Havlíčková Kysová, Šárka

Presages of contemporary theatre studies theories in Vladimír Jindra's structuralist theory of scenography

Presages of Contemporary Theatre Studies Theories in Vladimír Jindra's Structuralist Theory of Scenography

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová

spectrum

Abstract

The study provides detailed analysis of the work of Czechoslovak theoretician of scenography, Vladimír Jindra (1920–1979). It focuses on Jindra's at the time innovative taxonomy of scenography which substantially supported the shift in today's worldwide understanding of the notion of scenography as a complex theatrical discipline. The aim of the study is to connect Jindra's work with contemporary theoretical approaches to theatre, especially rooted in multimodal and cognitive analysis of scenography. Special attention is given to the elements of Jindra's work that predated Multimodal Metaphor Theory. The study shows that his conception of scenography is connected to the structuralists' understanding of the so-called 'stage metaphor'. This exploration should therefore show the reader not only the progressiveness of Jindra's thinking about scenography, but also outline a view on possible future research in the field of multimodal and cognitive approaches to theatrical scenography.

Key words

Vladimír Jindra, scenography, Czech theatre, theatre theory, structuralism, Cognitive Theatre Studies, Multimodal Metaphor Theory

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová

Presages of Contemporary Theatre Studies Theories in Vladimír Jindra's Structuralist Theory ...

[spektrum]

Context of Jindra's theory of scenography

In the former Czechoslovakia during the Communist regime (1948–1989), both scenography practice and theory were searching for a specific form of expression. The scenographers of the period reacted to the previous staging practice in designing theatrical space for performance. Overcoming the 'traumatic' experience of the 1950s, when theatre practice was controlled by communist ideology with its social realism doctrine dominating stage design in the first half of that decade, in the 1960s the overall tendency in direction and scenography leaned towards a more non-realistic, non-illustrative depiction of space in a performance, and especially to metaphoric approaches to staging.

In this milieu, Vladimír Jindra (1920–1979), theoretician of scenography, tried to conceptualise the historical and contemporary ways of designing the stage. He analysed the history of the development of visual elements and their changing role in theatrical performance. The analysis of the artistic practice of Adolphe Appia (1862–1928), Edward Gordon Craig (1872–1966), Konstantin Stanislavsky (1863–1938), and 'Trösterian-Svobodian' artistic practice, as characterised by Věra Ptáčková (1983: 6), allowed Jindra to formulate an innovative approach to the history of scenography and to devise a ground-breaking taxonomy of scenography. A taxonomy and theoretical approach that is worth mentioning even today. His *Specifičnost scénografie* [Specificity of Scenography], a volume of essays, was published posthumously by the Theatre Institute in Prague in 1983.[1] However, Jindra developed his approach to scenography earlier and wrote his treatises during the foregoing years reflecting up-to-date Czechoslovak staging practice. His approach was rooted in the tradition of Czech structuralism mainly following the works of the 'first generation' of Czech semiotic and structuralist theoreticians: Otakar Zich (1879–1934) and Jan Mukařovský (1891–1975).

The Czech structural approach to theatre is connected to the activities of the Prague Linguistic Circle (founded in 1926), sometimes referred to as the Prague School. In the 1930s and 1940s the members of the Circle developed a complex theatre theory (DROZD and KAČER 2016: 13). Its key concepts covered notions such as *structure*, *sign*, and *component* (DROZD and KAČER 2016: 14). As Jiří Veltruský, one of the theorists of the Prague School, pointed out, 'the most urgent task of theatre studies is to examine all the individual components within the structure of theatre performance and to learn how each of the components, with its own specific features, affects the structure as a whole' (VELTRUSKÝ 2016: 13).

---

1   The volume was edited by the leading personality of Czech historiography of scenography, Věra Ptáčková. In this article I focus mostly on the main part (chapter) of the volume – 'The Specificity of Scenography' (PTÁČKOVÁ 1983: 8–99) – in which the crucial ideas of Jindra's approach are introduced.

Vladimír Jindra's scenographic theory and taxonomy as a structuralist conception

Jindra's approach can be also characterised as structuralist, and his *Specificity of Scenography* is a pivotal work developing this approach in the area of scenography. However, Jindra, as a member of the younger generation of Czech structuralist thinkers, criticises the reductive understanding of one of the key notions of structuralism, which is *component* (*složka*), and in so doing he further elaborated Zich's and Mukařovský's ideas of the concept. Zich was the first to introduce the specific character of theatrical unity as the *combination* of 'two simultaneous, inseparable and clear-cut components that are *heterogeneous* – that is, visual (optical) components and audible (acoustic) components' (ZICH 1931: 22). Zich derives these components from poetry and fine arts. Jindra follows Mukařovský's view however, which emphasises the ability of different kinds of arts to integrate (PTÁČKOVÁ 1983: 5). At the beginning of his writing, Jindra seems to favour Mukařovský's idea of components consisting of sub-components, but later (further in his text) he eventually refuses the notion (PTÁČKOVÁ 1983: 5). In this context, it is worth mentioning that Jindra's analysis of the components and their functions in theatrical performance helps him to bring out a brand-new understanding of the 'visual' aspect of performance. Being familiar with and examining the works of Vlastislav Hofman (1884–1964), and especially scenographic works of František Tröster (1904–1968) and Josef Svoboda (1920–2002), Jindra articulates the specificity of scenography. He also speaks of the understanding of scenography as a more complex discipline compared to how it was discussed by his predecessors, equating it with stage design.

Jindra's observations concerning theatrical space and its classification also come from a structuralist approach. Following Otakar Zich's ideas, Jindra differs *scene* from *stage*. He understood *stage* as a 'solid base': 'The stage, in its ideally perfect form, is an inner space, limited by the structure of the theatre' (DROZD et al. 2016: 116). Overall, it is sign-less. The *scene*, however, is 'a fictitious space depicting or suggesting real space' (DROZD et al. 2016: 116). Further, the approach also differentiates *dramatic space* from *scene*. *Dramatic space* comes into existence in time – by gradual changes of space-time relationships between the actor and the scene (JINDRA 1983: 88). Jindra emphasises Zich's and Mukařovský's concept of *dramatic scene* as a 'force field' with 'powercurves' (*silokřivky*) and 'motoric tracks' (*motorické dráhy*) that changes under the influence of shape and power of different components (JINDRA 1983: 88).

Along with his approach to components, their relations and functions in the theatrical performance, Jindra based his understanding of scenography on analysis of the different approaches to designing the stage connected to the historical époques of theatre (and scenography). He introduces special taxonomy which distinguishes and defines four fundamental stages of development of approaches toward visual elements in per-

[spektrum]

formative arts: decoration (*dekorace*), stage design (*jevištní výtvarnictví*), scenic design (*scénické výtvarnictví*), and scenography (*scénografie*).[2]

Decoration is based on the decoration or embellishment of the object or space in the broad sense of the word. The stage is designed (decorated) in a way not so different from decorating an object or space in everyday, common life. It has no connection to the structure, function or structural characteristic of the material which should be expressed. Its only purpose is to cover all these connections and to make the object look aesthetical and fashionable. It can be characterised as something additional, passive, or artificial. It is based on stereotypical, conventional depictions of setting. It has no connection to the dramatic action, and it only brings false, superficial effects. An example of decoration can be the painted stage set that is invariable, changeless. As Jindra puts it, it makes the 'stage organism' a 'monotype', i.e., it highly limits the drama and its development on the stage. The painted sets bring with them the necessity to divide the drama into acts (to enable change of decoration/sets). Thus, it interrupts the evolution of the plot and weakens dramatic tension (JINDRA 1983: 16–18).

Stage design can be explained as a special kind of visual (design) art. The 'only' difference from its 'maternal', i.e., the original discipline which it is derived from, is the involvement of the theatrical stage. The stage depicts, determines, and restricts the area of its possible creative acts. However, as Jindra also points out, the stage can also be used on other occasions: in non-theatrical productions, gymnastic exhibitions, festivities, political speeches, etc. The stage design is dependent on fine arts (*výtvarné umění*). It attempts to make a creative act connected closely to a particular dramatic text – (but) using the means of its 'original' (maternal) discipline of visual (design) arts (JINDRA 1983: 20–21). This kind of designing the stage is, according to Jindra, represented, for example, by works of Vlastislav Hofman whose work style – as Barbora Příhodová puts it quoting Jarka Burian's words – tended towards 'heightened, bold expressiveness' (PŘÍHODOVÁ 2011: 257; BURIAN 2002: 170). This aspect may to some extent limit the creative potential in the sense of dramatic action and the integration of visual elements into the 'unity' of the performance.

Scenic design is less connected to the dramatic text; it is less dependent on it. It is a part (or component) of performance which is very well emancipated, equal to other components (including the text), and adequate in creating the synthesis of theatrical performance (JINDRA 1983: 21–23) – *dramatic art* in Zich's term. It has a high potential to carry dramatic function and to support the dramatic tension and its evolution during a performance.

I described these three of Jindra's categories to introduce the context of the fourth and final one, that is *scenography*. Jindra understands it as far more complex and, above all, he provides a space for approaching it from the cognitivist perspective. In the next part of my study I offer a more detailed analysis of this fourth category, and I eventually relate it to the notion and theory of multimodality.

---

2   I follow the translations of the terms introduced by Barbora Příhodová in her study titled '*The Specificity of Scenography*: A Czech Contribution to the Theory of Scenography' (2011). The translations of the parts of Jindra's text are mine.

Jindra's concept of scenography as a 'proto-multimodal' and 'proto-cognitive' perspective

In providing proper characteristics of the fourth category of Jindra's taxonomy, the *scenography*, his conception of *material* and *immaterial* (sub-)components of it is of great importance. Jindra develops these notions in his treatise, and they are vital for the understanding of his thoughts on scenography (JINDRA 1983). The idea is based on the necessity of examining 'antinomic relations' (JINDRA 1983: 71) between the components of theatrical art. Following Zich's and Mukařovský's approach, Jindra emphasises the dynamic interplay of all the components based on material theatrical means of expression (i.e., building, machinery, sets, props, staff/people). These means of expression serve as a base for the immaterial interplay (*souhra*) of stage action forces (JINDRA 1983: 71). Mukařovský's structural approach based on linguistic perspective presupposes that every component of theatrical art contains sub-components. For instance, the subcomponents of the acting (component) are voice, facial expressions, gestures, movement, costume, etc. (see JINDRA 1983: 71).[3] According to Jindra, none of the components, except the acting and direction, can be understood as essential and absolutely necessary for theatre (JINDRA 1983: 72): the direction battles for the unity of all the components. In general, these aspects characterise theatre as independent and united artistic work (JINDRA 1983: 72).

As Jindra explains, *material subcomponents* are fixed in a hierarchy. They are strongly connected to aspects of their evolution in history. They are dependent on their material, technical, economical, and organisational definitiveness (JINDRA 1983: 72). The *immaterial subcomponents* are space, time, movement, rhythm, light, colour, and sound (JINDRA 1983: 72–73). They penetrate all levels and components of theatrical art. Even though their nature and qualities differ, the space, time, movement, rhythm, colour, and sound are basic, crucial parts of acting, of dramatic text, of direction, scene, and music. Thus, the immaterial subcomponents penetrate all five basic components of theatrical art (JINDRA 1983: 73). Jindra understands the 'immateriality' as a substantial quality of scenography and this characteristic leads him to ponder on analogies with music or with the nature of ideas and emotions (JINDRA 1980: 23–35).

Jindra classifies the immaterial subcomponents as constants of the so-called *transformation principle*. This principle is explained on the basis of its distinction from another principle – the *principle of transposition*. The *transformation principle* is based on the assumption that immaterial subcomponents are able to integrate, to create a brand-new quality altogether. Jindra describes as 'mere' *transposition* a process in which components or elements of performance are derived from their 'maternal' arts without being sufficiently transformed and integrated into the work of art. In this case the components maintain the characteristics of the art (such as its structure) which they are derived from. Therefore, Jindra argues that while entering into the theatrical art, the

---

3   For more details see (MUKAŘOVSKÝ 2016a, b, c or HONZL 2016).

elements of visual or fine arts, like painting, architecture, sculpture and others, have to be *transformed*, not merely *transposed*.

The complex of immaterial subcomponents specifies the uniqueness of scenography and of theatrical art. The dramatic qualities are guaranteed by the very fact that these immaterial components, being indivisible, penetrate all components of dramatic art. According to Jindra, this feature cannot be found in any other artistic discipline (JIN-DRA 1983: 73).

Jindra's conception of material (building, machines, sets, props, staff/people) and immaterial subcomponents (space, time, movement, rhythm, light, colour, and sound) draws more attention to activities interceptable by the senses of the spectator. Today, we probably would not agree with the 'immateriality' of some of the components listed by Jindra: e.g., space, light, colour, maybe even sound (and movement?). Despite the fact that we cannot draw a clear line between 'materiality' and 'immateriality', Jindra's attention to components other than 'material' ones, moreover assigning them to different categories (e.g., time, colour, movement), anticipates the multimodal approach. Especially since we associate Jindra's thinking with Czech theatrical structuralism and semiotics, an interpretation of his ideas is now offered within the framework of the notion of multimodality described, for example, by Carey Jewitt (2017). Jewitt introduces the key concepts of multimodality (*mode*, *materiality*, *modal affordance*, *meaning potential*, and others) which are understood in a way similar to Jindra's key concepts. In addition to these aforementioned notions, which to some extent correspond to Jindra's components, Jewitt pays close attention to *intersemiotic* or *intermodal relationships*. In this respect, Jindra's notions of *immaterial interplay* and *transformation principle* should be examined.

Additionally, Jindra's subcomponents can be viewed analogically to Van Leeuwen's explanation of the *semiotic resources*[4] which I find useful to theatrical performance analysis:

> Semiotic resources are the actions, materials and artefacts we use for communicative purposes, whether produced physiologically – for example, with our vocal apparatus, the muscles we use to make facial expressions and gestures – or technologically – for example, with pen and ink, or computer hardware and software – together with the ways in which these resources can be organized. Semiotic resources have a meaning potential, based on their past uses, and a set of affordances based on their possible uses, and these will be actualized in concrete social contexts where their use is subject to some form of semiotic regime. (VAN LEEUWEN 2004: 285)

If I draw a parallel between this definition and the context of an artistic, specifically theatrical or scenographic work, we can try to interpret Jindra's slightly unclear concepts and the relationships between them. Both of Jindra's categories – of material and immaterial subcomponents – correspond to the notion of *modal resources* listed

---

4   I refer to Van Leeuwen's definition introduced also in Jewitt (2017: 24).

in Jewitt (2017: 23): space, movement, sound (which are *immaterial* in Jindra's understanding), and three-dimensional objects which more or less correspond to Jindra's *material* subcomponents as building, machinery, sets, and props. Jindra's *immaterial interplay* and especially *transformation principle* of components can be more precisely explained by examining the relationships between different modal or semiotic resources. *Transformational principle* can be then understood as a 'proto-umbrella term' anticipating concepts that are vastly examined today within the field of the theory of multimodality.

The transformational principle is the main link between Jindra's explanation of how scenography works and the theory of multimodality. Multimodality Studies, which is now a solidly developed discipline, explains more precisely what Jindra was trying to cover. Jindra's contribution lies first and foremost in the complexity to which he theoretically devoted himself when he quite rightly shifted the perception of scenography from a 'mere' monomodal and 'static' (i.e., non-timeless) discipline, to a complex multimodal shape. A shape that is *situated* and never definitive in the course of the performance, i.e., always co-shaped by any of the other possible modalities, especially the modality (in Jindra's words, *immaterial subcomponent*) of time. I see these connections between Jindra's theoretical approach to scenography and multimodal discourse as potentially mutually inspiring for further research.

In the next paragraphs, I will continue in introducing some concepts of Jindra's treatise and offer some suggestions for possible further research.

Performing and perceiving scenography

According to Jindra's work, modern *scenography* is in correspondence with some aspects of Renaissance and is also influenced by the reformative work of Appia, Craig, and Stanislavsky. Scenography surpasses the options of decoration, stage design, and scenic design, since it is based on the integration of three disciplines: creation, science, and technology. For example, light is an element that connects technology with creation (JINDRA 1983: 92). Jindra argues that the audience witnesses only 20 to 30 percent of scenographers' creative work.[5] The other parts (elements) of their work are – and even have to be – hidden from the audience's sight. Scenography must not be reduced to its *visual aspect* (*výtvarná stránka*); it cannot be stripped of its inner aspects and aspects of the dramatic art: as an insulate discipline it would lose its value (JINDRA 1983: 93). The specificity of scenography is based on cohesiveness with theatrical art. It is determined by the function it has in the whole of the theatrical art (JINDRA 1983: 95). Overall, the 'scientific' part of scenographers' work Jindra comments on is also worth mentioning. Jindra emphasises the in-depth analysis of the possible dramatic world(s) that has to precede every scenographic creation entering the theatre space.

---

5   Unfortunately, we have no modern data to verify these claims. I find it a very interesting topic for further research as well.

In the closing part of his *Specificity of Scenography*, Jindra identifies an objective criterion of modern changes in the approach to the discipline. It is based on the kinetic nature of scene connected to the *form-creating* tendency of the space. Jindra defines three development phases of the process: (1) stage design, (2) scenic design, and (3) scenography (JINDRA 1983: 95). In the first phase, during the stage design, the stage draft usually introduces a static picture for the stage that enables (only) to cover different acts, divided by the pauses or intermissions (to give enough time to change the sets). The second phase, scenic design, evolves from the two-dimensional picture to a creation of a three-dimensional active space for drama (JINDRA 1983: 95). For example, the pause becomes a dramatic, not technical tool. The third phase of the development brings scenography. It is based on the integration of all substructures and elements, excluding everything that comes into the organism of theatrical art from the outside and does not result from its very nature, and the dynamic factum. Jindra proclaims that for scenography the staging conception is or will be the sum of the up-to-date intentional means of communication, enriched by image and light scripts and by necessary experiments which require new documentation techniques (JINDRA 1983: 96).

Following the philosophy of Hegel, Jindra, when explaining the notion of *imagery* (*obraznost*), points out that 'naturalness' (*přirozenost*) is not a basis or the main feature of the art. He emphasises that the relationship between art and reality (every-day or common life) must not follow the way of descriptive realism. Instead of superficial description, the work of scenic designers or 'future' scenographers should deal with the metonymy, especially with synecdoche as its main principle.[6] Jindra argues that the whole can be synthesised in the part. The part is able to stand for the whole. Fragmentalisation is replaced by analysis which enables us to express the very nature of the idea or meaning (JINDRA 1983: 78). Reality is only a starting point for the scenic designer (scenographer) that enables him to create an 'arc of metaphor' (JINDRA 1983: 78). Jindra further explains (imagines) that via the perspective 'from above' the arc of metaphor the artist can express or explain every phenomenon. That it is done from multiple points of view. It also gives him the opportunity to discover new meanings and relations. The scenic designer (scenographer) creates a hyperbola 'over' the reality that touches the idea (high above the reality). And then as he puts it, 'from above' it returns back to the earth – filled up with imagery (JINDRA 1983: 78). This part of Jindra's text seems to anticipate some of the prerequisites of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory as I will also show in the next part of this study.

From the contemplative and conceptual reflection of scenic design Jindra comes to formulating future tasks of scenography. The scenic designers (scenographers) will not yield to the temptation of plurality of phenomena and the chaos and will not count on the possible use of geometrical perspective to organise them. They will take only some particular elements of reality and organise them into a brand new – intentionally and newly – whole. This whole is not, by any of its components, clearly and unambiguously

---

6   More precisely, he is emphasising the question of choosing the 'part' as *pars pro toto* (a part for the whole).

bound to everyday life and reality. It expresses in an imaginary way the whole of reality. Scenography has to create a representative or illustrative (*názorný*) model of the world which has its own laws (JINDRA 1983: 79).

Scenography is not based on transposition of element(s) from one kind of art to another. As Jindra argues, its main principle of creation is *transformation*.[7] One of the pivotal and most instructive examples can be found in Jindra's explanation of the process of involving architecture in theatrical performance which Jindra again approaches from the historical point of view. Every time an architectonical object enters the space depicted by picture frame stage it is specifically 're-created'. First of all, it changes its nature from three-dimensional (architectonic) object to the two-dimensional 'picture' – depicted or displayed in the 'picture frame' of the stage. But most importantly, the specificity of the space into which the object enters causes its *structural* change. The (architectonic) object is destructed and fragmentised (JINDRA 1983: 36). Then it is re-created according to dramatic – not architectonic or visual arts – laws. This applies for realistic tendencies and also for more 'abstract' or metaphorical approaches to designing the stage, to scenography. Jindra claims he refers to the principle as used by Stanislavsky when he asked for meticulous elaboration of the whole ground-plan of the scenic 'architectonic' object on the stage, although only one small part of it was to be displayed on the stage. A similar approach can be observed in František Tröster's scenographies – for example in his famous 'drunk doors' for Gogol's *Revizor* [The Government Inspector].[8] The doors, resembling wings (flats), were created without respecting the 'usual' laws of geometry (and kinetics). Also, Tröster's scenography for the production of Pavel Bořkovec's ballet *Krysař* [The Pied Piper][9] is remembered for the characters (dancers) entering the stage through different apertures or rather mouse-hole-like passages and doors. In both cases, the 'stage architecture' was created following the dramatic principles, not architectonic laws. Tröster highly elaborated the transformative principle, and his works are even today perceived as ground-breaking in modern scenography.[10]

---

7   For analysis of the issues connected to the work of the Prague School from the point of view of comparative semiology of arts, intermediality, transmediality, plurimediality, and more see (ŠLAISOVÁ 2014).

8   National Theatre Prague, 1936, dir. by Jiří Frejka.

9   National Theatre Prague, 1942, dir. by Václav Kašlík, conducted by Václav Talich, choreographed by Joe Jenčík.

10   For more details of F. Tröster's work see, e.g., bilingual monograph *František Tröster. Básník světla a prostoru / Artist of Light and Space* (KOUBSKÁ et al. 2007) or book in Czech by Jiří Hilmera (1989).

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová

Presages of Contemporary Theatre Studies Theories in Vladimír Jindra's Structuralist Theory ...

[spektrum]

Can Jindra's concept of scenography be approached from a cognitive perspective?

Today, Conceptual Metaphor Theory,[11] Conceptual Integration/Blending Theory,[12] and Multimodal (Metaphor) Theory[13] offer what appear as fresh approaches to theatre performance analysis. Yet, approximately fifty years ago[14] Jindra touched upon some of the topics from the vast field of theatre studies which have become relevant again within modern cognitive theories. I will focus on some examples of Jindra's ideas which can be connected to and even further inspire contemporary cognitive approach to theatre. For example, Vladimír Jindra's emphasis on the immaterial components as the most important means of expression of theatrical art meets some of the cognitive approach research topics related to the meaning-making process. In this respect, he especially examines the movement and rhythm rooted in time and space – he calls them 'gnoseological detectors' (JINDRA 1983: 90). In this section, I will introduce some relevant cognitive theories and focus on more examples of Jindra's thoughts that resonate with them and have the potential to contribute to them.

The date of publication of Jindra's work (1983) coincides with the time when the pivotal treatise on cognitive metaphor was published: George Lakoff and Mark Johnson introduced their Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) in the book titled *Metaphors We Live By* (1980). They understand metaphor not as 'a figure of speech, but a mode of thought' (LAKOFF 1993: 210). According to this approach, the 'poetic' or 'creative' metaphors are no more exclusively a matter of figurative speech or artistic imagination as was traditionally understood by literary studies. In the field of cognitive studies, these kinds of metaphors (figurative language) are treated as verbal manifestations or representations of conceptual metaphors. In the last forty years the CMT, especially when applied to highly sophisticated arts, shifted from its early focus on the verbal metaphors, towards *multimodality* and *multimodal metaphors*. Quite recently, multimodality also started to be applied in (cognitive) theatre studies (DANCYGIER 2016: 21–39; for general introduction to multimodal metaphor see also FORCEVILLE and URIOS-APARISI 2009). *Multimodal metaphor* is viewed as the result of multimodal communication/creation/ way of meaning construction where different *modes* such as pictorial signs, written signs, spoken signs, gestures, sounds, music, smells, tastes, and touch (FORCEVILLE 2009: 21) interplay. These modes – usually only some of them used at the same time or in one genre – can integrate to create a multimodal metaphor. I will focus on some possible connections between Jindra's ideas and contemporary cognitive approaches. My aim here is to give an overview of possible topics to be the subject of further research.

---

11   I rely mostly on the pioneering Lakoff and Johnson's approach (1980) or (LAKOFF 1993) and Zoltán Kövecses's works (e.g., 2003; 2005; 2010; 2020).

12   For general introduction of the concept see (FAUCONNIER and TURNER 2003). For discussion of the approach in theatre studies see, e.g., (DANCYGIER 2016) or Chapter 6 in (DANCYGIER 2012).

13   The discussion is below.

14   He probably had written his treatise much earlier than it was published.

Conceptual mapping and dilatation of conveying and perceiving the meaning

If we consider Jindra's *transformation principle,* it is, at least partially, in correspondence with *conceptual mapping*, i.e., 'usual', often unconscious, operation based on the 'correspondences between conceptual domains (space, time, force, emotion, etc.) or between entities within the same conceptual domain. Through mapping, we project inferences, elements, and relations from one mental configuration to another' (CÁNOVAS and MANZANARES 2014: 261). Everything for the purpose of evolution of the plot and dramatic action has to be re-created on the stage. It has to be (re-)conceptualised by the means of theatrical art – the 'bits' from reality are mapped to the world of drama. In my opinion, the relation of everyday world and the world of performance (expressed by scenography) is worth examining from this point of view.

Since the multimodality approach to metaphor in a way elaborates CMT, Jindra's notion of *arc of metaphor* should be examined via the connection of *conceptual mapping* and *transformation principle*. Jindra explains the relationship between art and reality via the image of only partial contact of scenography with reality. That is a starting point for viewing and conveying the meaning. Jindra's explanation is itself metaphorical. He evokes an image of *hyperbola over reality*, emphasises the 'above' of the *arc of metaphor* from which the artist can express or explain every phenomenon and give multiple points of view. The image of *hyperbola* or *arc* provides a camber, not straight trajectory of point, or a sequence of points of view from which reality can be observed. This explanation of metaphor includes also an image of the notion of a distance (starting and ending after some performed way again in touch with the reflected reality). The arc therefore dilates both the conveying and perceiving the meaning. And further, as I interpret Jindra's writings, in the arc, i.e., curved trajectory, of metaphor there are several points (emergent in time of performance) where *pars pro toto* principle applies as the synthesis of the whole in a part. The parts are compressed in a point and enable to convey and perceive new meanings and relations. However, the trajectory of view is not fragmental, but analytical: i.e., via subsequent synthesis, it enables us to express the very nature of the idea or meaning. In theorising scenography, Jindra provides and modifies metaphorical projection/mapping with further qualities – distance achieved by moving away from and re-approaching reality enabling, although paradoxically, dilatation of conveying and perceiving compressed meaning. And scenography is an instrument of this complex mental operation.

Interpreted from the contemporary conceptual metaphor or multimodal metaphor approach, Jindra outlines a complex process of metaphorical mappings in his explaining of the *hyperbola over reality* or *arc of metaphor*. In discussing these two notions, the correspondence between conceptual metaphor mappings can be seen. I suggest interpreting Jindra's *reality* or reflected reality as the *target domain* and his imagining *hyperbolic* or *metaphoric* 'movement' on the 'arc' as manifestations of offered conceptualisation, i.e., as complex scenographical *source domain* created by direction-scenographic

conception. To reinterpret Jindra's words in this theoretical context by way of example, Tröster's scenography of the 'slanted' (as if drunk) door in the staging of Gogol's *The Government Inspector* serves as a source domain for mapping not only the state of drunkenness but the working of the entire system. Such a scenographic source domain is to be created precisely by linking different perspectives and continuities of perspectives, the points from which the mapping between source and target domains is led.

If we were to consider the directions in which it would be possible and appropriate to develop Jindra's profound observations on scenography, other approaches besides those already mentioned, or more precisely, specific elaborations of the theories already mentioned, could be offered. Jindra's affinity with theatrical structuralist thinking, especially that of Otakar Zich and Jan Mukařovský, and his thinking about the metaphorical nature of scenography encourages further development of these reflections – especially in terms of the notion(s) of *deliberateness* and *non-deliberateness* of metaphor. Drawing parallel to another contemporary cognitive approach – possibly also to theatre – Valentina Cuccio's (2018) and Gerard Steen's (2018)[15] works should be taken into consideration. They introduce the concepts of *deliberate* (and *non-deliberate*) metaphors, very inspiringly discussed within the terms of embodied simulation, mirror neurons, attention, etc. Interestingly, the authors explain the relation between deliberateness (intentionality) and non-deliberateness as inseparable. This idea could also call back to some aspects of Mukařovský's notions of intentionality and unintentionality in arts.[16] Although some elements or parts of a metaphor may arise accidentally, they are an inseparable, complementary part of the metaphor and the meaning it carries. Following Jindra's thoughts about the meaning-making faculty of scenography, we can interpret and complete his remarks via Cuccio's and Steen's claim about communicative effectiveness of metaphor based substantially on attention: '[…] deliberate metaphors are those metaphors that force us to pay attention to both the source and the target domain construing the referential meaning of a metaphor related utterance' (CUCCIO and STEEN 2019: 193). Jindra's conception of scenography constantly circles around this principle: for scenography and theatre in general, it is essential that the viewer's attention must not only be on the target but also on the source domain.

From multimodality to scenography as a viewpoint

As I have outlined, Jindra's conception of *immaterial subcomponents,* space, time, movement, rhythm, light, colour, and sound (JINDRA 1983: 72–73), along with his idea that they penetrate all the levels and components of theatrical art, anticipates to some extent the processes approached within the field of multimodality. This shift in understanding the style and purpose of designing the stage is derived from the changing

---

15   See also their joint study (CUCCIO and STEEN 2019).

16   See (MUKAŘOVSKÝ 1978) and for the interpretation and contextualisation of some aspect of Mukařovský's work also Yana Meerzon's study (2014).

scenography in Jindra's time: into a 'multimodal' discipline gaining more ways for conveying meaning. Jindra calls for the integration of visual elements (as a mode) with other modes and defines the functions of the modes – that can be identified in his conception of immaterial subcomponents. The above analysed principles of transformation and metaphor also explain the way Jindra understood what was happening with the different (sub)components – in the running time of the performance. Similarly to the Multimodal Metaphor Theory (especially FORCEVILLE and URIOS-APARISI 2009), he claims that every (sub)component has the power to change a meaning of the already created whole (of subcomponents).

Jindra's observations are based mostly on analysis of Stanislavsky's, Appia's, and Craig's reformative work, and also on the 'Trösterian-Svobodian' approach to scenography. As Věra Ptáčková puts it, Jindra's 'ideal' scenography of an integrated theatrical work of art is related to spatial and light-kinetic scene developed by František Tröster's and Josef Svoboda's in their works (PTÁČKOVÁ 1983: 6). In conceptualising his own work, Tröster introduced some innovative principles. One of them is the concept of *dramatic projections* or *dramatic projection planes* (*dramatické průmětny*). Even though Tröster used the term quite loosely, it can be explained as an attitude to the work of dramatic art (KOUBSKÁ 2007: 15). In the context of scenographic practice, the concept can be understood as referring to material reality, that is a geometrical shape created as a part of scenography which has metaphoric meaning.[17] It is a way of expressing various thoughts, attitudes, points of view, or approaches to the topic of the situation or play. It can be seen as a tri-dimensional 'construct(ion)' from which the attempted meaning and expressed contexts of the production spring.[18] But the first step to achieve the purpose of this approach lies in 'identifying and choosing the dramatic projection or opinion which determines' the style ('shape') of direction and visual component (scenography) (KOUBSKÁ 2007: 15).

This approach also brings us closer to understanding not only the whole/entirety of performance but also the scenography in practice (not only in theory) in terms of the multimodal metaphor. Tröster's *dramatic projection plane* explains how Jindra's *immaterial subcomponents* (hand in hand with components in a structuralist sense) help to integrate different modes to create a metaphor – multimodal through and through.

Besides interpreting Jindra's groups of material and immaterial subcomponents as 'modes' as Forceville or Jewitt terms them, we can further follow his thoughts about the importance of scenography within the meaning making process while analysing Jindra's more general understanding of *scenography*. Again, we come to his image/concept

---

17   Vlasta Koubská writes: 'Tröster's concept of the dramatic or spatial "projection plane" meant in essence a chosen angle of view on the whole dramatic work. It was therefore necessary first of all to reveal and choose that dramatic projection plane or basic point of view which subsequently determined the form of direction and design' (KOUBSKÁ 2007: 15).

18   The definition is based on several sources – e.g. (KOUBSKÁ 2007: 15), as well as my interview with Koubská (KOUBSKÁ 2019).

[**spektrum**]

of 'arc of metaphor', a term which comes close to the notion of *viewpoint compression*[19] (DANCYGIER 2012) that moderates and drives the emergent story:

> [...] multiplicity of viewpoints in narrative discourse is conceptually manageable because of a series of compressions bringing a micro-level viewpoint up to the macro level of narrative spaces. Thus various partial and very local viewpoints are interpreted as contributing to or blending with the viewpoint of the narrative space currently being elaborated. (DANCYGIER 2012: 97)

Drawing the connection to Dancygier's approach, we can understand Jindra's notion of scenography,[20] which is obviously more than 'simple' designing/painting the theatre stage, as an instrument that literally provides a space for multimodal manifestations of one or multiple viewpoints. They co-construct a more 'general' viewpoint of the main narrative space that enables them to capture the emergent meaning of the story. The 'scenographic viewpoint' is performed via *compression* which Jindra outlined mostly in his terms of *transformational principle* and 'arc of metaphor'. Jindra's description of scenography as a discipline that can offer (multiple) viewpoints is worthy of further research – following especially current cognitive approaches.[21] In the next, last section, I will briefly outline Jindra's observations on historical shifts in understanding and creating scenographic modality.

From monomodal to multimodal understanding of scenography

Jindra based his taxonomy on the idea of evolution from a simple theatre stage made of or 'decorated' with visual elements (*decoration*) to scenography as a complex discipline. If we revise his approach in terms of multimodal analysis, Jindra puts stress on the development from a rather monomodal creation to a complex multimodal approach toward designing the space for performance. Scenography and its specificity as understood by Jindra can also be explained as multimodal in its very nature. His material (especially stage) and immaterial *subcomponents* (space, time, movement, rhythm, etc.) can be understood as modes, or at least they have to be taken into account when we intend to approach the theatre as a multimodal art. These *subcomponents* constitute elements of 'higher unit', i.e., the components, according to the structuralist understanding as mentioned above. These *components* (direction, acting) must also be understood as multimodal. Moreover, the 'unity' (theatrical performance) constitutes a coveted multimodal medium. In my opinion, all these thoughts are worthy of further exploration and research.

---

19   The concept is elaborated throughout the whole book, but in more detail in Chapter 4.

20   Interconnected closely with 'trösterian' scenography and Tröster's concept of *dramatic projection plane*.

21   One of the main possible sources of inspiration for such a focused analysis in this context is, e.g., (DANCYGIER et al. 2016).

[spectrum]

In other words, in his tracing of the evolution of visual elements in theatre and in creating the taxonomy of designing the stage, Jindra analyses the process of increasing multimodality. The specificity of scenography lies in its complex multimodality. Since multimodality is connected to and (at least partially) derived from the basic five human senses, Jindra's concept of scenography is related to current trends in approaching theatrical art and scenography as we observe them today. Together with theatrical art, the scenography also extends to other modes, and it broadens its multimodal nature – besides sight and hearing it also aims more and more at affecting also touch, smell and even taste (e.g., in immersive theatre). The structuralists defined various kinds of signs. In their notions of elements and components, the modes can be easily recognised. Jindra's subcomponents, particularly the immaterial subcomponents, also allow focusing on other vital 'modes' of theatrical performance – through analysing scenography. Jindra emphasises, for example, the rhythm, time, and space which are integral aspects of the multimodal nature of each component.

This approach can be evolved even further and engage all of the human senses into a complex interplay. The stream of outcomes of such complex interaction can be considered in terms of the concept of embodiment. From the current perspective, scenography is able to create the world in which the dramatic figures come alive. Moreover, such a complex world interacts with them, and it changes itself dynamically due to these interactions. Therefore, scenography can be understood as an embodied space of drama and as a 'living' dynamic system.

I think Vladimír Jindra understands making space for performance in these terms. Jindra's concept of scenography as a complex discipline anticipated its possible multimodal understanding. The scenography is not merely visual or 'static' discipline, as Jindra convincingly proves by his analyses. It can be defined not only by its visual aspect, but also by the audial aspects, and further, by its temporality, spatiality, or 'directionality'. In this 'expanded' understanding it can be also created by various modes connected to other human senses. Scenography – in the same way as theatre art – is complex and multimodal in its nature. It is able to take advantage of every mode.

Conclusion

Scenography is considerably productive in creating *creative metaphor* which stimulates our multimodal, metaphorical thinking during the performance. The ability of scenography to incite and engage our metaphorical thinking in a complex way is based on its multimodality and on the interaction of the modes in time and space. It creates the space for the drama to evolve. By its multimodal nature it also speaks for the drama itself (not only in the sense of pure text), in terms of interpreting particular productions. Even though Jindra did not articulate explicitly the specificity of the scenography in such a broad sense, his analysis opened to theatre practitioners and to theoreticians the option of comprehending a notion of scenography that we can further develop.

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová

Presages of Contemporary Theatre Studies Theories in Vladimír Jindra's Structuralist Theory ...

In this study I tried to provide a detailed analysis of the work of Czechoslovak theoretician of scenography Vladimír Jindra who at his time introduced innovative taxonomy of scenography. His taxonomy substantially contributed to the shift in understanding of the discipline and also to today's worldwide understanding of the notion of scenography as a complex theatrical discipline. My aim was also to connect Jindra's work with some contemporary theoretical approaches to theatre, especially within the vast field of multimodality and with some aspects of today's Cognitive Theatre Studies approach, to offer some further research topics which can be mutually inspiring for the field of Theatres Studies and multimodal or cognitive analyses.

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

CÁNOVAS, Cristóbal Pagán and Javier Valenzuela MANZANARES. 2014. Conceptual Mappings and Neural Reuse. *Front Hum Neurosci* 8 (2014): 1–3. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00261.

CUCCIO, Valentina. 2018. *Attention to Metaphor. From Neurons to Representations.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2018.

CUCCIO, Valentina and Gerard STEEN. 2019. Deliberate Metaphors and Embodied Simulation. In Ignasi Navarro i Ferrando (ed.). 2019. *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2019: 185–203.

BURIAN, Jarka. 2002. *Leading Creators of Twentieth-Century Czech Theatre.* London/New York: Routledge, 2002.

DANCYGIER, Barbara. 2012. *The Language of Stories. A Cognitive Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

DANCYGIER, Barbara. 2016. Multimodality and Theatre: Material Objects, Bodies and Language. In Rhonda Blair and Amy Cook (eds.). *Theatre, Performance and Cognition.* London: Bloomsbury, 2016: 21–39.

DANCYGIER, Barbara, Wei-lun LU and Arie VERHAGEN (eds.). 2016. *Viewpoint and the Fabric of Meaning Form and Use of Viewpoint Tools Across Languages and Modalities.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2016.

DROZD, David and Tomáš KAČER. 2016. Introduction. In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 13–27.

DROZD, David, Tomáš KAČER and Don SPARLING (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016.

FAUCONNIER, Gilles. 2018. *Ten Lectures on Cognitive Construction of Meaning*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018.

FAUCONNIER, Gilles and Mark TURNER. 2003. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.

FORCEVILLE, Charles. 2009. Non-verbal and Multimodal Metaphor in a Cognitivist Framework: Agendas for Research. In Charles Forceville and Eduardo Urios-Aparisi (eds.). *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009: 19–40.

FORCEVILLE, Charles and Eduardo URIOS-APARISI (eds.). 2009. *Multimodal Metaphor*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.

HILMERA, Jiří. 1989. *František Tröster*. Prague: Divadelní ústav, 1989.

HONZL, Jindřich. 2016. The Mobility of the Theatrical Sign. In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 129–146.

JINDRA, Vlasimír. 1980. Marginálie k dílu Františka Tröstra [Marginalia to the Work of František Tröster]. *Interscena* 2 (1980): 1: 23–35.

JINDRA, Vladimír. 1983. *Specifičnost scénografie* [The Specificity of Scenography]. Prague: Divadelní ústav, 1983.

KOUBSKÁ, Vlasta (ed.). 2007. *František Tröster. Básník světla a prostoru / Artist of Light and Space*. Prague: Obecní dům, 2007.

KOUBSKÁ, Vlasta. 2019. Telephone interview with the author (27. 02. 2019).

KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2003. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2005. *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

KÖVECSES, Zoltán. 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

LAKOFF, George. 1993. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Andrew Ortony (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 202–251.

LAKOFF, George and Mark JOHNSON. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

MEERZON, Yana. 2014. Between Intentionality and Affect: On Jan Mukařovský's Theory of Reception. *Theatralia* 17 (2014): 2: 24–40.

MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 2016a. An Attempt at a Structural Analysis of an Actor's Figure (Chaplin in *City Lights*). In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 192–198.

MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 2016b. On Stage Dialogue. In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 212–215.

MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 2016c. On the Current State of the Theory of Theatre. In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). 2016. *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings*. Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 59–75.

MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. 1978. Intentionality and Unintentionality in Art. In John Burbank and Peter Steiner (transl. and eds.). *Structure, Sign, and Function: Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978: 89–128.

PŘÍHODOVÁ, Barbora. 2011. *The Specificity of Scenography*: A Czech Contribution to the Theory of Scenography. *Theatralia* 14 (2011): 1: 254–262.

PTÁČKOVÁ, Věra. 1983. Úvod [Introduction]. In Vladimír Jindra. *Specifičnost scénografie* [The Specificity of Scenography]. Prague: Theatre Institute, 1983.

STEEN, Gerard. 2018. Attention to Deliberateness in Metaphor Processing. In Valentina Cuccio. *Attention to Metaphor. From Neurons to Representations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2018: 89–109.

ŠLAISOVÁ, Eva. 2014. The Prague School's Contribution to the Theory of Intermediality. *Theatralia* 17 (2014): 2: 41–49.

VAN LEEUWEN, Theo. 2004. *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London/New York: Routledge, 2004.

VELTRUSKÝ, Jiří. 2016 [1941]. Dramatic Text as a Component of Theatre. In David Drozd, Tomáš Kačer and Don Sparling (eds.). *Theatre Theory Reader*. *Prague School Writings*. Prague: Karolinum, 2016: 247–267.

ZICH, Otakar. 1931. *Estetika dramatického umění: teoretická dramaturgie* [The Aesthetics of Dramatic Art: A Theoretical Dramaturgy]. Prague: Melantrich, 1931.

spektrum

spectrum

doc. Mgr. Šárka Havlíčková Kysová, Ph.D.

Masaryk University, Department of Theatre Studies
Gorkého 57/7, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic
sarka.havlickova@phil.muni.cz
ORCID: 0000-0002-1259-5991

Šárka Havlíčková Kysová is Associate Professor at Masaryk University, Department of Theatre Studies. In her research and lecturing activities she focuses on the theory of theatre (especially from the perspective of cognitive studies), and the staging of opera (especially Czech stagings of operas by Claudio Monteverdi, Giuseppe Verdi, Richard Wagner, and Bedřich Smetana). At present she focuses on the application of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Multimodal Metaphor Theory in the field of the analysis of opera production practice and reflections on directing operas.

100