

'It's not about fucking it up'

Ledger, Adam

DOI:

[10.1080/10486801.2016.1183663](https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2016.1183663)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Ledger, A 2016, 'It's not about fucking it up': The Trial of Ubu, the text and the director', *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 345-356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2016.1183663>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Contemporary Theatre Review* on 22nd September 2016, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10486801.2016.1183663>

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.


Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



'It's not about fucking it up': The Trial of Ubu, the text and the director

Journal:	<i>Contemporary Theatre Review</i>
Manuscript ID:	GCTR-2015-0031
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Simon Stephens, directing, text and performance, Katie Mitchell, Sebastian Nübling

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

'It's not about fucking it up': *The Trial of Ubu*, the text and the director

Simon Stephens's *The Trial of Ubu* ran at London's Hampstead Theatre in January and February 2012, directed by Katie Mitchell, in the face of lukewarm press reviews and, as Stephens himself has pointed out, disappointing audiences.¹ Stephens's conceit in *The Trial of Ubu* is to take King Ubu, the central character of Alfred Jarry's 1896 play *Ubu Roi*, and place him on trial for crimes against humanity in a setting reminiscent of the International Criminal Court. Although Stephens has stated that he had no interest in creating a documentary drama to explore the aftermath of genocide, war crimes or other atrocities² – and had written the play earlier as a commission for an existing collaboration between theatres in continental Europe – he was criticised by *The Guardian*'s Michael Billington for not following the strategies of verbatim theatre so successfully employed at the nearby Tricycle theatre.³ *The Telegraph*'s Charles Spencer insisted too that the idea 'cries out for the detailed, sober documentary drama'⁴ of the Tricycle's work. These critics miss the point that Ubu is a fictional character; Stephens can but invent Ubu's testimony, drawing on *Ubu Roi*, though extends the account of Ubu's crimes to include more recent events.

By placing Ubu in a contemporary period, Stephens is able to examine the protracted legal wrangling of international tribunals (processes with a contested legal status still). As well as a legal team, court personnel and Ubu himself, characters are called as witnesses: Achras, Norbert Nurdle, McClub, the Major General-in-Chief and, a star witness, Ma Ubu herself. Each of these figures reports Ubu's gruesome behaviour, in a play that

¹ Simon Stephens, 'Recession has made British audiences more conservative, says playwright', 9 February 2012, *The Guardian* <<http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/feb/09/recession-british-audiences-conservative-playwright#comments>> [accessed 27 June 2014]. The article comments are drawn from an earlier interview with Simon Stephens on the Theatrevoice website <http://www.theatrevoice.com/7706/award-winning-playwright-simon-stephens-rewrites-king-ubu/#.U60RcHlwaZU> [accessed 27 June 2014].

² Stephens, in Duška Radosavljević, *Theatre Making: Interplay Between Text and Performance in the 21st Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 205.

³ Michael Billington, 'The Trial of Ubu – Review', 25 January 2012, *The Guardian* <<http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/jan/25/the-trial-of-ubu-review>> [accessed 24 June 2014]. The Tricycle Theatre has a reputation for staging verbatim work, including several recent plays 'edited', rather than 'written' by Richard Norton-Taylor that have staged inquiries and tribunals, such as *Nuremberg* (1996), *Called to Account* (2007), concerning the legality of the invasion of Iraq, and *Tactical Questioning* (2011), based on the inquiry into the death of a prisoner in British custody in Iraq.

⁴ Charles Spencer, 'The Trial of Ubu, Hampstead Theatre, review', 25 January 2012, *The Telegraph* <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/theatre-reviews/9038474/The-Trial-of-Ubu-Hampstead-Theatre-review.html>> [accessed 24 June 2014].

clearly should be taken to mirror recent events in The Hague, not least the trial of Slobodan Milošević.⁵ Like that figure, Ubu ends the play alone in his cell, remembering 'one time I dreamt that the sky was full of stars but all of the stars started to bleed and burst [...] I dreamt that all the metal in this place started crying. Ubu - watch the skies! [...] Ubu – this is what you did! This is what you have to do'.⁶

Prior to Mitchell's production, *The Trial of Ubu* had been staged earlier in 2010 as a German-Dutch co-production between Toneelgroep Amsterdam and the Schauspielhaus Essen, directed by Stephens's regular collaborator, Sebastian Nübling. In some contrast to the London reaction in the press, reviewers enjoyed the 'physical clowning and verbal horseplay' of Nübling's production. Even if, as I discuss, Stephens's text was not followed closely, Nübling's inventive production was relished for its 'grandiose clowning-about and excited action painting', in which actors covered each other in paint and indulged in casual violence, like, as one critic suggested, amidst 'a children's party that descends into a bacchanal'.⁷ As well as Nübling's bold directorial hand, it was as if Jarry himself had been let loose on the production.

Unlike their Continental counterparts, some reviewers of the Hampstead production resorted to their familiar criticism of Mitchell, disliking how the play had apparently been warped by the interventions of a self-interested director; key to Mitchell's production was the radical decision that the procession of characters in the trial scenes would not be seen by the audience. Instead the bulk of Stephens's playtext was delivered by two courtroom interpreters (the presence of these figures is only alluded to in stage directions), who translated the speech of 'invisible' witnesses, as well as Ubu himself, into English. Elsewhere, a wheezing Ubu with smudged clown make-up, his gaoler and two lawyers were shown in scenes set in other locations; in the court characters 'appeared' only through the eyes of the actors playing the interpreters, who had worked in rehearsal to create this 'reality' for themselves very precisely, as if watching live action or film. But Spencer found Mitchell's choice led to a 'smart-alec production' and opined that her 'absurd focus on the translators, rather than the witnesses and the accused, is to create an arty, tiresomely self-regarding production out of

⁵ Milošević was President of Serbia (1989-97) and President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1997–2000). His five year trial for genocide and crimes against humanity, during which Milošević conducted his own defence as he refused to accept the legitimacy of the court (which had not been convened according to UN agreement), ended without a verdict upon Milošević's death in his prison cell in 2006.

⁶ Simon Stephens, *The Trial of Ubu*, (London: Methuen, 2012), p. 45

⁷ These review quotes are, respectively, from the website 'Come-on.de' and the newspapers *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (Germany) and *Trouw* (Netherlands), but are taken from <http://www.tga.nl/en/productions/ubu/pers> [accessed 25 June 2014]. I am grateful to Simone Schroth for these and subsequent translations from non-English press sources.

subject matter that ought to offer a serious, sober insight into the darkness of mankind at its worst'.⁸ Certain critics could not accept a performance where a formal approach was at odds with the kind of realism they had seen elsewhere and, in contrast to Continental practice, wanted instead a director who would not interfere (as they saw it) with the writer's text.

Despite differences in performance style and reception, Stephens had an active involvement in both productions of *The Trial of Ubu*; he is a writer who wishes to work amidst a creative process where the realisation of a new play is never complete until director, actors, production personnel, the rehearsal process and, ultimately, audiences comprise part of the collaboration. Stephens has particularly embraced the directorial daring of German contemporary theatre, describing Nübling's work as 'remarkably bold, visually confident, theatrically physical, intellectually daring [...] there is terrific kinetic energy to his productions'.⁹ Stephens's collaboration with Mitchell continued too with his version of *The Cherry Orchard* at London's Young Vic (2014); indeed, Stephens dedicated the published version of the text to Mitchell, praising her 'rigour and cheekiness and clarity'.¹⁰

Mise en scène

This discussion offers an account of the two contrasting productions in which the directors created radical reworkings of the playwright's *schema*, yet where choices still aligned with and promoted the intention of the work. Cutting through the often circular contestation of the 'problem of text and performance', Duška Radosavljević usefully considers staging is an act of meaningful translation, suggesting 'translation' should be understood as 'an epistemological rather than a mechanical endeavour',¹¹ where idiom and context are important. Beyond entrenched positions around text and its (too) straightforward relationship to a production, the 'experimental' directors of the London and German-Dutch productions both exemplify how such a shift in thinking and practice produced something *new* within the idiom of their respective formal experimentation and in the context of particular performative circumstances. In looking at aspects of both productions of *The Trial of Ubu*, I intend to consider place (here specifically a courtroom),

⁸ Spencer, 'The Trial of Ubu, Hampstead Theatre, review'.

⁹ Theatrevoice, <http://www.theatrevoice.com/7706/award-winning-playwright-simon-stephens-rewrites-king-ubu/#.U60RcHlwaZU> [accessed 27 June 2014].

¹⁰ Anton Chekhov, *The Cherry Orchard*, English language version by Simon Stephens (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), n.p.

¹¹ Radosavljević, *Theatre Making*, p. 27.

approaches to acting and characterisation, and some of the implications of the respective director's choices. I adopt Patrice Pavis's dual notions of *mise en jeu* and *performise* as discussed in his *Contemporary Mise en Scène: Staging Theatre Today* (2012) to examine some of the choices evident in the two distinctive productions.

Pavis suggests that the more familiar term *mise en scène* is confusing: it may be 'the passage of the text to the stage' or 'an autonomous art'.¹² Pavis suggests that *mise en scène* is, more clearly, 'the tuning of theatre for the needs of stage and audience', in which 'organisation and meaning'¹³ is - significantly for this discussion - that of the director. Pavis further proposes the term *mise en jeu*, a 'putting into play' of the playtext within the *mise en scène*. As exemplified in both of the directors' work discussed here, a performance, as an event in itself, may sometimes radically depart from what the writer has placed on the page.¹⁴

A more sophisticated understanding of the interrelationship between playtext, director, acting and production leads Pavis to suggest a 'connection [...] which is so marked we might be tempted to invent the new terms, *mise en perf*, or *performise*',¹⁵ a hybrid neologism bringing together 'the previously incompatible notions of performance and *mise en scène*'.¹⁶ To relish what is in effect the presentation of the outcome of 'translation' (as Radosavljević puts it) appears in some contrast to the apparent British tradition of vanilla renderings of the playwright's text, exacerbated in the case of the Hampstead Theatre's production of *The Trial of Ubu* by expectations in the press of mimetic re-enactment of courtroom proceedings through verbatim drama. Stephens has also suggested that the conditions of production are

¹² Patrice Pavis, *Contemporary Mise en Scène: Staging Theatre Today* (London: Routledge, 2012), p. 11.

¹³ Pavis, *Contemporary Mise en Scène*, p. 4.

¹⁴ Of course, rather than offering a closed, fictional world and defined location, some contemporary writers' texts increasingly have a call to create a directorial *mise en scène* written into them: Martin Crimp's work without attributed characters is a clear example, and Stephens's *Pornography* has implicit a challenge to *find a mise en jeu* through its openness and fluidity of place and time, despite its 'seven ages of man' structure; Stephens has mentioned using Jacques's speech from Shakespeare's *As You Like It* as a framework several times in interview, e.g. '*Pornography* – Simon Stephens interview' <<https://www.list.co.uk/article/10159-pornography-simon-stephens-interview/>> [accessed 15 February 2015].

¹⁵ Pavis, *Contemporary Mise en Scène*, p. 47.

¹⁶ Ibid.

key determining factors in outcomes,¹⁷ whereby economic or other factors, not merely ‘smart alec’ tendencies, necessitate certain decisions. Far from thwarting *The Trial of Ubu*, as I discuss, directorial choices in both productions were undertaken with Stephens’s approval, both undermining the UK critics’ assumptions and reinforcing a playful *performise*.

The court

Stephens asks that *The Trial of Ubu* is performed ‘immediately after a performance of *Ubu Roi* by Alfred Jarry or combinations of his *Ubu* plays’.¹⁸ Stephens in fact provides his own, shortened version of Jarry’s *Ubu Roi* (some nine and a half pages in the published English version), which Stephens explicitly says ‘should be performed by puppets’.¹⁹ In Mitchell’s production, the puppet play recalled something of the violence of Punch and Judy - using puppets certainly makes stage directions such as ‘the stake is driven up his arse’²⁰ a little easier to realise - and established Ubu’s violence that, in turn, served to emphasise Stephens’s contemporary response. Dispensing with the puppets, though using some of Stephens’s prelude text similarly to revel in the totalitarianism and toilet humour of *Ubu Roi*, Nübling’s production took place in an unidentified action-space in which actors worked as an inventive, ensemble-based company, each playing several characters (bar the male actor Nicola Mastroberardino as Ubu); Frieda Pittoors, for example, first played Ma Ubu (an ‘unseen’ character in Mitchell’s production other than in puppet form) and later the presiding judge when Stephens’s play proper began.

One of the greatest challenges presented by Stephens’s script is how to stage a courtroom, which, if following the example of the International Criminal Court, would comprise some forty people. The playtext lists twelve named characters, but the script calls for additional court personnel. To understand the sheer noise levels created by all these people and envisaged amidst a Babel of languages - an acoustic aspect never really achieved in either production - Stephens’s instructions are worth quoting in full as they reveal a particularly aural dimension to his imagination:

¹⁷ Simon Stephens, ‘Two Kingdoms: England vs Germany’, discussion at ‘Turning the Page: Creating New Writing 1945-2013’, University of Reading, 13 September 2013.

¹⁸ Stephens, *The Trial of Ubu*, n.p.

¹⁹ Ibid., n.p.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 57.

In the courtroom multiple translations are used. Words are translated into German, Dutch, English and French where appropriate.

Where appropriate we can hear the translation.

Where appropriate the multiple translation becomes cacophonous.

Sometimes there may be discrepancies between the spoken statements and their translations.

Sometimes the translation is on a soundtrack that slows down or speeds up unnaturally.

Sometimes the sound drops out altogether.²¹

These stage directions clearly offer directorial choice and also suggest a more abstracted soundtrack that at once echoes the action of the court, whilst also suggesting its irreality, again demonstrating Stephens's desire to resist a classic courtroom drama. As if in response to the writer's attempt to make the sound of language sometimes dominate action, the Hampstead version staged the court as, crucially, *voiced* through the interpreters, cocooned in their accurately recreated booth, locked in the translation and verbalisation of dialogue between parties carefully visualised by the two actors Kate Duchêne and Nikki Amuka-Bird. The presentation of the courtroom action was thus a sometimes frenetic speaking of other characters' dialogue taken in turn by the two interpreters; this new version became, so to speak, the play of the play by Simon Stephens.

There is a pre-existing economic, as well as an aesthetic issue at stake in Stephens's original that offers some justification for Mitchell's choice. She explains:

It's a courtroom drama; telly does it so much better and also we didn't have enough money to do a full court, we didn't have all the characters that were going to be in the court, a courtroom like the ICC, that's like forty to fifty people, so to do it credibly... And I thought it would end up being derivative of other theatrical practices like at the Tricycle or of television.²²

²¹ Simon Stephens, *The Trial of Ubu* and *King Ubu* (London: Methuen, 2012), p. 6.

²² Katie Mitchell, unpublished interview with the author, 30 October 2012. Subsequent quotations appear as 'Mitchell, interview'.

Mitchell's comments suggest her interest in detail and realistic portrayal of environment, which cuts across her work regardless of genre. Not least due to the production budget, Mitchell's opposition to a half-baked version of somewhere like the ICC or TV courtroom drama backs Stephens's resistance to documentary, but it is this contained, verbally driven performance that, paradoxically, became the directorial strategy to invoke the play's thematic concerns. As Mitchell goes on to explain, any other choice would result in

An impoverished version of a courtroom [...] that would diminish the intellectual ideas. The scale of it was somehow better. I couldn't animate the ideas underpinning the material and the scale, the burden of the process of a two-year trial through normal means and that would conjure it, the scale and the burden, much more efficiently, I thought.²³

Thus the weight and flow of words of Stephens's original remained, yet with in-built hesitations and micro-pauses. This emphasised the dispassionate delivery of the spoken material, not as quotation but an act of precise translation. Such an approach captured the actuality of the dramatic world and the ideas of the play through an evident *performise* of its action, which housed a *mise en jeu* of the text, not a bald narration of the dialogue. However, as we shall see, Mitchell and her actors introduced a carefully constructed physical aspect to the performance: the sheer verbiage was sometimes delivered, especially at first, with the characters in a state of energised, nervous tension; as Mitchell continued to place the actors in concrete situations, whilst not in Stephens's original, this led them at times to being seriously affected by the horror they heard.

In contrast to the swiftly rehearsed London production (achieved in some three weeks only), the German-Dutch production rehearsed for two months, had a cast of ten and played at two European theatre centres.²⁴ Instead of a realistic portrayal of what Stephens determines as 'Trial Room 2 of The Hague and surrounding rooms',²⁵ Nübling's production took place on an almost open stage. Figures were seen slowly setting up the space, moving cardboard and paper, sometimes attached to wooden frames,

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ The production also had a re-rehearsal week in Amsterdam to adapt to the bigger performance space.

²⁵ Stephens, *The Trial of Ubu*, p. 4.

whilst some also painted signs in careful calligraphy. The set was completed by a wooden backdrop and a floor covered by polythene on which the actors slipped when the surface became increasingly splattered in paint. Yet this open-plan setting housed a clear interpretative decision; Nübling explains:

Normally I have a clear idea or main line before rehearsal. For *Ubu* [this was to show] three steps: from some kind of order (the writing out of sections of the Declaration of Human Rights), to chaos, to a system again in the trial – or at least a mixture of these aspects. Sometimes this is lost in the rehearsal process and working with the freedom of the actors, but if the frame on the theoretical and aesthetic levels is good enough, then you can have the freedom to juggle around on the intellectual, theatrical or playful levels.²⁶

In Nübling's production, following what he considered the representation of 'a lost high cultural system'²⁷ to begin with, a semi-improvised version of Jarry's *King Ubu* took place instead of Stephens's puppet prologue, in which Ubu careered around inflicting the symptoms of his despotism before escaping with his cronies through a window clearly held in mid-air by the ensemble. As in Mitchell's production, this created a 'kingdom' for Ubu, drawing on the reality of surrounding objects and exploiting the cartoonish spirit of both Jarry's original²⁸ and the playfulness of the production, before recourse to the writer's main text began, if only after around an hour of stage time. However, given the co-production, multiple languages emerged, since actors regularly swapped between English, German, Dutch and French, which came closer to Stephens's stage directions.

For Nübling, the purpose of rehearsal is evidently not the realisation of a text as a blueprint for pre-established dramatic action; neither is reworking material mere directorial wilfulness. Text is vital for Nübling, who states 'it's the piece of art where everybody is connected, it's not just one track, it's the main source'.²⁹ Given that other 'tracks' were created, Nübling moved scripted sections around as required: the

²⁶ Sebastian Nübling, unpublished interview with the author, 8 March 2015. Subsequent quotations appear as 'Nübling, interview'.

²⁷ Nübling, interview.

²⁸ In discussion (Nübling, interview) Nübling states that 'Jarry wrote the *Ubu* story as a young man [...] so I think there's some kind of teenage wildness that comes from Jarry; he carried that spirit'.

²⁹ Nübling, interview.

indictment speech, for example, was accurate, although occurring in a different place than stated in the published text, but the end of McClub's testimony was improvised and segued into the scene between the Defence and Prosecutor, here not kept separate, as in Mitchell's version. These alterations were, the director explains, 'a continuous process [...] in contact with Simon [...]. It's not about fucking it up; rehearsal drives somewhere, it goes in some corners, but still in the same direction as Simon wants, though by taking different moves'.³⁰ Given that he was present in rehearsal, Stephens was part of a production process that, rather than a mimetic *mise en scène*, staged the broad action of the trial through an ensemble *mise en perf*, underpinned by the grotesque, physical characterisation of the actors' performances.

Acting

If Mitchell's intent was that spectators should vicariously witness the activity of the (for her, unstageable) court as seen by the interpreters, Nübling's directorial focus was that of collective creativity. He explains, 'I understand myself as some kind of co-actor [...] I'm very busy, very involved, not really sitting there and waiting to see what comes'.³¹ Certain motifs thus appeared: having established the role of paint in the production's aesthetics, Nübling's actor's sawed off (obviously fake) legs that spurted red paint, and killed Good King Wenceslas, splattering him with yet more red paint, before the actor later got up to play his other part. Elsewhere, an actor was wrapped in brown paper and 'drilled' by an absurdly long paint mixer attachment, connected to a (real) electric drill. This inventive grotesquery extended too to how some of the characters were established: in the court proceedings for example, Achras hobbles on with walking sticks and Norbert Nurdle's face is distorted by rubber bands (items earlier repeatedly used as the weapons of choice by Ubu). But before listing others' atrocities that have slipped from collective memory, Ubu halts and questions:

is the building this big to keep me inside or is it this big to show everybody how hard you're *trying*

³⁰ Nübling, interview.

³¹ Nübling, interview.

to keep me inside [...] I stand here listening to you talking about talking and about honour and about law and about justice [...]³²

Ubu may drop his trousers, but Nübling describes his directorial approach as 'interested in the cases when the body tells a story different from that of the text, also with regard to its relationship with other bodies. [...] I want to preserve the ambivalence of these relationships. To be able to cope [...] with tensions instead of releasing them'.³³ In the trial, many of the figures thus wear clown shoes, as if to underline the *performise* of its (questionable) legal status (something Ubu constantly draws attention to in the text) and the casual violence of the characters surrounding Ubu. But Nübling's work is no simplistic cartoon; it relishes the ambivalence of ideas through the violence of the clownesque.

Stephens has said of Nübling's work that he is especially good at finding times when actors can face out front, using direct address.³⁴ Overall, Nübling's directorial tactic lends an urgency to the performances he creates as characters are put on the spot and actors must appeal to a collective. In Nübling's production of *The Trial of Ubu*, there was little recourse to a 'fourth wall': Mastroberardino as Ubu spent much of the initial part of the performance addressing the audience and the indictment was delivered through a microphone, with the actor facing front. Particularly during the parade of witnesses, this front-on orientation served to include spectators in the world of the courtroom. Although very much in contrast to Mitchell's contained performance mode, both choices in the respective productions activate the involvement of spectators, as if they might pass judgement, albeit if in one version through actors eyeballing the assembled audience and in the other by a staging choice that draws an audience into the imagined courtroom.

In contrast to Nübling's emphasis, the two central actors in Mitchell's production created definite - if imagined - activity, closely following Stephens's script and seeing this like an internal film; this is much like Stanislavski's 'Film of Images', an acting technique where the actor mentally 'runs' a set of imagined pictures or eidetic images. Exactly what the actors 'saw' was, as mentioned earlier, carefully worked out:

³² Stephens, *The Trial of Ubu*, p.42.

³³ *Badische Zeitung*, 'Theater ist nicht ökonomisch', 8 March 2013, <<http://www.badische-zeitung.de/theater-2/theater-ist-nicht-oekonomisch--69859169.html>> [accessed 29 December 2014].

³⁴ See Theatrevoice, <<http://www.theatrevoice.com/7706/award-winning-playwright-simon-stephens-rewrites-king-ubu/#.U60RcHlwaZU>> [accessed 27 June 2014].

at one point, the interpreters 'see' Ma Ubu take the stand, their speech halted as they trace her progress across the floor. Stephens has spoken of this

amazing moment [...] there's a silence for 34 seconds and [...] the two actors playing it just watch an imaginary person leave the room, wait, and then [watch] another imaginary person come back and take their place. Now, some people were really cross about that: you know, that's not drama, that's not acting. I thought it was completely intoxicating because it places the court completely in your imagination'.³⁵

It is worth noting the writer's enthusiasm for a moment that was simultaneously absent and present, manifested in precisely rendered yet completely imagined action. It *is* acting, of course, but the objection in the press appeared to be that it could not be acting if it was not *acting out* observable action.

Mitchell's production became, increasingly, the story of the two women. Undermining blithe accusations of creating a 'self-regarding production', and echoing the German-Dutch production, Mitchell reveals that Stephens had an input into the version at the Hampstead Theatre, explaining,

we decided with Simon what would happen between the two women in each of the scenes [...] the climax of the relationship of the two women in the booth [...] something that happens to interpreters, very, very rarely, is that they can't talk - this is something that happens - so that would be the climax of it and therefore we'd have to build one character who was more functioning than the other character, so we constructed biographies.³⁶

Importantly, Stephens co-authored the events outside of his own text; whilst it was for the director and the rigour of her process to find the means to manifest the action, he was complicit in the version, underpinned by Mitchell's faith in action as a consequence of previous life events. For the characters, these included, for example, how they had achieved fluency in Ubu's language and that for one of them,

³⁵ Stephens, in Radosavljević, *Theatre-Making*, p. 205.

³⁶ Mitchell, interview.

Amuka-Bird's character, her first appearance was also her first day of work in the booth. Thus invention was carefully justified retrospectively through new ideas outside of Stephens's text in order to make decisions secure and repeatable.

Aside from this carefully constructed fictional hinterland, the interpreters periodically went through high speed, time lapse sequences, with extremely accurate movement. To return to Pavis's notion of *performise*, this is an example of how 'an acting technique is thus staged' evidencing 'an impeccable physical training, but without the refusal of *mise en scène*',³⁷ through which Mitchell employed the physical skill of the actors, guided by Joseph Alford's movement coaching, to fast forward the action. In Pavis's terms, performance became the dominant choice, where slick physicality told a different story, one of the trial's duration, rather than the immediacy of the court room and scrutiny of Ubu's crimes. Whilst this is theatricality of panache and rigour, the themes and detail of the play were not at this point foregrounded (Pavis's initial definition of *mise en scène* above) because the sophistication of the acting took prominence.

The centre of *The Trial of Ubu* in the London production was, then, not a play-within-a-play, but perhaps, to coin a phrase, a carefully constructed play-outside-a-play. Mitchell's fixing of time, place and temperature as a measure of the familiar Stanislavskian 'given circumstances', was palpable:³⁸ each scene between the interpreters took place in the same booth of course, but the passing of seasons and the temperature (inside and outside) were made clear through costume changes and carefully determined physical behaviour in response to a hot or cold environment. In turn, these decisions served as playable circumstances to punctuate and articulate the extreme duration of the trial. At other points, one interpreter is poorly and medicines are mixed; one is late; they find things funny or deadly serious; and, increasingly, are caught up in the content of the trial, until Kate Duchêne's character has a kind of seizure.

Faithfulness

If, for Mitchell, the court is a place of verbal and psychological gymnastics, for Nübling, it is a macabre

³⁷ Pavis, *Contemporary Mise en Scène*, p. 48.

³⁸ For an elaboration of Mitchell's process, see Katie Mitchell, *The Director's Craft: a Handbook for the Theatre* (London: Routledge, 2008).

game. Where does this put Stephens and his text? Towards the end of his book, Pavis questions 'faithfulness', usefully distinguishing between the dramatic text and the stage event, something I have also drawn attention to here. If 'faithfulness' implies performing the text in the order the lines were written with the characters presented as they appear on the page and in a setting prescribed by the author, neither production discussed here is faithful. For Nübling, Stephens's text is a stimulus for a performance space and action, out of which figures emerge and who engage, more or less, in the action of Stephens's play. These choices attest to what Stephens himself relishes as Nübling's 'balletic imagination and [...] instinct for formal explosion'.³⁹ They confirm his role as a writer providing materials for a director and actors to take on and shape. At first glance, Mitchell seems faithfully and accurately to place the text at the centre of her production, since this was mostly spoken by the interpreters and became, for them as well as an audience, the principal point of focus. Yet this was not consistent and a mix of genres emerged in the production: the puppet play; the precise, verbal rendition of question and answer through the interpreters, which obliged an audience's imagining of the court; the realism of the lawyers; and the *bouffon*-like Ubu in the scenes set outside the courtroom. Perhaps hinted at, too, by Nübling's use of clown shoes, these latter aspects point to a marionette-like leitmotif which runs through the production: puppets, two actors who ventriloquise the action of the court; two lawyers (whose dialogue is a bit too expositional); and the grotesque Ubu, played by an actor. It is perhaps this thread to (here, Pavis's second definition of) the *mise en scène* that brings together potentially disparate aesthetics in political terms; in the world of the international tribunal, all are caught up in a performance of legality where others seem to be pulling the strings.

For these two directors, the kind of narrow 'faithfulness' I suggest above is not the point. They have instead taken the key content of the play as they have understood it and proposed decisive directorial choices. This is not unusual: in his nuanced discussion of 'Werktreue' ('faithfulness to the play'), for instance, David Barnett explores how even wildly radical stagings of texts may qualify as 'faithful', concluding that 'the relationship between text and performance is defined by a central aporia – the difficulty of comparing two fundamentally different types of artistic product, the theatrical text and its

³⁹ Theatrevoice.

1
2
3 production.⁴⁰ Thus Pavis suggests that 'faithfulness' is an 'illusion [...] as if there existed a correct
4 reading [...] that reveals a verifiable truth in the play'.⁴¹ Mitchell's work appears a verbal, intellectual
5 rendition of the 'truth' - the more visceral material is the separate and invented story of the interpreters -
6 and Mitchell holds the themes of the play up for scrutiny through the drive of language. Nübling's
7 production relishes a knockabout, ensemble playing style, yet, in its dispensing with chunks of text, was
8 not, as Stephens says earlier, to rip the heart out of the play, but to expose its heart, placing it as a
9 circumstance squarely on stage. For Mitchell, the *mise en jeu* of the playtext play sits alongside created
10 action; for Nübling, the script is a scenario offering a pretext to an inventive theatricality, which, here, is
11 rendered part of a total *performise*.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ⁴⁰ David Barnett, 'Offending the Playwright: Directors' Theatre and the 'Werktreue' Debate', *German*
56 *Monitor*, 77 (2013), 75-97, p. 91.

57 ⁴¹ Pavis, *Contemporary Mise en Scène*, p. 295.

This article examines two different productions of Simon Stephens' *The Trial of Ubu* (2010) in order to argue for the radical theatrical interventions of their respective directors. Stephens' play takes Alfred Jarry's King Ubu and places him on trial for crimes against humanity. At London's Hampstead Theatre, much of the performance (2012), directed by Katie Mitchell, became a sophisticated ventriloquy delivered by two courtroom interpreters, minor characters in the actual text. The earlier German-Dutch co-production (2010, Toneelgroep Amsterdam and Schauspielhaus Essen) was directed by Stephens' regular collaborator, Sebastian Nübling. Actors played multiple characters in a production of ensemble inventiveness, as if Jarry himself had intervened in the proceedings of the International Criminal Court. If neither production apparently followed what Stephens had written on the page, what had, instead, been produced? The discussion explores Patrice Pavis' notions of *mise en jeu* and *performise* (*Contemporary Mise en Scène*, 2012) to suggest that the productions are examples of a 'putting into play' or 'performances' of Stephens' text, yet where both remained faithful to his intent. The article draws on reviews in English, German and Dutch, and interviews with Katie Mitchell and Sebastian Nübling, in order to highlight vital artistic choice in the context of current discussions around text, performance, authorship and directing.



The Trial of Ubu, directed by Sebastian Nübling (Toneelgroep Amsterdam/Schauspielhaus Essen, 2010).

Photo: Jan Versweyveld
705x311mm (72 x 72 DPI)



The Trial of Ubu, directed by Sebastian Nübling (Toneelgroep Amsterdam/Schauspielhaus Essen, 2010).
Photo: Jan Versweyfeld
705x470mm (72 x 72 DPI)



© 2012, Stephen Cummiskey +44 (0) 79 2978 6305

IMAGE(S):	File name: SC_HT_UBU9421; and SC_HT_UBU9934 The Trial of Ubu by Simon Stephens, Dir Katie Mitchell (2012)
LICENCE TO:	Dr Adam J. Ledger
USAGE:	Single print licence, one edition
SIZE:	1/8 page
DURATION:	One issue, 2015
DISTRIBUTION:	UK - small circulation
COPYRIGHT:	Photo © Stephen Cummiskey / +44 7929786305 / stephencummiskey@me.com
[PLEASE DELETE IMAGE AFTER USE - PLEASE DO NOT KEEP AN ARCHIVE OF THE DIGITAL IMAGE ON DISC]	

The Trial of Ubu, directed by Katie Mitchell (Hampstead Theatre, 2012). Photo: Stephen Cummiskey
264x238mm (240 x 240 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



© 2012, Stephen Cummiskey +44 (0) 79 2978 6305

IMAGE(S):	File name: SC_HT_UBU9421; and SC_HT_UBU9934 The Trial of Ubu by Simon Stephens, Dir Katie Mitchell (2012)
LICENCE TO:	Dr Adam J. Ledger
USAGE:	Single print licence, one edition
SIZE:	1/8 page
DURATION:	One issue, 2015
DISTRIBUTION:	UK - small circulation
COPYRIGHT:	Photo © Stephen Cummiskey / +44 7929786305 / stephencummiskey@me.com

[PLEASE DELETE IMAGE AFTER USE - PLEASE **DO NOT** KEEP AN ARCHIVE OF THE DIGITAL IMAGE ON DISC]

The Trial of Ubu, directed by Katie Mitchell (Hampstead Theatre, 2012). Photo: Stephen Cummiskey
264x238mm (240 x 240 DPI)