

SILENCE AS A FIGURAL EVENT: SHAKESPEARE IN THE REPERTORY OF THE NATIONAL RADIO THEATRE

ANA MARIA MUNTEANU

“Ovidius” University of Constanta, Romania

Abstract. The remarkable coherence of Shakespeare’s broadcast at the National Romanian Theater in successive crisis contexts, both moral and institutional, before and after the events in 1989, explains and participates – in a way that has to be deciphered and understood – at the symbolic re-capitalization of the public service and to the mutual consensus on the role, on the National Broadcast Radio Theatre’s mission in the process of de-ideologization and redefinition of the entire cultural system in the logic of the cultural market. The Shakespearian theatrical laboratory functions symbolically, logically, morally, as a high-accuracy magnifying glass. We will try to accredit the radio-drama as silence-generating polyphony. A silence full of life, amplified by the accelerated movement of signs and of a reflexive, active, intense, open intentionality... In other words, if the theatre is the art of interrogations, then the radio-drama was not during communism and it is not even now a bedtime story for listeners, because theatre listeners are not part of the cliché of the object-listener. Ask the substance and importance of Shakespeare’s plays and the volume of their radio mediation in the context of the period must be appreciated also from the perspective of the cultural production fields’ articulation. Paul Grigoriu, renowned director and former manager of the Romanian Radio Broadcast Society, considers that the radio’s offer, even in the toughest years of the totalitarian regime, “a refuge of the heart”, of certain authenticity, an uncontaminated part of Romanian culture, a kind of “cavern” or island, one could say, in which ideas and imagination have continued to prosper... For the great repertory of the NRT, totalizing more than 2000 titles, an accident-free transition has taken place, and without the noisy de-mythologizing that have affected other authors and the critical canon in general. Shakespeare’s work continues to represent a durable phenomenon, a center of diffusion if the great themes and interrogations, a model, principle, resource of social imagination, emblematic for the construction of reality and “our feeling of present”.

Kwywords: radiodrama, culture, communism, propaganda.

There is a point in which the great myths of the past and our sensation of living in the present, here and now, meet. Their fusion is what I have always found captivating. It is about great erudition, scholarly spirit and imaginative insight in the deep movements of history; but they have never lost that link to what can truly concern us, the living

instant in which we live... a solid piece of present. In English, present also means gift.

Peter Brook

The present is very generous with the National Radio Theatre and the best radio adaptations of the '80s preserve their up-to date quality intact. Romeo and Juliet, Othello and The Tempest in the digital form – collector's offer - have been reintroduced during Access via CEEOL NL Germany Silence as a Figural Event: Shakespeare in the Repertory of The National Radio Theatre 54 the 2006 edition of the National Shakespeare Festival in Bucharest, counting, naturally, on an audience niche in which we include the new collectors interested in buying effigies of the past communist period, when Shakespeare's plays were acted out by great actor's voices, with a genuine cult for the text. In full competition with the commercial TV channels and with the "prototypical" crumbling of the audience, the fidelity of the public is also cultivated by the free access to the entire radio plays, a priceless gift from the Fonoteca de Aur (The Golden Record Library), in the new online form of the Radio Romania Tineret (Radio Romania for Youth), up to date with technology and cyberculture. The case of Shakespeare's plays is not singular. Other productions of the radio theatre of the '60s – '80s, adaptations and dramatizations, are presented during the great theatrical events of recent years, in festivals or fairs, in international media expos. An aura of classicalness envelops this product of identity and institutional portfolio which is not the shadow of the communist regime, but which rather seems to be the manifestation of a force, of an impulse that begs to be deciphered. What is spectacular in the career of the dramatic text at Radio Romania in the long duration of the culture – according to Adam Michnik (1994: 3), the only one favourable for the construction of the cultural legitimacy – is the efficiency of connecting large audiences to the "metaphysical fictions" of great texts and to their universality through re-presentation, whose effects were amplified on/in and through the social representations by the system of the editorial flow's production, because "our world, an interpersonal and social world, is experienced since the beginning as a world which has a certain sense" (A. Mucchielli 2005: 188). Thus, in more general terms, a conscience is exterior to itself, it is oriented towards the sense (Ricoeur 1995: 52). But the world of the sense is seriously deteriorated and overturned during the period of utmost isolation and indoctrination of the last two decades of communism, and reconsiderations seem hard to accept. We must admit that the "episode" of communism gradually fades away in the immediate or medium-term representation, but it persists "in the long subjective run", and "the short inter-subjective relation is coordinated within the framework of the historical connection with various long inter-subjective relations, mediated by institutions, social roles, collective instances". In other words, the current dialog space, selective, as opposed to history and memory, must be explained at the level of the more complex historical connection which

encompasses the spontaneous appreciation process unfolded in short segments of inter-subjectivity (H.G. Gadamer, quoted in Ricoeur 1995: 43).

In 1994, Adam Michnik suggested a thorough, objective and lucid study of Ceaușescu period, impossible to perform, in that moment of overheating and even explosion of public awareness, marked by a thirst for discourse proportional to the years of silence. Despite the time spent in communist prisons and the dramatic experiences he had as leader of the Solidarity, he asserted, surprisingly, that “the monologue of communism was also our monologue, and, in a way, both fanatic communists and anticommunists alike, we are all the bastard children of communism” (Michnik, 2005: 2). The force and the gravity of this categorization, not to be found elsewhere, in another founding thinking for the post-communist world, consists of the suggestion of an analysis through a different lens than the one provided by evidence or the tardy forms of contestation. Therefore, a methodological demand is confirmed, the demand of “destruction of the immediate reference recommended in a hermeneutic approach, but not so as to cancel the “text” of reality, but so as to advance beyond the indexical texture because “text is the mediation through which we understand ourselves”, and even further, in spite of the subject’s pretence to know itself through a non-mediated intuition, it must be said that we only understand ourselves through the great detour of the signs of humanity deeply rooted in the works of culture” (Ricoeur 1995: 106, 107). In an ideal typology of the signs, the symbol governs significance and the index governs communication. While symbols function by means of concepts (ideas), the action of indices is in the immediate, in reference (Prandi, 1992: 144). Even if we attributed a peripheral value to the radio theatre, in the entire field of interpretation, we know for certain that things are not thus. Shakespeare at Radio Romania is only the tip of the iceberg. The septic appearance hides a symbolic contagion that takes place in silence through listening. Acceptable for the censorship because it does not openly contradict the regime, Shakespeare is the reason that speaks prophetically... at the radio – in Pericles, Antony and Cleopatra and Julius Caesar, in Measure for Measure, The Tempest and Macbeth etc. – about power and usurpation, about madness and death, about the loss of moral limit and the unleashing of a psychological and social evil. It is a curious breach of the ideological system, opened, paradoxically, by the structural properties of the message (radio-drama), in which the censorship does not identify the subversive marking, that language of the evident demonstratio ad oculos, considered a danger for the great dogma of the personality cult. An icon of the European and universal culture, Shakespeare at the National Radio Theatre is set in the confined theatre of the communist world. We could describe this method of listening Shakespeare’s plays in silence as a participation in a theatrical reading, a form of working on the text which suspends, during the representation, the abusive use of the mind’s screen as a multiplying mirror of the image of the providential leader and which balances somewhere, in and through the depth of articulation, a fatal significant energy for the myth of the Ceaușescu era. The encounter of the large public with Shakespeare has happened in a systematic and imperative way, as if under the rule of necessity. A necessity to update like an inner

pressure, from the system of values which survives and regenerates, with no connection to the dominant ideology – since it does not confirm it in any way – and which expresses the power of the Shakespearian text as a national/universal relay and as a significant energy that crosses the cultural field, influencing it in diverse forms and intensities. Beyond any contextual obstacles and evolutions, in and through the grids of the ones that program, produce and grant its co-presence and public legibility, and, not least, in the folds of the Romanian society that undergoes long decades of dictatorship, Shakespeare participates in a “diegetic acceleration plan of a history that he interrogates” (Banu, 2005: 68-77). In his book *De ce surâde Shakespeare? / Why Does Shakespeare Smile?*, Dan Vasiliu operates with an analytical device, forcing the placing on the orbit of the Shakespearian theatrical system. The author develops the analysis of Jan Kott on the “great mechanism” of power and death, within the framework of a system of communication with variable distances, and the focus is not the contemporaneity, but the prophetic Shakespearian thinking, both validated by the historical events and the theatrical spectacular nature of 1994 (the year when the book was published), marked by the falling of idols, the reversal of situations, thus offering an undecided picture of the sudden stops and of accelerated changes. At the beginning of the '90s, the staging of *Titus Andronicus*, at the National Theatre of Craiova (1992), under the direction of Silviu Purcărete, was received with an orchestration and an expansion of the symbolism of death in a hallucinating imaginary visual realm, placed in connection with the chaotic, violent scenes of the miner's revolt on the streets of Bucharest and of the obstinate remembrance in the mind of every Romanian of the events from 1989. *Richard III* directed by Mihai Mănițiu at the Nottara Theatre, which received the UNITER prize during the season of 1993, represented a “jump into the abyss of power”, so as to attain that point of transformation (devastating), that would trigger the shamanic effect of the “rediscovery of the alienated soul” (Levi Strauss, 1987: 123). Put on stage and rendered into acting, Shakespeare's text generates the sense effects that can renew the self-awareness of Romanian society in the great crisis of legitimacy and identity into which it has been pushed by history. The scene comes to greet the transition society with a baggage of explosive symbolism. While the seismic force of the University Square shakes the institutional system and breaks the front of the new communist power, the theatre participates in the dethroning of the effigies and symbols, in their mixing and fragmentation, as well as in the general combustion of all the signs in the great ceremonial performances, especially through the *Ancient Trilogy* at the National Radio Theatre, directed by Andrei Șerban, through *Ubu Rex* with scenes from *Macbeth*, *Titus Andronicus*, *The Danaides*, directed by Silviu Purcărete at the National Radio Theatre. The “Art for Social Change” programs witness the structuring – through projects financed by diverse European and international foundations – of new educational environments that have as goals the triggering of the crisis, the breaking of the psychotic circle, the detachment from the still present past as an alternative psycho- and socio-dramatic space, promoted by the new actors of the stage and of the social participation, the theatrical non-governmental organizations, by various forms of theatrical laboratory,

where people practice a systematic deconstruction and analysis of the micro-social universe, through suspension techniques between “als (as) and vor (before), “the horizon from which each and every thing will be understood as being this and that” (Heidegger, quoted in Ricoeur,1995: 42), assuming the entire keyboard of the representation of life in communism and of the crisis from the years following 1989. After the symbolic embargo of the socialist realism, the new theatrical language acts through shock waves which contribute to break the old system of significance, drains and reorganizes the great indexical trash that appeared after the explosion, hectically grasping the “hidden”, secret life – the tragic and absurd personal histories, the uprooting, the repressions, the secrets of the communist power, behind the scene, the diversions – the balcony, the public arena are the spaces where it bursts out, after the long period of censorship, an explosive mixture of idle talk and meaningful talk, making a profound psychoanalysis of the crisis, through which another discourse and another lucidity gradually crystallize. A dramatic and existential process of repressed post-modernity even more radically as it makes up for lost time at great speed, especially in the context of the transgression of the theatre – real life limits during the 1989 moment and the period that followed. In the analysis of “the dimensions of a liminal ritual”, Mihai Coman approaches the media representation of the University Square phenomenon from the perspective of the configuration of a communist-free space, as opposed to the rest of society (2003: 135), an opposition in which the severance from communism and the creation of a “warm circle” of loyalty takes place (Goran Rosenberg, quoted in Z. Baumann,2000: 9, 10). The deep crisis of representation and the reconstruction of the sense through a resource state, a pure unity which allows the separation between “us” and “them”, and is made in an evanescent space of the “sacralizing discourse” that looks strikingly like a state of elementary theatricality (earth, water, air, fire) from which the new social order is gradually instated and is theatrically legitimized, by the sharing of the sense. “The rite, as a means of formalizing some unstructured social movements, manifests at the level of “differentiation operators...” (Coman, 2003: 136), in a space with sacred functions “of curing”, “of communion”, whose forms are traced by the movement of history above the rift between the systems from which the words that express the new social identity appear. Unlike these theatrical forms and methods equally based on the shock of representation and on the suspension of the institutionalized meanings by the *ad populum argumentum* through which (the images with) the crowds dislocate a world of sense, allot the new senses and figures that differentiate and distinguish either reality or the text from the previous regime of social representation, the radio produces a distinct mediacy of the Shakespearian text which crosses the decades and the crises, that part of the sonorous archives represented by the intangible cultural heritage whose value is suggested by the choice of the signifier *Fonoteca de aur*. The radio adaptations of the dramatic texts are an answer to the need of everyday performance, materialized in the specific parameters of the radio channel, for which the English term radio-drama is adopted, in the specialized discourse (Oprina 1998: 90). If the Mc Luhan model, of the message-channel fusion, or the one of the Frankfurt school, of cultural

degradation by series production were confirmed, the nature of the radio channel would represent the strong element of the radio drama and the value would be de-calibrated and probably degraded by the constraints of mediation (political, ideological, editorial, consumption-related, etc.). On the other hand, once we cover the event-related conditions, for which the production and broadcast represent a firm base, and Shakespeare's work, along with the one of other valuable writers, represents the source and the generating module, we can approach the field of complex interactions, in which "the sense is in depth a way of acting upon the other". It is, first of all, a means of intervention (of acting and action, performing, confronting) in the framework that was institutionalized by the discourse (Ducrot, quoted in C. K.-Orrecchioni, 1998: 56). The sense is divided, according to H. P. Grice, into standard linguistic (institutionalized) significance and significance for the speaker/interlocutor, and the concept of "standardized/institutionalized significance for the speaker" is surpassed, in the author's perspective, by a comprehension of the language as a vessel for thoughts oriented towards communication (communicative thoughts), and not a thinking environment in itself, as these thoughts are expressed as propositional attitudes, an idea that has been criticized, because it would reduce semantics to a psychology of propositional attitudes. The intentional orientation of the speaker balances the roles through the conversational "implicatures", "the intention of recognizing the emitter's meanings" exceeds the theory of the enunciation's relevance through "the reflexivity of the communicative intentions" (P. H. Grice, quoted in Bach, 1987: 141-154), a key concept for a theory of significance in the case of the radio-drama. But the form of the implication (implicature) and its intensity as "participation" in the action of communicating through the theatrical event raises theoretically subtle problems, dramatic in the sphere of the experiences of the acoustic theatre. After all, the stereophonic – theatrical event depiction can be considered an ambiguity-filled relative of the media event depiction. Between the perfect illusion of reality – experimented with the known tragic consequences by Orson Welles during CBS's program "Theater in the Air", on October 30th 1938, with H.G. Wells' "The War of the Worlds", through the borrowing of the form of the event's narration by a reporter located on-site for a famous sci-fi text about the invasion of the Martians – and the experimentation of "the world as a story" (Coman, 2003: 45-46). In the circumstances characteristic to the modern living, the distance varies depending on the technology of the "adaptation" and the stakes of communication, but not in this case too, where we have seen a maximal manipulation of the radio-dramatic situation that has triggered real panic reactions. The differences undoubtedly pertain, first of all, to "the referential or encyclopedic competence" (Frumușani 2004: 61) owned by the "targeted" audience and to the cultural and perceptive pattern modeled by the dominant form of communication, regardless of how we would "read" the similarities or the differences between the two orders/disorders, real – imaginary, either on the axis of forgery, or on the one of confirmation and authenticity. Thomas Sebeok, in his famous dispute that he had with Eco on signifying, (Sebeok, 1999: 93) has sustained the importance of the alethic function of the enunciation within the semiosis, unlike Eco,

the advocate of ambivalence of any enunciation – the same enunciation can be utilized either for lying or for telling the truth, which transforms truth into a property of discourse, the fundamental dilemma of philosophic semiosis that paves the way for the exclusion of the subject from the logic of the action, including the communicational one. That is why intentionality, expressivity and ethics of mediation appear fundamental so as to trace the frontiers between real and imaginary, even more fragile in the multimedia context. The relations between the real worlds, based on a project, and the imaginary worlds, based on scripts, are regulated up to a point of intersubjectivity and common sense, but they are in fact threatened by a reversed game on “the three axes” (Frumușani, 2004: 60) of perceiving and assuming reality as a result of the interaction through discourse. The evolution of the media phenomenon demonstrates that in the depth of the game space of meanings, reality is subject to the unlimited variability of the decisions through which reversibility and confusion is generated, at a psychological level, and the synesthetic re-projection of the stimulus facilitates and accelerates the identification in the conditions of the multiplication of the actors (and of their centers) with enunciation power in the network that has replaced the pyramid. A retrospective look over the period of maximal effervescence of theatrical life in Romania from the 7th decade to the present reveals also in the case of the National Radio Theatre a number of over 1000 titles, covering 24 universal literatures, to which we can add adaptations from the national dramatic and literary creation, and we can maybe decode the decisional game and the (alchemical) formula of influence, as the theatrical radio discourse is as much a figure (event), as it is a background (context) of interior speech, in opposition or interfering with other forms of public discourse. During the period 1973 – 1993, Shakespeare, with 18 radio adaptations of his plays, and 44 of their broadcasts along with reruns of some previously recorded performances (like, for instance, *As You Like It*, directed by Liviu Ciulei, radio adaptation of Mihai Zirra, or the recording of the famous actor George Vraca in *Richard III*, before his death, in 1965), is followed by I.L. Caragiale, with 15 adaptations (sketches, short stories, plays), Carlo Goldoni, Luigi Pirandello and Chekhov, each with 11 (scores based on Georgeta Raboj, 1998) whereas other authors have a smaller frequency... It is hard to estimate – to paraphrase the intervention of journalist and dramatic author Anna Foldes (Anna Foldes, in J.Elsom 1998: 115-118), on the “naturalization of Shakespeare in Hungary – in the process of composing the repertory of the National Radio Theatre, if Shakespeare had become more Romanian than English, through the wide broadcasting of his work and through the success that his work enjoyed on Radio Romania, but we can assume that this popularity is also due to the translations whose value is guaranteed by great names of Romanian literature – Virgil Theodorescu (*As You Like It*), Gala Galaction (*The Merchant of Venice*), Șt. O. Iosif (*Romeo and Juliet*), Ion Vinea (*Macbeth*), Tudor Vianu (*Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar*), Dan Amedeo Lăzărescu (*Measure for measure*, *Love’s Labours Lost*, *Twelfth Night*, *Troilus and Cressida*). If from the point of view of the language’s systematic structure, a text appears as an unpredictable result (Prandi, 1992: 153), maintaining it in the

interpretive field of the great literary tradition implies hypothetical correspondence and resonance networks, constituting a language with an abundance of sub-texts that continue to resist to “the ephemeral communication events” (Lausberg, quoted in Prandi 1992: 102), through which mass communication is characterized, communication to which the public radio actually belongs and which does not rule out the efficiency of a long-term cultural program. It is a complex indication of the vertical cultural orientation, based on the universal idea, opposed to the one of the niche, a fundamental concept of communication technology – in the context of the significant growth of the audience after 1960, when 1.326.406 subscribers are recorded for 1961, and in a short while, in 1965, their number reaches 1.920.157, according to the data published in the history displayed on the institution’s website. The public of cultural shows is situated, in most surveys, around the ratio (market-share) of 1 – 3 %, which indicates audiences of up to 40 000 – 50 000 listeners for a radio premiere, although it is possible that the real number of listeners may be bigger, as there is the practice of listening in groups, and, later, in the course of the next decades, when technical progress allows the access to portable reception apparatus, the radio becomes an uninterrupted background for the activities performed during spare time (loisir).

William Shakespeare – Radio adaptations broadcast by Radio Romania During the period 1973-1997			
Name of the play	Duration (min)	Premiere	Rerun
<i>Pericles</i>	60 min	1973	1977,1992,1995
<i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	84 min	1974	1976,1977,1980,1994
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	97 min, 35”	1977	1982,1984,1994,1997
<i>Cymbeline</i>	84 min	1978	1980,1984,1991,1996
<i>Julius Caesar</i>	92 min	1979	1979,1982,1983,1990
<i>Measure for Measure</i>	83 min	1984	1984,1985,1989,1990, 1995,1996
<i>Henry IV (part I and II)</i>	204 min	1984
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	100 min	1986	1988,1993,1998
<i>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</i>	107 min	1987	1990
<i>Love’s Labours Lost</i>	104 min	1987	1989,1995
<i>All’s Well That Ends Well</i>	109 min	1987	1993
<i>The Tempest</i>	99 min	1978
<i>Twelfth Night</i>	109 min	1988
<i>Taming of the Shrew</i>	88 min	1989	1991,1992,1994,1997
<i>Macbeth</i>	100 min, 30”	1990	1991,1997

<i>Troilus and Cressida</i>	118 min	1991	1991
-----------------------------	---------	------	------

The present data reveal the fact that the professional structures of the National Radio Theatre's production are characterized by the stability of the teams of directors during several seasons of the Radio Theatre and, on the other hand, the coherence and continuity of the professional values could advocate the existence of a relative editorial autonomy or of an efficient filtering of instructions and commands that could not be absent in the functioning of the radio as a means of propaganda. The homogeneity and the specialization of the teams of directors are interesting. In this period that exceeds two decades, the direction is ensured by 7 people: Cristian Munteanu – 6 titles (*Cymbeline, Othello, Henry IV, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Tempest, Troilus and Cressida*), Dan Puican – 3 (*The Merchant of Venice, Romeo and Juliet, Taming of the Shrew*), Titel Constantine scu – 3 (*Julius Caesar, Twelfth Night, Macbeth*), Grigore Gonta – 1 (*Pericles*), Silviu Jicman – 1 (*Measure for Measure*), Leonard Popovici – 1 (*Love's Labours Lost*), Corneliu Dalu – 1 (*Antony and Cleopatra*). The same tendency of specializing appears at the level of the musical track, assumed by T. Alexandrescu and R. Chelaru, and of the technical aspect (T. Andreiciuc, V. Manta, I. Sireteanu), characteristics through which the radio creates an expressive and technical standard under the pressure of time and other typical constraints. A frequently noticed factor is the quality of the cast and the principle of their composition according to the model of the cinema production, different from the "parochial" limitation of the theatrical system of that period. 71 actors appear in the Shakespearian repertory of the National Radio Theatre for the period that we took into consideration, actors belonging to several generations, masters, middle-generation actors, young actors – Clody Bertola, Mircea Septilici, George Constantin, Ion Caramitru, Victor Rebengiuc, Mircea Albulescu, V. Ogăsanu, Marcel Iures, Irina Mazanitis, Gina Patrichi, Adela Mărculescu, Valeria Seciu, Adrian Pinteă, Mirela Gorea, Forian Pittis, Mariana Buruiană, Maia Morgenstern, and many others of recognized value, whose public image is growing also through their promotion in the National Radio Theatre's programs.

The radio adaptations launch an actor's profile and a formula of composition, and they are based on pivotal figures of some complex imaginative representations, whose personality and interpretive resources are joined by a perfect diction, a fluid phrasing and a capacity to re-project (in the accredited sense of the neuro-linguistic reprogramming) of the entire register of expressiveness in the acoustic image of a dramatic text, technically called the "convertibility" and condensation of expression instruments (of which the following actors have spoken: Clody Bertola, Mircea Albulescu, Maia Morgenstern, in their words at the 70-year old jubilee of the National Radio Theatre). The dimension of the portfolios of interpreted roles at the NRT during this period convincingly illustrates the hypothesis of a specialization within the framework of the theatrical production field, the development of a language and of a specific performative technique. At the end of the '90s, George Constantin was at the top of the pyramid, with 86 premieres at the NRT; for Mircea Albulescu, his activity

in the sphere of the NRT is “the most prodigious of his theatrical activities”, with over 60 interpreted roles, and Irina Mazanitis considers herself a specifically radio actress with her 36 roles. One can talk of great actors of the radio Shakespearian repertory, like Clody Bertola, George Constantin, Octavian Cottescu, Mircea Albulescu, Alexandru Repan, Ion Caramitru, Adrian Pinteau, Florian Pittis and many others.

The substance and importance of Shakespeare’s plays and the volume of their radio mediation in the context of the period must be appreciated also from the perspective of the cultural production fields’ articulation. Radio promotes the theatrical productions of the season and successful actors, borrows value criteria and professional hierarchies, consolidates careers through mass public exposure, and, in its turn, influences these specific fields. The remarkable coherence of Shakespeare’s broadcast at the NRT in successive crisis contexts, both moral and institutional, before and after the events in 1989, explains and participates – in a way that has to be deciphered and understood – at the symbolic recapitalization of the public service and to the mutual consensus on the role, on the National Radio Theatre’s mission in the process of de-ideologization and redefinition of the entire cultural system in the logic of the cultural market. Asking himself why Shakespeare’s creations mark so strongly the Romanian theatrical history, director Mihai Măniutiu takes into consideration two distinct phenomena and finalities: the one of a (re)generative energy “is an uninterrupted making, a conception continuously shared by those who give it scenic life and meditate upon it”, and a lesson, because “you must not want, as a human being, more than it is given to you – to know your own limits architecturally constructs you on the inside – but so as to find out how good you are and how much you can actually do, you must want to achieve the impossible” (Mihai Măniutiu, 2003: 46). In such a perspective, the phenomenon of re-theatricalization initiated after the war and assumed during the 7th decade by a brilliant pleiad of directors like Lucian Giurchescu, David Esrig, Liviu Ciulei, Vlad Mugur, Horea Popescu, Lucian Pintilie, Radu Penciulescu, Dinu Cernescu, Sanda Manu, Valeriu Moisescu, represents a phenomenon of re-thinking of theatricality in all its structuring inside the “prismatic model” of the system of scenic representation, it represents a movement with a much larger impact, providing valuable arguments in the life of successive generations of intellectuals. The censorship’s interdiction of some theatre performances, the exile of many personalities, but also the contact in idea and significance of the great public with the shows created by the great directors of this period on the Romanian stages provide clues about the vigor of the theatrical phenomenon in that period but also about large scale socio-cultural effects that exceed the sphere of aesthetic renewal and engage the mentalities. A series of sonorous performances, innovative readings and noteworthy directorial versions follow one another during the period 1960 – 1993 - we have tried to observe also the first years after 1989, with the purpose of pointing out the continuity of “working with Shakespeare” within the perimeter of Romanian theatrical life - *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 1960, directed by Lucian Giurchescu, *Hamlet*, 1967, directed by Dinu Cernescu, *Macbeth*, 1968, directed by Liviu Ciulei, *Measure for Measure*, 1971, directed by Dinu Cernescu. 1972 is the year of

confrontation with the censorship, as *Hamlet* at the National Theatre of Cluj, directed by Vlad Mugur, is banned in the phase of general rehearsal; another banned performance is Gogol's *The Inspector General*, directed by Lucian Pintilie at the Bulandra Theatre. The series of great Shakespearian shows continues with *Richard III*, 1978, directed by Horea Popescu, *The Tempest*, 1978, directed by Liviu Ciulei, *Pericles*, 1981, directed by Dinu Cernescu, *Macbeth*, 1982, directed by Mihai Măniutiu, *Hamlet*, 1985, directed by Alexandru Tocilescu, *Antony and Cleopatra*, 1985, directed by Mihai Măniutiu, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1990, Liviu Ciulei, *Ubu Rex with scenes from Macbeth*, 1990, directed by Silviu Purcărete, *Hamlet*, 1990, directed by Tompa Gabor, *Titus Andronicus*, 1992, directed by Silviu Purcărete, *Richard III*, 1993, directed by Mihai Măniutiu.

The number of new productions dwindles in the course of the entire decade before 1989 and grows in the following years. However, 1961 is the moment of the disquieting meeting between being able to and being, as a performance based on Shakespeare re-generates and influences on a long-term basis the theatrical life, and it will be at the center of the wave of defining events both for the new hermeneutic and theatrical language and for the injured destiny of innovation and freedom of thought and speech, in relation to tradition and official canons. Aside from the aesthetic dilemma, visionary particularly by the liberation of space and the essentializing of the décor, the re-sizing of human relations as an inter-subjectivity unleashed on the social distances ritualized in the situation, and especially by the unsettling composition of actress Clody Bertola in *Rosalind*, the performance of *As You Like It*, directed by Liviu Ciulei generates and stimulates an interesting phenomenon of modern re-thinking of the staging of a Shakespearian text – at pace with the redefining of the theatrical space operated by Peter Brook in and through Shakespeare's universe, first on the stage of Stratford-on-Avon and then in Paris, in the Bouffes de Nord theatre – in a society that was profoundly marked by the dislocations caused by the war and the Soviet occupation.

The innovations introduced by Liviu Ciulei do not have an explicit anti-ideological stake, but they are read in the key to the situation. In his book, dedicated to the great actress Clody Bertola, the one who played the legendary role of *Rosalind*, Ludmila Patlanjoglu narrates in great detail the debate organized by the magazine "Teatru" after the premiere of the show (1997: 197-207). It is a perfect illustration of the way in which the "ideologizing marks" settled into the critical discourse, declining, in the subtext of an aesthetic debate, a stake of another nature, namely the Shakespeare's transformation into a cultural stereotype and his ritualization, part of the strategy of freezing, closing the attempts at discussion, reinterpretation and re-positioning of signs in the public and artistic life. But the liberty to interpret a text, to change its referent, as the liberty to build symbols with a force of social impact represents an operation through which the world is built, in its representations as the world of meanings, it generates different and personal perspectives instead of the clichés provided by censorship. The Shakespearian theatrical laboratory functions symbolically, logically, morally, as a high-accuracy magnifying glass. Centuries before

the micro-sociological, psychoanalytical or quantic psychological experiment or fashioning, Shakespeare dares his “contemporaries” to comprehend the “limitless theatre of the world”, he builds the model of negative manipulation and the dramatic effects of distorted mirroring, he theatrically amplifies the versatility of “atoms” in the games of life and death. He analyzes the effects of passions, of love and hate, he utilizes “theatre within theatre” as a technique of investigation of human behavior in real or possible situations and of provoking behavioral effects, he undoes or disassembles the mechanism of power in historical or fictional contexts, he experiments at different scales of complexity destruction and the fall into oblivion. On the performance of *Titus Andronicus*, the director Silviu Purcărete has asserted that it is “the image of the wound that touches conscience. The obsession of madness which is fairly strong in my country” (Purcărete 1995: 2), and Mihai Măniuțiu goes even further with the analogical game: “In *Titus Andronicus*, there is a swarming akin to one from the beginning of the world. Dozens, hundreds of characters endeavor to arise in a jumble, suffocating one another. They take the words right out of their mouths, they rush to exist, to voice at least a fraction of their truth.”(Măniuțiu, 2003: 47).

An interpretation that shortens the distance between the real worlds and the possible ones. But while in 1990, the society is effervescent, the '60s represent the grey backdrop on which the reflexes of theatrical creativity acquire other dimensions. The discussion for and against the change in convention, triggered by Liviu Ciulei's show is a disproportionate reaction to a warning signal. It is not the “life” and the theatrical signs created by Liviu Ciulei that worries the censors, but the liberty to change the meanings of a text, to exit from the canon of tradition, an interpretation convention like any other, as Liviu Ciulei clarifies in the context.

These discussions in which aesthetic values are confronted with ideological labeling also reveal the solidarity of the three directors- L.Ciulei, L. Pintilie and D. Esrig,- subsequently adopted by the “new wave” of directors in the sustaining of the freedom of thought, of a theatrical autonomy, resource-values that will contribute to a rupture of many of the directorial personalities from the theatrical institutional system, and the hitting of the ideological wall is inevitable and produces long-term events on the historical and cultural sequence. In this discussion, the liberty of directorial reading is interpreted and evaluated as a liberty in general, a problem – liberty for the ideological mechanism, which explains the aggressiveness of certain expressed points of view.

Instead, a very significant phenomenon for the theatrical world comes to pass, a world in which the forms of loud contradiction of the system are not specific, but within which phenomena of opinion which deeply influence the cultural space the ideas and theatrical praxis are initiated. The question if the loss of the visual dimension in the case of one of Shakespeare's plays affects or not the power of the text and the scope of its symbolic functioning, the signs, the links, the forces, the transformations, the intensity of the sense. To what extent are the body, pivot of theatrical symbolism, and its energy actors' voices. Obviously, the temperature of the stage's image is different from the one

of the acoustic image from the stereophonic laboratory, and the re-distributed, recalibrated theatricality implies another machinery of the sense, utilizing articulation, music, electronic effects, but especially another directorial thinking, another dilemma of “co-conception”.

But the problem of conception must be developed farther through its purpose, the impact of articulation for which we shall prefer the term of “radiating enunciation (energy)”, utilized by the theatrical analyst George Banu: “Brook always says that what he tries to develop in the acting beings is their capacity to intensify their emotions, to boost them, also helping them to open up” (Banu 2005: 67).

Therefore, can Shakespeare generate, in the radio-dramatic format, sense effects capable of sustaining our hypothesis, namely the one of a cultural life form under the ideological ice?

Is radio-drama as a genre, and the Shakespearian one in particular, a form of aesthetically justified cultural consumption?

Where could it be placed, between emptiness and fullness? How about between “hypothetical” and “anti-hypothetical”?

We will try to accredit the radio-drama as silence-generating polyphony. A silence full of life, amplified by the accelerated movement of signs and of a reflexive, active, intense, open intentionality... In other words, if the theatre is the art of interrogations, then the radio-drama was not during communism and it is not even now a bedtime story for listeners, because theatre listeners are not part of the cliché of the object-listener.

The wresting from the daily referential system, from what we call reality implies re-interpretation of the “structure of publicity”, as a sphere of the conception of representations and recipes within which we define the “public consciousness”. “What becomes reference when the discourse becomes a text?” Paul Ricoeur asks himself and answers: “reference pertains to the power to show a common reality to interlocutors or, if one cannot show the thing of which one speaks, at list it can be situated in relation to the unique spatial-temporal network in which the interlocutors are introduced; in any discourse, the last reference is offered by the adverbs “here” and “now”, determined by the situation of the discourse”.

But this connection is only possible in the oral discourse and not in written text, where “a situation common to the writer and the speaker alike no longer exists”. Hence the different understanding of the delineation public – private in the two spheres of the text (Ricoeur 1995: 105-106). Mihai Măniutiu, in his studies of theatrical phenomenology, clarifies the essence of this “publicity” – processes of intensification of communicative consciousness through fusion – in the data of the theatrical performance. “The centralizing actor” – center of the others’ representations – as a motor/pivot of the dramatic text’s “publicity”, and not only the scenic entity, be it even an over-puppet, a redoubtable device of theatrical magic, in Gordon Craig’s vision, but also in Ariana Mnouchkine’s performances. The radio-drama confirms, as we shall see, the theory of the paradoxical Romanian director, in a communication system in which the body does not play the role of the “natural referent” of identity, but becomes a “body on loan”, delivered to imagination, a virtual body, a space in which the representation becomes autonomous, in relation to its reality “here” and “now”, a result of the transitive temporary unity between

body, sensation, desire, objects. At any rate, in the definition of the actor's body as an extension and concentration of the directorial reading of the text and stage of the sense – “stage-body”, M. MăniuŃiu (2003: 17, 18) develops Artaud's theory of the “double” in the “objective” transformations and structuring of the text, in the “transformations of the body” generated by the “state of theatricality”, under the convention that places theatre as an interface between the world of the text, of the sense and intention (hidden so as to be discovered) and the world of action, of the game that causes events (visible, exposed, tangible).

This comprehension of theatricality as a form and essence of “publicity” as presignifying (within the framework of the concept of “sense” analyzed by Heidegger, the projection which triggers the “selfhood”) and then as post-signifying (as a resonance in the consciousness, in the Platonic definition of catharsis) resists the transfer within the coordinates of the great radio-dramatic repertory, a growing territory of theatricality and the imaginary which slinks between thinking, text and “objective” reality, a territory not entirely real nor entirely imaginary, whose importance is majestically inferred by W. Lippman in his study from 1927 on the public phantom (Bybee 1997: 1,2).

For this visionary thinker, “opinions” represent manners of practical thinking, but also results of spontaneous and irrational interpretations, energies that set into motion warm currents, as opposed to the cold, institutional, inertial ones, or the ones of reflexive, analytical clarification of social consciousness.

The analyzed phenomenon can be included in this middle “region” which, through the intensity of theatricality, pushes the ideologized physicality outside the temporal/spatial limits, configured as emission/reception of radio theatre and of instating the “de-ideologized” world, thought in the respective moment in the universal aesthetic categories.

Let us not forget, the context of Ceausescu's political heroizing and ritualizing through means of mass information was completely different from the opulence of the current media market's signs, but the ideological excess was acutely felt in the context of the concentration, restraint and attempt to monopolize the public sphere through the duration, frequency and isotopies of the ideological discourse. In the dramatic radio representation of *The Tempest*, the referential system is maintained through the marks of identity of the characters and the relations between them, as well as through the indexical structure of the sign's musical texture, but the tendency towards a referential and logical specification of space and succession is rivaled by the fluidity of the musical images, by the frequency of the flashback, the diegesis which interrupts the consistency of real or imaginary happenings (if the island is only an ellipse, and absence of reality, teeming with creations of fantasy, or, if we accept Prospero's convention, the magic reality of the island is a reality raised to the level of thought. In both cases, the encounter of fiction with what comes to pass is a “in real time” game, real-imaginary complicity).

The first two scenes of *The Tempest* are united by a long musical phrase that debuts abruptly and gradually calms down in the strange vibration of the island. We perceive the intensity of Miranda's look before the unbound waters but also before a turmoil that she lives for the first time. These two looks merge in the fearful wish to save the castaways, a tension that turns into uneasiness caused by Prospero's long guffaw, overlapping her line (prolonged laughing is a vector that strikes several planes of the

complex sign, it is a direct indicator, it divulges Prospero's power and "switches" referential levels and frames from Prospero to Miranda. Its unusual duration suggests the unreal, and the fact that it only takes place in Prospero's mind is the signifier of the complicity between Prospero and the listener (a tertiary condition developed through virtual compositions), maybe as a reaction to the success of the magical operations, perhaps amused by Miranda's unrest, surely satisfied of the change in the ratio of forces with Antonio, his usurping brother.

Laughter is a radio-dramatic signifier rich in virtualities which will come to pass in the course of the radio representation. An acoustic creation of exceptional clarity and brilliance, the sound of the entire radio play is far from any excess. Instead of the unleashed forces, the director opts for the sonorous image of the impressionist type, a tempest that is mirrored (but not in the least amplified) in vaguely baroque sonorities (procedure through which the marks of historicalness receive a sourdine – the music is a creation of composer Theodor Gheorghiu – through which the refinement of Liviu Ciulei's directorial thinking is seized as chamber music, abstracted (abduction), musically and poetically by Mihai Zirra, director of the radio version. By listening to this performance, you perceive the finesse of the indexical game that makes reference to the "hidden show", in inflections and accents, in breath and in the figural articulation, while hearing becomes sight, vision, space – through which one can make the situations and contexts, the inferential fluid game, "the conversion into something else" in the poetic dimension, "the non-occasional signified" more or less ambiguous (Grice quoted in Bach 1997: 124,126).

In opposition with the scenic representation, the "adaptation" – molded on the conversational style and the fine regulation of the distances in communication – at the phone, you only shout if you want to interrupt the conversation, and you do not make prolonged pauses, the rhythm is faster than the direct communication, the narration is more concise and the chamber atmosphere – characteristic to the radio-telephonic listening calibrated by the warm, informal frame, reduces and shapes, it tinges up to the polished form of a crystal. It supposes indexical restraint operations which, paradoxically, do not modify, but amplify the theatrical symbolism in and through the length of the chain of details (sequences of micro-signs) – the indexical reduction and poverty of death increases the brightness of passion, in *Romeo and Juliet*, the perspective on the act of justice, overturned by Balthasar/Portia by the reinterpreted detail, raised to the status of condition in *The Merchant of Venice*; the referential ratio is perturbed by the magic of Prospero's laughter. The theatrical sign varies the pressure on common significance either through amplification (volume, details at a large scale), or through shrinking, concentration, reduction. The small scale facilitates the objects' maneuverability, it re-semanticizes them and triggers the effect, in methods comparable with play of magic, on the basis of the analogical principle. In conclusion, the radio-theatrical effect and its expressive efficiency (for which Grice's concept of "utterance" is convenient) are produced by less and not by more, by bigger or equal, this mathesis – the entire universe, a part of it, but also Venus de Milo, can be expressed in the form $f(x, y, z)$ – (Constantin Noica 1934) that is characteristic to the radio-drama utilizes the notion of inter-subjective in the creation and amplification through the logic of resonance of the metaphors of the living (Banu 2005: 157). Thus, the centralizing actor does not disappear, but he is converted in the expressive radiating force of his voice – deprived of the "body on loan" to the others'

sight – which bends to a jocular, imaginative involvement/implicature of the listener, intensifying the uniqueness which does not get lost in multiplicity. We thus obtain a new “public form” of the text, in which “what is offered must be, through its most intimate content, through its essential form, a public event” (Luckacs 1976: 201 [emphasis added]). Nevertheless, the radio-drama is not less theatre and more literature; this predominantly sonorous theatrical form can create, through the nature and forces of communicative experience, in certain conditions that we have mentioned earlier, blurring of the limits between real and imaginary. If we know that the extraction from the “here and now”, typical of the language-everyday object as a sequence of operations through which we obtain the referential shrinking/compression will continue (the emptiness, the void that precedes the event, the action of jumping into the abyss of the expectation which is free of the present’s constraints, state of expectation from which the performance of words, of sound appears, characterized by a liberty of play of the absent part’s representation until the moment of silence from which the show exits, compensated by a freedom of play of the absent part’s (the body, the light-space, the temperature, the illusion) representation, then what is the “space” and especially the “nature” of the publicity that continues to hide?

If “the text is the mediation through which we understand ourselves”, then the approach to fiction, the approach of drama through the listening program, as a participation to the world of the text must be conceived in relation to the distancing that is characteristic to the writing (Ricoeur 1995: 106). Then the listening and the listener, going through the structural objectifications of the text are a response to the author but also to the sense as its own occurrence – type (token), a co-construction of the universality of a text through a concrete experience of communication. In the terms of Foucault’s analysis, we could say that the listener is chosen by the radio theatrical discourse, more so than the other way around. A discourse stronger than the one of reality, which seeks in the ether his manifestations in the dynamic process of significance connections, combinations, transformations that take place inside the chain of semiosis, through which any careful and passionate listeners are freed from the “trunk” of discourse in which they are captive, much like Ariel. They can become a being of air, they can enter the vibration of the Shakespearian logos, in the sense of the healing shamanic experience from the Platonic pharmacy, where the memory of the type acts through the philosophical tropes in the discourse that unites praxis and pathos. Octavian Cottescu demonstrates, in his impersonation of Shylock in the radiodramatic version of the play *The Merchant of Venice*, the untold resources of a sonorous theatricality. The actor chooses a sinusoidal phrasing, vaguely evocative of the biblical serpent, so different from the ascendant-vectorial dynamics of the oratorical tirade. The figural aspect is instated in an oscillating manner through argumentative amplifications (extroversion) and withdraws inside the hidden self (introversion), coiling, with the purpose of gradually eliminating, by punctual negotiations (by calculations and transactions), the moral reference point embodied by the character Antonio in the indirect speech of the other characters, Bassanio, the Duke, Portia. Antonio is presented as a moral axis, a role model, an example in the Venetian world – who oscillates between creed and calculation, as any of the historic worlds – an axis that should be overturned, felled, from the perspective of Shylock’s interests, precisely through the

effect of the contract that sustains the worlds of money and of sea commerce, a form of social connection which does not makes distinctions between individuals, business and merchandise, a situation that we cannot say is entirely unfamiliar to us. Shylock does not suffer from that “ill-will” that has befallen Hamlet, Othello or Macbeth, a state that generates psychotic processes, in which reason and humanity darken and the distance between reality and illusion gradually fades away. Shylock’s fixation is only fueled by the “conflict of interest” between him and Antonio, and the obstinacy to physically eliminate the latter firstly pertains to the calculation and profit and only then to persecutions and humiliations suffered in the past from the part of Antonio who opposes Shylock’s money lending (lending with high interest) and his overnight enriching from the ship-owners’ ruin. Shylock is for Venice (a city encircled by the elemental presence of water) what Prospero is for his magic island, a power factor. An upturned one, because money is for Shylock what Ariel is for Prospero, a part of the whole of power, the visible one, for the invisible whole, the one that calls to the whole, orients it towards the achievement of all possibilities. We thus have the same analogical mechanism of the unleashing of forces on which a prognosis is based, within the framework of the holistic, systemic paradigm, or an anticipation of a global sense as a cultural trend. Agent of a dynamic and shifting existential process in the case of *The Merchant of Venice*, spiritual, typological, epistemic, in the case of *The Tempest*. Shakespeare projects (in the modern sense, projects and experiments) through Shylock something else than a mere cliché of the moneylender, and the ambivalence of Jessica, daughter of Shylock (good) Shylock (bad) spares us from an accusation of anti-Semitism in Shakespeare’s case. The sinister contract that stipulates for Antonio the obligation of paying, in case of failure, “a pound of flesh” from his owns breast contains something blasphemous for the body and also for the soul whose seat is the heart (in the pneumatic doctrines). Something blasphemous but accepted nonetheless in modern contractual terms, in which the practical conditions are fixed, not the moral aspect of the trade. Morality can be excluded from commerce, as can God, excluded from Laplace’s system 200 years later.

The predictable (up to a certain moment) effect of honoring the contract, Antonio’s death, through which Shylock would transactions), the moral reference point embodied by the character Antonio in the indirect speech of the other characters, Bassanio, the Duke, Portia. Antonio is presented as a moral axis, a role model, an example in the Venetian world – who oscillates between creed and calculation, as any of the historic worlds – an axis that should be overturned, felled, from the perspective of Shylock’s interests, precisely through the effect of the contract that sustains the worlds of money and of sea commerce, a form of social connection which does not makes distinctions between individuals, business and merchandise, a situation that we cannot say is entirely unfamiliar to us. Shylock does not suffer from that “ill-will” that has befallen Hamlet, Othello or Macbeth, a state that generates psychotic processes, in which reason and humanity darken and the distance between reality and illusion gradually fades away. Shylock’s fixation is only fueled by the “conflict of interest” between him and Antonio, and the obstinacy to physically eliminate the latter firstly pertains to the calculation and profit and only then to persecutions and humiliations suffered in the past from the part of Antonio who opposes Shylock’s money lending (lending with high interest) and his overnight enriching from the ship-owners’ ruin. Shylock is for Venice (a city encircled by the elemental presence

of water) what Prospero is for his magic island, a power factor. An upturned one, because money is for Shylock what Ariel is for Prospero, a part of the whole of power, the visible one, for the invisible whole, the one that calls to the whole, orients it towards the achievement of all possibilities. We thus have the same analogical mechanism of the unleashing of forces on which a prognosis is based, within the framework of the holistic, systemic paradigm, or an anticipation of a global sense as a cultural trend. Agent of a dynamic and shifting existential process in the case of *The Merchant of Venice*, spiritual, typological, epistemic, in the case of *The Tempest*. Shakespeare projects (in the modern sense, projects and experiments) through Shylock something else than a mere cliché of the moneylender, and the ambivalence of Jessica, daughter of Shylock (good) Shylock (bad) spares us from an accusation of anti-Semitism in Shakespeare's case. The sinister contract that stipulates for Antonio the obligation of paying, in case of failure, "a pound of flesh" from his own's breast contains something blasphemous for the body and also for the soul whose seat is the heart (in the pneumatic doctrines). Something blasphemous but accepted nonetheless in modern contractual terms, in which the practical conditions are fixed, not the moral aspect of the trade. Morality can be excluded from commerce, as can God, excluded from Laplace's system 200 years later. The predictable (up to a certain moment) effect of honoring the contract, Antonio's death, through which Shylock would get rid for good of an obstacle in the way of money lending that made him rich, triggers the organic solidarity of the friends and of the whole community against Antonio, brings back into the present a value that scored low in the social importance, by juridical regulation, abstract but necessary, fundament of the new commercial order (!). Shylock remains alone, firm, against the Venetian community, gathered at a genuine show of arguments for and against, he remains against Antonio and the virtues embodied by him and observed by all, at least theoretically, because Shylock is "a stony adversary, an inhuman wretch", as the Duke proclaims. Shakespeare stops the succession of events that advanced towards a predictable sacrificial crisis by the intervention of Balthasar.

Shylock receives a blistering justice, as he pays with half his wealth for the error of his ways, of having insulted the values of society, and the other half is left to Jessica, "the flesh and blood" of Shylock, she who shall marry a Christian. Antonio is saved, the truth triumphs through all conscience, reconfirming the moral and social order in both worlds, because Balthasar is for Shylock a genuine Daniel (the prophet Daniel, the one that announces the coming of Jesus), angel and judge (here is an union of the two worlds, through the approval of the Old and New Testament, a grounding of "progress" in the model of the good book indirectly invoked, but also a re-signifying of secular, commercial relations, in the questioning (claim) of the prophetic matrix-model of the act of justice). Although one can recognize anti-Semitism, Shakespeare makes a decisive step towards a philosophy of the "good" modernity, which includes the dilemma of doubt as an integral part of "free will" (!..) and conscience, as reality is nothing more than an effect (theatrical and prophetic) of sense in the flow of existential facts. But the rhythm of the representation does not depend solely on the play of oppositions and exclusions (tensions and incidences) through which the radio adaptation sets off the complex text towards the directorial intention and the comprehension of the listener. It is manifested in the sonorous texture of the scenes, in the orchestration of the voices, in the creation of the emotional atmosphere and tension, the virtual stereophonic space that pushes the illusion into the

authentic and the state of the theatrical histrionics in the real, physical unit of the receiver, a new existence or state, in which the actor, fiction and spectator are co-constructed. It is a theatrical quasi-interaction (Thompson 1999:83-86), mediated by the radio, which triggers “the network” downstream of the representation, making it vibrate to the upstream of the text, depending on the eventgenerating power of articulation. Laurent Jenny considers articulation a figural instituting, and the rime an original function of crossing the paronomasia(the tendency towards approach, fusion). with the antonomasia (the tendency towards dissociation, distinction, separation), as poles of the homonymic block, as phases of the complex process of generating the sense, first as desemantization, as a road towards the indistinctive, in the silence that re-initiates the semiosis and which pushes the process towards its origin in the archetypal image (Jenny, 1999: 92-106). We could hence deduce that the energy of poetic articulation has much more vast consequences than the ones granted by modernity or post-modernity to the word. As “body” of the directorial discourse and result of a hermeneutics of the text, which can be analyzed as an emotional wave but also as a para-verbal device, the voice of the actor and the articulation of the great dramatic poem is a “jump into the abyss” of indetermination, of the indefinite, of the void, desemantization by the cutting of the referential connection (rope), as the “jump into 0 level” is gradually reversed, and boosts in significance (re-semantization) are recorded during the sequences. An interesting approach to the process of the Shakespearian text’s re-semantization is also propounded by Alexa Visarion, as he adopts from R. Barthes the term of “galaxy of meanings”, “C factor” (the invariant cultural factor, a term utilized in approaching the integration of immigrants into the American society), predetermining the directorial enunciation of the text as being the universe towards which the re-presentation offensively orients its protensive aspects. Thus, “the fall” and “the jump into the abyss” are the obligatory stages of a hermeneutic phenomenology (or the other way around, of a phenomenological hermeneutics), discovery – revealing of the “hidden performance”(Visarion, 2002: 10),. The formula of the Shakespearian theatre is enunciated in an “atomic” sequence – epic theatre, social analysis, ritual cruelty, introspection” but the justification of this remarkable synthesis appears farther – “The fusion links the oppositions and allows the sensory character of the words to have the untranslatable nature of life, to explode in several directions, to replace a point of view with a multitude of different visions” (Visarion, 2002: 10 ff),. For Lucian Pintilie, the re-semantization is the result of a genuine shock wave, generated by the directorial reading (Lucian Pintilie, 2001:5), but that gradually instates itself in the reading phase with the actors, which precedes the rehearsals on the stage, the symbolic partitioning in the dream phase, the initiation phase of the actors and of the director. Thus, the theatrical phenomenology implies the “positive lesson that gives us words like madman and fool”, as part of the “Eucharist” and “surprise of the growing contribution of negation” in life and society, as Constantin Noica would say (1987: 190, 191). For the theatre of life, the theatre is disintegration and “burning” of the signifier for ritual re-birth, purifying a community, the manner of initiation of life through renewal/sharing of the sense. The arming of the semiotic tension, pre-existing any incarnation through theatrical re/present/ation is the one that, “after the spondee of silence, sets apart the distinctive from the indistinctive” (Jenny, 1999: 92) through the shock of a new reading, an integral part of the discourse of modernity. The Shakespearian icon, result of the fusion between author, corpus of texts, C

factor (tradition) in the radio-dramatic process, institutes and crosses a space of the sense where the (thermo) dynamic process of representation acts as a motor (symbolic pivot) with two contradicting vectors: movement towards the indistinct vs. movement towards the figural distinctions. The ambiguity generated by the empty – full tension, indefinite – definite, real – imaginary, generates new instances of pricing, reconsideration, re-sizing, logical and historical, gradual distancing but also explosive clashes, decisive for the sphere of significance, because, eventually, the transformations of the symbolic realm clear the organized consciousness, referentially restructured, through which the “social self”, a fundamental concept of modern theories of identity, meets the self and the ego, equivalent for “*sein*” or “self” and “the self” of which C. Noica speaks, naturally by resorting to phenomenology, but also to the Romanian language’s virtuality to generate complex forms and experiences in the ascendant dynamics of being and existing (Noica,1987:11-18). A “fuller, a path to fullness that goes through “self-ascribable” and “other ascribable”, the inter-subjective space in which the text is mirrored, a place of gathering, of celebration, but also of emotional sliding or melting Ricoeur (2001: 152-162). An interesting remark is the one of Derrida about the absence of boundaries between *physis* and *psyche* (Derrida,2000:129), in the summoning back to life of the memory whose “*föhlung*” is for Husserl the fundamental constituent of identity(Husserl quoted in Ricoeur,1995:42). But the universality of the text represents more than the image of the text and its typologies, more than the halo produced by the concept in the crossing of the mind and operated by ideas. It is an increase in the significance’s tension, which will lead oppositions to the iconic and indexical ruptures, having as a symbolic effect – the liberation of integrating sense, the Eucharist of which Noica speaks, similar to the light effect produced by the photo-type, which allows the distinguishing, by a flash, of the “suspect” from the mass of experiences of evidence comparison and the piecing together of different clues.

A universality in action crosses spaces and culture, undoing it referentially, or amplifying the warm current of memory that calls the space – territory and the roots, an unstoppable symbolic stream that encompasses the memory of the person and of the group, summons them back to life and vibration. Primordial freedom of the dream and game in the enclosed spaces, temporarily paralyzed by the censorship... Shakespeare on the radio suspends, or at least switches to silence the wooden language of propaganda, cracks the ideological and mythological encircling of the communist era, regenerates the psycho- and socio-dramatic identifications which continue to ensure a living tissue of representation under the rigid shell of the ideological discourse, announcing the overflowing of compensatory speech. For the great repertory of the NRT, totalizing more than 2000 titles, an accidentfreetransition has taken place, and without the noisy demythologizing that have affected other authors and the critical canon in general. Shakespeare’s work continues to represent a durable phenomenon, a center of diffusion if the great themes and interrogations, a model, principle, resource of social imagination, emblematic for the construction of reality and “our feeling of present”. Paul Grigoriu, renowned director and former manager of the Romanian Radio Broadcast Society, considers that the radio’s offer, even in the toughest years of the totalitarian regime, “a refuge of the heart”, of certain authenticity, an uncontaminated part of Romanian culture, a

kind of “cavern” or island, one could say, in which ideas and imagination have continued to prosper... Nowadays, after a period of severe audience crisis, the public radio has redefined its status of cultural event – producing institution, as if acting under the motto – nothing is lost, but re-opened, as Shakespeare’s value (and of his repertory) grew in the course of time, as it happens with wine... The scale of the repertory, the quality of interpretation and the long-term system of the broadcast keep the NRT’s offer in the programs of Radio Romania Cultural and Radio Romania ActualităȚi, as a flow that is convertible into cultural value of heritage, a first-class function of the national public service in the context of the European cultural diversity, “a vital element for democracy, part of the European culture” (Open Society Institute, 2005: 21).

A service whose mission, within the EC, becomes increasingly important on a media market with a high degree of concentration.

References

- Bach, Kent. 1994. “Conversational implicature”. *Mind and Language*, 9. 124-162.
- Banu, George. 2005. *Peter Brook. Spre teatrul formelor simple / Peter Brook. Toward the Theater of Simple Forms*. Polirom: Iasi.
- Berceanu, Patrel. 1997. *Monografia unui eveniment teatral. „Titus Andronicus” de W. Shakespeare. Un spectacol de Silviu Purcărete / The Monograph of ATheatrical Event. “Titus Andronicus” by W. Shakespeare. A Show by Silviu Purcărete*. Craiova: Editura Aius.
- Baumann, Zygmunt. 2003. *Comunitatea, The Community*. Editura Antet
- Bybee, Carl, R. 1997. „Media, Public Opinion and Governance”. *Mass Communication*. Module 10, Unit 56, University of Leicester.
- Coman, Mihai. 2003. *Mass-media mit si ritual. O perspectivă antropologică / Massmedia Myth and Ritual An Athropological Perspective*. Iasi: Polirom.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1997. *Diseminarea / Dissemination*. Bucuresti: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Kerbrat-Orrecchioni, C. 1998. *Interactions verbales*. Tome 1, Paris: Armand Colin.
- Frumusani, Daniela RovenŃa. 2004. *Analiza discursului. Ipoteze si ipostaze/ Discourse Analysis. Hypotheses and Instances*. Bucuresti: Tritonic
- Jenny, Laurent. 1999. *Rostirea figurală / Figural Speech*. Bucuresti: Univers
- Lukacs, Georg. 1976. *Romanul istoric/ The Historical Novel*. Bucuresti: Editura Minerva.
- MăniuȚiu, Mihai. 2003. *Cercul de aur, eseuri teatrale / The Golden Circle. Theatrical Essays*. Bucuresti: FundaȚia Culturală “Camil Petrescu”(Revista Teatrul azi).
- Michnik, Adam. 1994. ”Problematici ale tranziȚiei prezentate în cadrul reuniunii internaȚional.Cultură si mentalități”/Problems of Transition Presented at the International Conference ”Culture and Mentalities”, FundaȚia Culturală Română, Sinaia, 1994, interview, in *Tomis*, (1): 2-3.
- Mucchielli, Alex. 2005. *Arta de a comunica. Metode, forme si psihologia situaȚiilor de comunicare / The Art to Communicate. Methods, Forms and the Psychology of Communcation Situations*. Iasi: Polirom
- Noica, Constantin. 1987. *Cuvânt împreună despre rostirea românească/Wording on Romanian Discourse*. Bucuresti: Editura Univers,

- Noica, Constantin. 1992. *Mathesis sau bucuriile simple / Mathesis, or Simple Joys*. Bucuresti: Humanitas.
- Răboj Georgeta, Oprina, Dan and al. 1998. *Teatrul Național Radiofonic / The National Radio Theater*. Bucuresti: Bucuresti, Editura Casa Radio.
- Open Society Institute, EU. 2005. *Monitoring and Advocacy Program/ Raport de Monitorizare*.
- Patlanjoglu, Ludmila. 1997. *La vie en rose cu Clody Bertola / La vie en rose with Clody Bertola*. Bucuresti: Humanitas.
- Prandi, Michele. 1992. *Grammaire philosophique des tropes. Mise en forme linguistique et interpretation discursive des conflits conceptuels*. Paris: Minuit
- urcărete, Silviu. Interview. *Le Nouvel Observateur*. 27.06.1995.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1995. *Eseuri de hermeneutică / Essays in Hermeneutics*. Bucuresti: Humanitas.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2001. *Memoria, istoria, uitarea/ Memory, History, Forgetting*. Timisoara: Ed.Armacord.
- Sebeok, Thomas. 2006. *The Sign Science and the Life Science*. Geneva: ASSA.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Merchant of Venice*. Teatru la microfon / The Romanian Radio on-line Library. www. radio3net.ro
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*, Teatru la microfon / The on-lineLibrary. www.radio3net.ro.
- Strauss, Claude Levy. 1987. *Antropologia structurală / Structural Anthropology*. Bucuresti: Editura Politică.
- Thompson, John. 1999. *Mass-media si Modernitatea / The Media and the Modernity*. Antet.
- Vasiliu, Dan. 1994. *De ce surâde Shakespeare / Why Does Shakespeare Smile?* Craiova: Ed Aius.
- Visarion, Alexa. 2002. *Spectacolul ascuns / The Hidden Show*. Bucuresti: UNATC