries of naturalistic conditioning, we must make a special effort to downplay the sanctity of the written word as it is inscribed in the dramatic text and relegate its function to that of an inspirational point of departure for a performance project. The performance, here understood as a group of bodies collaboratively acting out in space, should be elevated to the status of a bona fide, independent method of engaging (and consummating) a text. And the students need, more than anything, the freedom to create their own space and their own act, as well as the encouragement to trust their own ability to perform creatively and to create through performance and, incidentally, in a foreign language.

With these principles in mind, in the fall semester of 1993 at the University of Louisville I devised an innovative theater practicum for intermediate students of French, most of whom had no more than four to five semesters of basic to intermediate language instruction and only two of whom had any theatrical experience. The primary objective of the course was to encourage and teach the students to create collaboratively what would be to a large extent their own French performance texts so that, through performance, their capacity for understanding and learning the language-culture would improve. By consummating an experience in French, they would reach a new level of awareness of the potential of their performing bodies. Performance-based activities evolved from the most unmotivated and unstructured to the complex central project, the one-hour public production of our de-formed and re-formed version of Jarry's *Ubu roi*: "*Ubu roi déformé*." All activities and exercises stressed creativity, collaboration, and total participation by all members of the class. Before I discuss the central project, I would like to give you a general idea of the class's performance bent by describing its first official exercise, a preliminary lesson in foreign language performance technique.

Immediately after introducing myself to the students and "warning" them of the class's focus on performance, I asked each student to call to mind and express a short, unmotivated phrase in French—to say whatever they cared to or whatever they could, no matter how nonsensical it might sound. (At this level of French, it is usually the student's limited linguistic knowledge rather than his or her creative imagination that determines the phrase.) This instruction produced a wide range of utterances. Once all eighteen students had contributed a phrase, I asked the group to recall what they considered to be the most memorable phrases. This narrowed the field to six different phrases, which I wrote on the board. Then, as a final step in this literal-textual phase of the exercise, I asked them to choose two of the most "performable" phrases, without any further explanation of what I meant by this term. The two phrases chosen were *Il fait beau*

aujourd'hui 'It's nice out today' and *Je n'aime pas ça!* 'I don't like that!' The students were then divided into groups of three and asked to develop a spatial context for these two sentences and perform them. Two students would each have one line to speak; the other student would help create the situation visually. The result was, of course, that these same lines elicited very different performances, a plethora of contexts and situations. After each group performed, the audience (the nonperforming students) answered questions relating to the kind of situation the actors were trying to create: Was the scene taking place outside or inside? Was the location hot or cold, closed or open, pleasant or unpleasant? Why did they say inside, or hot, or pleasant? and so on. Finally, the spectators were asked to add stage directions concerning action (X enters, Y approaches X), place (public rest room, bus, classroom), and attitude or tone (drunk, surprised, sarcastic, embarrassed). Note here that this assignment reverses the order in which university students usually approach drama, since the schematic utterances with which the students began were elaborated and "completed" not as a writing exercise but through performance, before the students did their descriptive writing.

This initial exercise has a multiple objective. Students certainly learn something about semiotics of performance, something about the way in which theatrical sign systems (space, body, objects, movement, etc.) come together on stage. They also learn about the spectator's experience, the perceptual effects of performance. Perhaps the most cogent lesson, though, is the concrete demonstration of the open, contingent status of all verbal text, the precariousness of a disembodied utterance in isolation. In spatializing and performing the text, the students were completing an experience by creating form, so, in a sense, they began the course as creators. Finally, the language-instruction objective that falls within the "subject matter-*parole* concept" paradigm: perhaps for the first time in their experience with French these students were focused more on their bodies and space than on the abstract language structure (grammar and vocabulary) itself.

This introduction to performance technique—or, more specifically, to creativity, collaboration, and consummation through performance—set the standard for the class, and it was succeeded and complemented by an array of activities designed to create a sensibility for whole, concentrated language in the student-actors and thus to enhance their awareness of the body and the space behind their speech and to increase their willingness and capacity to work as a group. These activities ranged from modified versions of dramatic games suggested by Agosto Boal and Jean-Pierre Ryngeart to more elaborate enterprises such as *tableaux vivants* and theatrical happenings and interventions outside the classroom.⁶ Most of these activities were "absurd" in the sense that they broke radically from conventional patterns of behavior, especially classroom behavior.⁷

The central project of the class began with a close reading of Jarry's *Ubu roi* and concluded with the public performance of my students' version of the story. As you know, the play is a so-called absurdist text, one that quite conveniently is constructed around denaturalized characters, places, and actions; and much of the dialogue is as indeterminate ("incomplete") and unmotivated as that of the atextual performance activities to which I subjected the students before and during the use of a written text. After reading and discussing the text, the students worked in small groups to select, contextualize, and perform the most theatrical scenes from the play. Then they took a written exam, an exercise in critical evaluation of text and performance. The questions on the first part of the exam pertained to the *Ubu* text from a theatrical point of view, focusing on space, objects, and characters and the relations among them. The second part of the exam interrogated the students' perception of the performance activities and exercises; it required that they critically evaluate the group as a whole and their contributions as well as those of their peers.⁸

Next, they "re-created" the written *Ubu* text, paying close attention to concrete dialogue and visual material needs. For this step, the sixteen students remaining in the class were divided into groups of four. Two groups were assigned to rewrite acts 1, 2, and 3; the other two groups, acts 3, 4, and 5. The students reworked each act with the intention of abridging it and rendering it more comprehensible to a contemporary audience of varied competence in French, including high school students and other university students of French. The key component of the new, customized version was the addition of the narrator who would summarize, explain, critique, and demystify the action while effecting a liaison between the actors and the audience. The re-created versions of the acts were compared and discussed at length in class and, on the basis of the individual written versions and student suggestions, I developed a preliminary script of "*Ubu roi déformé*" with the understanding that our collaborative effort during rehearsals would inspire even further revisions.⁹ In the spirit of Turner's theory, the performance would complete the text. This preliminary script was legitimately a collaborative product; more important, I believe that even the passive students who likely did not partake much in the writing or suggesting still felt more involved. I attempted to include even seemingly misguided and incoherent ideas at this point with the expectation that the performance would either render them coherent—in an absurdist way—or smooth them out.

To achieve our goals of total participation and comprehensive collaboration in the performance, we considered each act separately not only for the casting of roles but also for the assignment of practical duties. The students rotated among their acting roles and positions including assistant director, stage manager, prompter, and lighting and sound technician. Students collaborated on the

selection of props, costumes, and stage sets and on other peripheral tasks such as making a poster to advertise the play. For the portrayal of the denaturalized characters we pushed theatrical self-consciousness and Brechtian alienation to their limits, taking cross-dressing, cross-behaving, and even cross-casting for granted. Not only were individual actors assigned multiple roles, but the principal roles (Père Ubu, Mère Ubu, Narrator) were actually shared by two or more actors.¹⁰ For example, the two women who played Mère Ubu and Père Ubu in acts 1 and 2 were replaced by another woman as Père Ubu and a man as Mère Ubu for acts 3 and 4. In the final act, the two women who played Mère Ubu and Père Ubu in the first two acts switched their roles, and finally, for the conclusion of the play, all four Ubus, on shipboard, joined in a discussion of where they might find a new home (Louisville perhaps?).

This shared, even explosive creativity and complexity placed performance as spectacular event at the forefront of the project and encouraged further creative collaboration. What is more, it certainly took the students' minds off French as a second language. The role sharing itself suppressed any kind of proprietary control over text and textual characters, and it increased the critical sensibility of both actors and spectators by allowing them to compare different renderings of the same role. It also encouraged each actor to contribute something new and personal to the role. We further increased the complexity of the project and the spectacular quality of the performance by interspersing the story of *Ubu roi* with theatricalized versions of Raymond Queneau's *Exercices de style*.¹¹ This strategy too had a multiple objective: it increased the acting contribution of those students who had less than major roles (usually group appearances as soldiers, peasants, or nobles); it increased the demand for collaboration, since transitions had to be developed to ensure the flow of action; it further required the students to think of the play as a comprehensive spectacle or event rather than as a representation of a text; it challenged the students to investigate the theater's ability to create form; and it decreased the students' consciousness of the strangeness of speaking French text.

My class was largely successful in meeting the complex demands of the project: the use of narrators, the exchange of roles, the incorporation of a secondary text. The greatest accomplishment, however, I would describe as neither aesthetic nor technical nor strictly instructional; rather, it was psychosocial. In his book on theater arts and the teaching of second languages Stephen Smith expresses one of the pedagogical attributes of theater as follows: "Native and non-native speakers develop an attachment to the language of the play they are working on. Typically a cast will develop into a 'speech community,' and the actors will feel a sense of camaraderie as they use the new language" (31). This idea of "speech community" is quite relevant to the *parole*-concept approach to language

teaching. Nevertheless, Smith is referring to the production of a realist play through a rather conventional if inspired approach. I would therefore have reservations as to just how *parole*-oriented, how idiosyncratic or consummatory, the performance might have turned out. Given the more collectivist and spectacular approach of our absurdist project, the creativity involved in rewriting one text and integrating another into the action of the first, and the critical demands of the sharing of the roles and of production duties, I would like to return the emphasis to performance as consummation instead of speech as production. I prefer to think of the success of my work as the coalescence of a group of language-culture learners into a performance community, a French-speaking community—brought together by creativity, complexity, and close collaboration—that transcends any conventional sense of the term *speech*. The onus was removed from the formal use of French as a foreign language, and the language was holistically rehearsed and performed rather than conventionally, artificially, or dutifully articulated as a fixed-text foreign language. Admittedly, in some ways it was Americanized, but necessarily so. With performance of a foreign text as our goal, the foreign bodies (essentially foreign to the target language) that first reformulated the language before performing it were themselves deformed and reformed, molded by unique French cultural codes. The result was a fluent and articulate, if divergent or accented, French.

The text is in many ways the students' text. Created, modified, and shared through an integrated, holistic approach to performance, it exists autonomously as a unique theatrical event. Unlike the Molière, Racine, or Giraudoux that many of us have helped present to audiences of other language learners, professionals, or sympathetic friends, in this play there is a body behind every expression, a motivation behind every word. These students knew what they were saying because the words consummated their *Ubu* experience, which has helped them to penetrate a daunting psychological barrier in their move toward the culture of the French speech and performance community. Only after the final performance did I give my students the option of seeing a professional English-language version of *Ubu*. The four students who took the time to view it said that they had no doubt that our version was better. This biased judgment means more to me than a critic's review, since the class emphasized the student performers and the way in which they collaboratively re-created this story.

I would like to conclude this discussion with a bit of wisdom from Artaud's teatro-metaphysical vision of the world: "I do believe that the theatre, utilized in the highest and most difficult sense possible, has the power to influence the aspect and formation of things" (79). Would it be too much to suggest that it could even influence foreign language pedagogy?¹²

Notes

¹Referring to research carried out by H. H. Stern, Swaffar affirms that "second language research supports the findings of cognitive psychologists for first language learners: students acquire greater language proficiency when they study subject matter presented in the second language than when they study the second language per se" (57).

²In a note, Swaffar explains the origin of the *langue-parole* dichotomy: "The terms *langue* and *parole* are being used here in the sense of Saussure as a distinction between the language accessible to the entire speech community (*langue*) and the language used by a particular group for particular purposes (*parole*)" (59).

³One could detect an analogy here. The semiotician's preoccupation with the creation of meaning corresponds to the foreign educator's preoccupation with systems (such as *langue*) that tend to transform meaning creation into a mathematical calculation. Systems must be received in a certain way to have not only meaning but relevance as an act. Like the *langue* approach to language teaching, semiotics does not allow for idiosyncratic usage (*parole*) or recreation, the manipulation of codes. *Langue* is an abstract ideal until it is produced by a body and a voice that are as unique as a snowflake. No two native speakers perform French in exactly the same way; there is really no such thing as standard French. So why deny the freedom enjoyed by native speakers to the foreign language learners?

⁴"The term 'performance' is, of course, derived from Old English [sic] *parfournir*, literally 'to furnish completely or thoroughly.' To perform is thus to bring something about, to consummate something, or to 'carry out' a play, order, or project. But in the 'carrying out,' I hold, something new may be generated. The performance transforms itself" (79). *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* identifies the origin of *parfournir* as Old French and not Old English.

⁵See, for example, Mésavage. At the end of each (theme-based) chapter there is a section titled "Mini-théâtre" with scenes relating to everyday life situations to play out. In *A votre tour!* Jean-Paul and Rebecca M. Valette include exercises in role playing, elementary script development, and performances of everyday situations. Likewise, Isabelle Salaün-Gorrell includes a section titled "Mise en scène" in each chapter of *Tête-à-tête*.

⁶For a useful selection of dramatic games, see Boal, *Jeux or Games*; Ryngaert, *Jouer, représenter*. While these works include examples of tableaux vivants, for a more detailed description of this exercise see Feldhändler, "Expression."

⁷The most ambitious exercise that I had scheduled to precede the central project was an improvisational theatrical intervention. My students spent about two hours of class time planning a theatrical scene, a hypothetical accident involving a vehicle, to stage for the unsuspecting students of another class. I divided the class into four groups of four student-actors each. Each group was instructed to develop the scenario of an accident involving some or all of the following characters: driver(s), victim(s), witness(es), police officer(s), ambulance attendant(s). Each student in the group was to assume one of these roles with the understanding that the group would assign (on an ad hoc basis) at least one of the roles to one or more of the students in the host class. Each student-actor was to develop an inventory of possible actions and utterances for each character. My students had three minutes in which to play out the action. Only the instructor of the host class would have advance notice of our visit. The major objectives of this exercise for my actor-students were to convey as concretely as possible the idea of the action they were performing and to involve the students of the host class in some way

in the action itself. This assignment would serve as my students' first confrontation with an audience under circumstances that would compel them to work closely with the audience and to be highly cognizant of the reception of their acts. They also had to be creative enough to develop a flexible relation to the verbal text instead of being enslaved by it. It was definitely an exercise in which they could detach themselves from language as simply language. While they were not entirely unconscious of their French text, with rehearsals they became able to improvise more creatively in French.

⁸The written component of the class consisted of two parts: the exam (given six weeks into the semester) and the journal. The text-oriented first part of the exam consisted of questions such as this one: "Discutez l'espace (y compris décor et objets) et le rapport espace-personnage dans *Ubu roi*. Vous pouvez tenir compte des citations suivantes: «L'action se passe en Pologne, c'est-à-dire Nulle Part» (Jarry); «. . . le personnage se déshumanise, inversement l'objet s'anime» (Kleiger-Stillman); «Les personnages sont tout aussi schématiques que l'intrigue. C'est de là qu'ils tirent leur puissance théâtrale» (H. Béhar)." The second part of the exam, based on the in-class performance exercises ("travaux pratiques"), included questions such as this one: "Commentez (critiquer, discuter) votre participation à l'une des activités suivantes: (A) un exercice d'échauffement ou un jeu dramatique tels que «les bonjours», «la bouteille saoule», «l'Ours de Poitiers», «se pousser l'un l'autre», «déplacement dans la salle»; ou (B) l'une des séances du «tableau vivant». Pourquoi avez-vous trouvé cette activité efficace ou utile? Pourquoi pas? Réflexion faite, qu'auriez-vous fait différemment?" This second part of the exam was facilitated by the journal. From the beginning of the course, students were instructed to keep a journal focused on the following: comments on the relevance of class activities to the central project; critical evaluations of class activities and performances, in which the students were to break each activity down into parts or steps (How did they feel at any given moment of the activity? Were they hoping that someone else would volunteer to initiate it? Were they worried about what the instructor or others would think if they did or did not participate? Were they surprised at any other actor's contribution to the tableau?); their personal development, attitude, and inhibitions; and their perception of how the collective class project and the group work were developing.

⁹Two of the twentieth century's most influential and revolutionary theorists of the theater openly condemned the sanctity of the dramatic text. One has only to read a chapter from Antonin Artaud's *The Theatre and Its Double* like "No More Masterpieces" to get an idea of his distaste for the dramatic text in general: "We must get rid of our superstitious valuations of texts and *written* poetry. . . . Once and for all, enough of this closed, egoistic, and personal art. . . ." (78–79). Timothy Wiles explains Bertolt Brecht's view of dramatic texts in these terms: "He believed so little in the sanctity of his texts that he constantly rewrote and revised them to correspond to party dictates, current events, and the audience responses which he wished to elicit. Brecht's theory has less to do with plays as literature than as theatre event. . . . the meaning which emerges from performance. . . ." (75).

¹⁰While it is not clear to me that Brecht ever advocated role sharing for performance before an audience, he did encourage this practice in his *Lehrstücke* (learning plays) for the critical benefit of the actors. In *The Measures Taken*, for instance, he advised that each of the four actors should play one of the Young Comrade's four main scenes (Ferran 14).

¹¹A total of nine "exercises" were presented. Two appeared at the end of each of the first four acts of *Ubu roi*; the final one, *Comédie* (a play), was quite appropriately integrated into the conclusion of *Ubu* as a short dramatic performance sketch of the nonsensical situation proposed by Queneau.

¹²My experience with the Louisville project has inspired a similar theatrical project in which I am currently involved at the University of Tennessee. The level of the ten students in the project has a higher and wider range; four are graduate students and the others are juniors and seniors. We are combining two very different works, Molière's *Dom Juan* and Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac*. Our scaled-down re-creation of these texts has resulted in a juxtaposition of the five acts of the two stories that focuses on the theme of passion. But we have maintained a contemporary and comic point of view as well as a "re-creative" approach to the script.

Works Cited

- Artaud, Antonin. *The Theatre and Its Double*. Trans. Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove, 1958.
- Boal, Agosto. *Games for Actors and Non-actors*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . *Jeux pour acteurs et non-acteurs*. Trans. Régine Mellac. Paris: Découverte, 1991.
- Feldhendler, Daniel. "Expression dramaturgique: «Quand le prof' de langue devient animateur en expression et en communication!»" *Le français dans le monde* 176 (1983): 45–51.
- Ferran, Peter W. "New Measures for Brecht in America." *Theater* 25.2 (1994): 11–28.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Semiotics of Theater*. Trans. Jeremy Gaines and Doris L. Jones. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1992.
- Mésavage, Ruth Matilde. *En cours de route*. 2nd ed. Boston: Heinle, 1992.
- Ryngaert, Jean-Pierre. *Jouer, représenter*. Paris: CEDIC, 1985.
- Salatün-Gorrell, Isabelle. *Tête-à-tête*. Boston, Heinle, 1992.
- Smith, Stephen M. *The Theater Arts and the Teaching of Second Languages*. Reading: Addison, 1984.
- Swaffar, Janet K. "Curricular Issues and Language Research: The Shifting Interaction." *ADFL Bulletin* 20.3 (1989): 54–60.
- Turner, Victor. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal, 1982.
- Valette, Jean-Paul, and Rebecca Valette. *A votre tour!* Lexington: Heath, 1995.
- Wiles, Timothy. *The Theater Event: Modern Theories of Performance*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Students and teachers practice what they must do if someone attacks them with a gun. They have to go to a classroom and lock the door. In the past 5 years there has been a large increase in the number of school shootings in the USA. (4) _ There is no simple answer to this question. The goal of the exchange program was to introduce students and educators from Elkhorn to their counterparts in Moscow, so that Russian and American students could develop friendly relationships, learn about each other's system of education, discover common interests, and become acquainted with the art, culture, history, and the traditions of both countries. You can lose your way in the dark. 2) Could you_ the information on their website? 3) I_ (just) these newspapers. In the same way, an adverbial phrase can begin a sentence or a clause, followed by a verb. This kind of sentence is common in literary writing. A group of armed men came along the street. Along the street came a group of armed men. While we were waiting to see what would happen next along the street came a group of armed men, waving their guns in the air and shouting. Up the hill went the bus, creaking and groaning. Through the window jumped a masked man. conditional sentences as, though with may, might It may sound unlikely, but it's true. These are highly formal, and omit if, putting the auxiliary at the beginning of the sentence. If the government were to resign, the situation might be resolved. Were the government to resign, the situation might be resolved. Easter eggs are given out and kisses offered. Apparently the play dates back via the English "Mummers plays" to ancient Syria and Egypt. I was Toss-pot once but nobody wanted to be kissed by me! It is a remarkable history and one that shaped not only Russia but played a huge part in the making of the modern, technological age. But it is a little known history and one which for many years was shrouded in secrecy because of the political requirements of those times. But now the story has been told and "Science and Philosophy in the Soviet Union", has been nominated for the National Book Award for history. Graham is Professor of the History of Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Visiting Professor of the History of Science at Harvard University. pronounce French words with a distinctive American accent. Grammar can also be affected. English. speakers who learn both French and Spanish sometimes combine grammatical rules of both when speaking either of them. G. More than half of the world's 7,000 languages are expected to die out by the end of the century, often taking with them irreplaceable knowledge about the natural world. When a species dies out, sometimes fossils can be found, remains uncovered. B. In my opinion the only way you will ever truly learn a language is going to the country that speaks that language. Stay for at least three months at the same place at first you will feel frustrated but this is normal and you will soon get used to the language and I have never been to a language class. un letrero semicircular uniforme de 1.000m de diámetro y cuyo peso w está sostenido por dos cables, como se muestra en la figura. ¿cual es la tensión en cada uno de los cables que sostienen el letrero? Anterior. Siguiente. Ayuda gratis con tus tareas Ayuda gratis con tus tareas. ¿Por qué registrarte en Brainly? pregunta acerca de tu tarea. no solo respondemos, también te explicamos.