

Havlíčková Kysová, Šárka; Kačer, Tomáš

Editorial

Theatralia. 2016, vol. 19, iss. 2, pp. 7-8

ISSN 1803-845X (print); ISSN 2336-4548 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/135851>

Access Date: 01. 03. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Editorial

Eighteen months ago, we called for papers in the fields of theory, meta-theory, and research methodology in theatre studies. We also announced our intent to include a special section on cognitive theatre studies in the issue, as this approach had become a dynamically developing trend in the field. We have collected several very inspiring papers based on this approach. We have also received papers dealing with other issues from the field of theatre theory and meta-theory.

This issue of *Theatralia* (2016/2) includes a carefully selected collection of papers dealing with various contemporary theoretical topics. The cognitive approach is reflected in most of the articles in the section ‘Yorick’. Despite the fact that the approach is very well elaborated in various areas of research, such as film and literary studies, theatre studies still appears to be only slightly inspired by it. There is no ‘school’ of cognitive theatre studies to speak of, and this is especially apparent in the scholarly environment of Central Europe. Therefore, in this issue we provide our readers with papers which take inspiration from the cognitive approach. Both by applying its methodology, and by considering its approach from a theoretical and meta-theoretical perspective.

The section ‘Yorick’ opens with two articles based on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the pivotal concept of cognitive studies – especially cognitive linguistics. The first article by Svitlana Shurma and Wei-lun Lu is titled ‘A Cognitive Poetic Analysis of LIFE and DEATH in English and Ukrainian: A Multiple-Parallel-Text Approach to Hamlet’s Soliloquy’. The authors analyse different translations of the ‘To be, or not to be’ soliloquy from Hamlet into Ukrainian. Rooted mostly in cognitive linguistics, the article focuses on conceptual metaphors related to life and death in different Ukrainian translations of the soliloquy. The article ‘Stage Metaphors in Verdi’s *Otello*: Miloš Wasserbauer’s State Theatre Production (Brno 1967) in the Context of *Otello*’s Staging Tradition’ by Šárka Havlíčková Kysová is also inspired by the cognitive approach and provides an example of analysis using the Conceptual Metaphor Theory while

explaining some of the metaphors and key concepts of the play and opera via conceptual metaphors. Jan Motal focuses on methodological issues of the approach while dealing with cognitive phenomenology in the context of theatre studies. In his article ‘Cognitive Phenomenology: The Promising Pragmatic Marriage of Methodologies in the Field of Theatre Studies?’, he touches upon the relationship between cognitive studies and phenomenology from a different point of view than it is usually treated. The next article, ‘Contemporary Dance Theatre in Neurocognitive Perspective – Granhøj Dans Case’ by Tomasz Ciesielski is the last one in the area of cognitive theatre studies. The author applies cognitive science and neuroscience to issues from the area of dance theatre. The last article in the section ‘Yorick’ deals with contemporary issue of theatre theory. Dorota Sajewska and Dorota Sosnowska discuss the methodological issues of body and technology in performance. They deal with the body, mediation and manipulation, the notions of liveness and presence on the stage etc. All the articles included in the section ‘Yorick’ are – from a meta-theoretical point of view – examples of contemporary thinking about theatre and theatre theory. They present issues discussed in theatre theory today and also represent contemporary theoretical and meta-theoretical discourse in the area of theatre studies.

The section ‘Spectrum’ includes a study in the history of theatre theory. In her ‘Meaning(s) of Otakar Zich’s Concept of the Semantic Image’, Dita Lánská analyses aesthetic studies written by Otakar Zich, the forerunner of Czech semiotics of theatre. She observes changes in Zich’s interpretation of the concepts of *semantic image* over time.

The section ‘Guests’ includes two interviews with theatre studies scholars. Dorota Sosnowska is interviewed by Martin Bernátek and Knut Ove Arntzen by Tereza Konývková. Both guests were asked two identical questions – we want the readers to have an opportunity to compare the views of both interviewees. Other questions in the interviews deal with issues from each guest’s area of research. The interviews aim at introducing both scholars and presenting their work and opinions.

The section ‘Reviews’ includes articles which reflect on books which are mostly focused on Czech theatre and personalities who have left their mark on its development and contributed to the theory of theatre. These reviews comment on new books written in Czech. Some of the reviews deal with English books focused on the issues from the field of theatre studies.

As usual, the articles in the section ‘Events’ focus on contemporary events in culture which are, yet not necessarily all, connected to theatre, or which should receive the attention of theatre studies scholars.

The issue of *Theatralia* 2016/2 offers a fresh insight into contemporary issues of theatre studies. We hope readers find it enriching and inspiring.

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová, Tomáš Kačer