THE COLLAPSE OF DRAMA: WHAT IS LEFT?

Ana Candida de Carvalho Carneiro

ABSTRACT

The Neo-avantgardes of the 20th century left an indelible mark on the idea of theatre, establishing once and for all the concept of drama as a theatrical form, historically defined and based on identifiable criteria. The script as an end in itself was either dismissed – and pure performance was thus preferred –, or it was used as a device or starting point for what was occurring on stage in the hybrid, experimental theatrical forms. The role of playwrights – and therefore that of the script as an independently meaningful structure – fell into a deep crisis. By coming to grips with the new experiences, playwrights were able to explore new modes of textual expression, putting their art back on the right track. What dimensions do the categories of drama take on today? What are the new literary devices and techniques that contemporary playwrights can adopt? In order to try and answer these questions, we will analyze the script *La demande d'emploi* (The job application) by Michel Vinaver. Although written in 1971 – therefore, at the very beginning of the mentioned revolutionary period –, it already presents very important features of a type of playwriting that can be qualified as post-dramatic, like almost the entirety of the playwright's work. We will explore and develop concepts like fragment, movement and polyphony, that can be frequently encountered in contemporary theatrical texts and with which both scholars and theatre professionals have to come to terms.

Key words: Post-dramatic; Vinaver; La Demande d'emploi; Fragment; Movement; Polyphony; Pièce paysage.

Writing today, for a playwright, is a very different job than it was fifty years ago. We could even argue that the word "playwright" is no longer suitable to describe the compositive work of the modern theater author because it keeps the root word, *dramatos*, which includes this vision of a theater author as a creator of action. The current state of the art for theater writing would require a different name, rather than a generic "theater author". In fact, our work today is more similar to a *composition process,* such as writing music or creating visual arts, which does not necessarily have anything to do with action (at least not in the classic sense of the word) or telling a story, which is very necessary to this particular art form. In the 1980s, Jean-Pièrre Sarrazac suggested the notion of a rhapsode author, based on the idea of the medieval rhapsode as an assembler of that which has been previously torn apart, and identifies a "rhapsodic impulse" in theater authors of the last few decades. However, this impulse is in the direction of evolving towards freer forms of dramatic writing. Theater writing has become, for Sarrazac, a point of view inside the drama, a *de-compositive act*, with the intention of pushing the crisis element in the fabula, the character and the dialog to a maximum until it almost disappears.[1] However, we find this idea restrictive, in light of resources that the theater author has as a creator of theater before being a creator of the text. Theater: an art that has become more and more hybrid starting with the *neoavanguardia* influences from last century.

In 1976, *Einstein on the Beach* came out - recently redone by the Teatro di Reggio Emilia. It was an opera in four acts with music by Philip Glass, directed by Bob Wilson and choreography by Lucinda Childs. This is a historic show, which I believe represents theater art on a wider scale like no other presentation. In this work, music, dance, text, and visual composition coexist in a scenic space without hierarchy to create a hybrid event that captures the audience's attention despite its five-hour duration. This all new concept of theater holds the spectator's attention not with the events of a well-woven story, according to the dramatic rules of identification (or their violation), but by the here and now of a meticulously organized scenic event with brand new parameters. Obviously, the entire era of experimental theater in the 1960s came before this, which developed in a cultural context of challenging the middle class *status quo*, in which its experiences had already strained traditional dramatic mechanisms. However, never had such a unique combination of concepts been used, difficult to define as Image Theater. In a work of this kind, the spectator is stimulated primarily from a sensorial point of view, and the construction of a sensible story is a secondary or even optional element. Beauty talks. But where does this beauty come from? How is it produced? The theater author asks, since beauty has been discarded by directors and research committees as an icon of an age dominated by the monolithic imposition of a sense in the trappings of a demiurge. He begins to explore his art as never before, searching for new methods and remembering, that he is - first and foremost - a theater artist.

In 1999, the book by Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatisches Theater* came out, offering a new paradigm for reading the experiences of neoavanguardia artists up to our times. In order to develop an aesthetic logic for that new type of theater that we spoke of before, Lehmann identifies a series of common features that are not included in the traditional idea of theater that would be classified as drama. It is a matter of continuing, so to speak, the work started by Szondi, who analyzed the crisis of the drama from a point of view inside the dramatic format, contrasting Aristotelian unities with Brecht's epic theater construct. This last point of view would indicate a disintegrating trend ("becoming epic"), and also postulate the fracture of this closed genre called "absolute drama", characterized by excluding the real from the presentation, the linearity of the story, the prevalence of dialog as an form of interpersonal exchange and observing the three

[1] SARRAZAC, Jean-Pièrre. *Lexique du drame moderne e contemporain*, Circé, 2005, p. 19.

Aristotelian unities (time, place, action). However, almost forty years later, Lehmann wrote with the aid of his *neoavanguardia* experience, and questioned Szondi's theoretical perspective. He said that epic theater postulated by Brecht is only a counter trend inside the drama genre, and not a force towards its destruction. Lehmann said:

> Brecht's theory contained a highly traditional thesis: a fabula (story) remained in a condition of *sine qua non* for him. However, considering the fabula, the decisive elements of the new style of theater between the 1960s and the 1990s cannot be understood - not even the textual forms of dramatic literature (Beckett, Handke, Strauss, Müller, Kane, etc.). Post-dramatic theater is post-Brechtian theater. [2]

Lehmann identified the combination *mimesis*/action as a pillar of drama. In this model, the play would be a microcosm that always hints at another reality, or rather, human behavior. Post-dramatic theater, on the other hand, arises from the fall of these, or rather, from the failure to identify drama (or the "tragic", in Hegel's words), and supplying an essential change in perspective for the spectator's cognitive processes. He explains:

> If we do not break free of this model, we will never be able to perceive how much the way we are aware of life and recognize it is intensely modeled and structured by art: modeled and structured points of view, and ways of hearing and thinking, ways of interpreting meaning (Benjamin's 'Art des Meinens') that are only elaborated through and by art (...). [3]

Therefore, we accept this paradigm as being fundamental for reading contemporary creations, at the performance level and at the textual level (dramatic literature). From the artist's point of view, it must be used as a tool for critical contemplation of one's own work, and also as an expansion of the theater writer's technical and expressive possibilities, if the writer has become more aware of his/her artistic capacity. An expansion to become: a window opens on to a *playground* with complex but very amusing topography. I use the word *playground* because never before has it been so necessary to have an aspect of playfulness in one's art. Writing for theater audiences has become mainly exploration with an incomplete map of composition methods that change each time, and can absorb the unexpected. Not for this reason are they purely formal. Lehmann has given us some coordinates.

Catherine Bouko, in her *Théâtre et réception*, insists on the excessive elasticity of the concept of post-dramatic as presented in *Postdramatisches Theater*, underscoring the need for more specification that would help critical work. She identifies the abandonment of the text as the main aspect of post-dramatic theater. [4] This view seems limiting, because in this case the paradigm would apply more prevalently to the scenic event and its methods of reception. "Post-dramatic" becomes a category restricted to the direction processes. However, theater continues to contemplate text, the work of writing and the words. Will this model be sufficient as tool to analyze contemporary theater texts?

Theater writers, comparing their own work with *neoavanguardia* style work, or rather, with the appearance of forms like performance and happening, and the work of directors as Bob Wilson mentioned, have absorbed processes that they later tried in their own works, with extraordinary results.

---

[2] LEHMANN, Hans-Thies, *Postdramatic Theatre*. Routledge, 2006, p. 33.

[3] *Ivi*, p. 37.

[4] "Scenic creation is post-dramatic when it elaborates a system that is no longer centered on drama. The scenic procedures are emancipated from the authority of the text, if there even was one."
BOUKO, Catherine. *Théâtre et réception. Le spectateur postdramatique*. Routledge, 2010, p. 24.

Except for a few authors believed today (in some cases, this is partially debatable) to be purely post-dramatic, such as Elfriede Jelinek, other hybrid forms have been created that *play with and explore* new ways to communicate with the audience. I do not use the phrase "tell a story" because stories are often reduced to such a fine thread to seem absent. In light of this, contemporary theater texts must be approached from a multi-perspective point of view, which does not exclude the drama system, but instead causes it to interact with the new model of reading. On this subject, Bouko admits:

> If Lehmann can present Brook as a post-dramatic, it is probably because he defines post-dramatic theater with a constellation of features that we find in different degrees in scenic creations. His post-dramatic model does not exclude the approach to a show or artist in light of dramatic *and* post-dramatic systems, depending on the features that we want to insist on. [5]

Thus, post-dramatic does not mean forgetting drama, but instead it is an aesthetic category that evolves differently. As Karen Jürs-Munby explained in the introduction to the English edition of the collection of Lehmann's works:

> (...) it will hopefully become clear that "post" here is to be understood neither as an epochal category, nor simply as a chronological 'after' drama, a 'forgetting' of the dramatic 'past', but rather as rupture and a beyond that continue to entertain relationships with drama and are in many ways an analysis and 'anamnesis' of drama.[6]

In this way, we intend to recognize and discuss certain of these features, identifying them as the concepts of *fragment, movement and polyphony* - categories that I believe are outside of drama, even though they maintain a dialog with it. For this purpose, I take as an example a work by French dramatist Michel Vinaver, *La Demande d'emploi.* Though written in '71 - when he was still unaware of the experiments undertaken during that decade - it contains some very important aspects of drama writing that can be identified as *post-dramatic*. Actually, almost all of the rest of his work could be labeled as such, to a greater or lesser degree, but always exploring new forms of expression.

A theater for hearing

A very well-known author of French theater, Michel Vinaver started writing in the 1950s, precisely in 1955, the date of his first work *The Koreans*. Assimilated approximately by the "A Theater of the Everyday", he built his artistic path through experimentation. He completed his university education in the United States, and translated many different literary texts from English, including The Wasteland by T.S. Eliott, from whom he said to have learned composition.[7] He talks about *juxtaposition*, or rather, the relationship of materials, a technique that I believe is paramount for theater writing. He explains in his very interesting book Writings for the Theater, which has unfortunately not been translated into Italian, that the principle of juxtaposition is that of taking ugly material - linguistically speaking - to obtain rhythmic effects, collisions of sounds, changes in meaning from one sentence to the next. This way of interpreting writing

---

[5] Ibidem.
[6] Jürs-Munby, K. *Introduction* in *Postdramatic Theatre*, London, Routledge, 2006, p. 2.
[7] Vinaver, M. *Écrits sur le theatre 1*, Paris, L'Arche, 1998, p. 125.

brings the author to come out of a dramatic logic to start to use musical or icon construction processes, beyond a clearly defined or subtle story. What counts are these effects that bring contrast and interruptions, and sometimes even well constructed nonsense, which the dramatist is absolutely free to construct at will. And to manage this immense freedom, it takes quite a bit of wisdom. J.P. Sarrazac commented as follows, concerning Vinaver's work methods:

> His [Vinaver's] starting point is a rich, variegated language, the variety of which is amorphous *a priori,* and nevertheless, meaning emerges through the counterpoint, the interruption, the ellipsis" [8]

The author's work becomes, therefore, the <u>process that puts material into a relationship</u>. In this process, as mentioned above when we spoke of the need identified by Lehmann to emerge from the dramatic paradigm to understand how our cognitive processes are in some way conditioned by it, in order to expand them or override them,[9] declares Vinaver in a revealing way, I think, that responds to a necessary increase in the author's awareness of the action of writing:

> The work of the dramatist is to assemble and model the bricks of language so that they <u>reveal how we build our images of the world</u>. [10]

This assembly and modeling of language, which is obviously the basis of any type of writing, becomes significant (and subversive; I consider subversion as a matter of quality) in the proportion in which it *reveals* mechanisms that are taken for granted, putting the reader/spectator in the position to investigate the work and the processes used to understand it (and therefore, also used to understand the world). For centuries, identification was the founding mechanism of dramatic writing, but in the measure that the authors allow the character to atrophy, turning him into a simple speaker of words that do not belong to him - quotes, someone else's memories, actions by the author - many times reducing to merely a name (the character becomes a linguistic operation, not the mimesis of a subject. Spectators are thrown into a disoriented status that only opens up the possibility of understanding the real through a different modality, more directly sensorial (as in Vinaver's works, with the sound material in the foreground; I should mention primarily Novarina, an author who takes this principle to an absolute) or extremely formal (I could mention my experience with Plastic Doll in that sense).

In France, authors connected with Nouveau Roman (Sarraute, Pinget) have begun to challenge dramatist practices, as an extension of the aesthetics that they want to apply to prose. Sarraute, for example, wrote in *Pour un oui ou pour un non* without building characters, but only linguistic entities known by letters (H1, H2, H3, H4). Vinaver, even if not associated with this idea, (he published two novels before he started to write for the theater, but he is mainly considered a theater writer, unlike others) did similar experiments. I would say his were even more radical in investigating composition processes. For Vinaver, in fact, the text is a "non-standard, polyphonic structure", a "mixture of fragmented dialogs" of different lengths, that can range from one word or several pages long.[11] At each repeat performance, the subject (line of discourse or train of thought, as Sanchis Sinisterra[12] says) and the subject of the word can change, without warning, fading out or an intermediate phase.

---

[8] Ibidem.
[9] Lehmann, H.T., *Op. cit.*, p. 33.
[10] Vinaver, M. cit.in: Bradby, David. *The Theater of Michel Vinaver*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1993.
[11] With regard to *Par-dessus bord*, however, it can be attributed to the writer's practice of writing.
   Eigenmann, E. *La Parole empruntée: Sarrute, Pinget, Vinaver*, Paris, L'Arche, 1996, p. 157.
[12] There are no written references about this; it is a term he used in his writing workshops.

WALLACE: What were your parents doing in Madagascar in 1927?

FAGE: With her arm folded, she was beautiful to look at.

NATHALIE: Papa if you do this to me

LOUISE: I didn't shine your shoes

In this small fragment, taken from the first scene, we can observe the overlapping of four different lines of dialog, that interact with one another in a completely autonomous way. The absence of a direct relationship between them creates a contrast. The first line of dialog is spoken by Wallace, during the job interview. The second belongs to the relationship between Fage and his wife. The reader's/spectator's expectation of a response to the first subject is broken by the intervention of the second subject (Fage cannot bring himself to wake his wife because he was watching her sleep deeply), which we instinctively try to put into a relationship with the first. Our expectations for meaning to be created are again dislodged by Nathalie's line, referring to the third subject, the relationship between Fage and his seventeen-year-old daughter, who is pregnant by a black man. Her line echoes from her refusal to have an abortion as her parents wanted.

Therefore, all of the elements of a drama have potential: Fage, an unemployed middle-aged man, needs a job (a character who is in difficulty). His daughter is pregnant (the stakes are raised). His wife, to try and ease the financial difficulties, begins to work, which goes against Fage's values as breadwinner (complication). However, all these elements are shredded and managed *polyphonically*. The language and its sounds determine the textual construction, not the action in the classic sense of the word and the mechanism of cause and effect. When talking about musicality as a main orientation factor, Vinaver says:

> "In a theater production, there is certain musicality'. The play is not just something more than its content. Without this music, there would be no theater production. The music is an integral part of the theater production."[13]

This idea, put into practice as we have seen, is similar to what Jelinek calls *Sprachflächen*, <u>language surfaces juxtaposed</u> instead of dialog[14], a method used by the author because she does not like the typical illusion of drama. The gradual disappearance of narration and figuration principles to support the fabula (story) favors a process of making language autonomous that is typical of texts organized post-dramatically. The dialog is non-existent or takes on different expressions, regulated for example by sonority, language surfaces that emerge to bring us *fragments* of situations, micro-dramas, fading images, as we can observe in Vinaver's works from the 1970s.

In this type of text, it is not possible to speak of action as a dominant axis, but of *movement*. The traditional definition of action is "a series of events and acts that form the subject of the dramatic work" (Larousse Dictionary) or "the sum of actions completed" (ARISTOTLE) or also, in a semiological sense, "the transforming and dynamic element that makes it possible to pass logically and temporally from one situation to the next.[15] Action is dramatic *par excellence*, that is, it belongs to the "drama" system. On the other hand,

---

[13] Vinaver, M. *Écrits sur le theatre 2*, Paris, L'Arche, 1998, p. 17. (my translation).
[14] Schmidt, C. *Sprechen sein. Elfriede Jelineks Theater der Sprachflächen*. in http://www.einarschleef.net/texte/Sprechen.html.
[15] Pavis, P., *Dictionnaire du Théâtre*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2009, p. 8

movement (the term was coined by J. Danan in a book in 1999), is the flow that makes the test move, which can be merely associative, through sound (on the level of meaning) or formal. Even if the author develops movement in relation to Ibsen's theater and connects it more directly to the realm of cinema (cinema as writing of movement), it is clear that this is also a musical term, the broadest meaning of which is the progression over time of the musical composition. In our case, we speak of movement as a progression over time of the verbal fabric, a progression that is no longer linked to what is called intrigue in classic drama. Danan says:

> In dramatic writing, if the origin of the movement is caused by action, as restated by Hegel after Aristotle, the crisis of the action brings forth other types of movement that go beyond the notion of action. In one of these more decisive dimensions, movement can become, in a clearly Deleuzian way, 'movement of the soul' (...) This movement is less apparent, and stems from the composition of the work (or is present within it), from the underlying levels of meaning within it and - a mandatory reference to cinema - the way it is mounted.[16]

In Vinaver's text, this movement does not come from a narrative progression, but from an almost musical progression, in which repetition in the mounting of fragments produces meaning. In fact, the author states that *Situation Vacant* was conceived with a "theme and variations" structure, with reference to the Diabelli Variations by Beethoven. The author's method, his way of creating theater, becomes more than a game, in which meaning is a possible result instead of a starting point.

> This method of writing is connected to the fact that, for me, the theme of this piece is undetermined; nothing fully justifies writing about a subject. What interests me at the beginning is presented in a foggy way, and it does not go towards a story, a fabula. My starting point is the opposite of a story. In contrast, I need many stories that irrigate the writing, but none of them is authorized to become the hegemonic axis. The unique story becomes a comfortable communication vehicle. For me, today, the vehicle is a junction of elements that reflect one another, this is *montage*.[17]

*Montage (*and in the same way, *collage)* is an indispensable idea for anyone who writes for theater and designs a heterogeneous and discontinues effect that emerges in the structure and also in the themes of the theater text. [18] Borrowed from film-making (*The Montage of Attractions*, Eisenstein), aims to destroy any illusion of that organic totality that characterises the secular concept of the theater text as "animal beauty". We can speak of montage on both a macroscopic and microscopic level (macro and microdramaturgy): the division in parts is a form of montage, the succession of scenes, and so on, until we reach the cellular level of words that form a line (and maybe we could go even further, in the gaps between words). The theater author's understanding of this ore concept gives him enormous freedom in the writing process, and his texts can become highly complex mechanisms. A work no longer becomes the manifestation of an idea *a priori*, but instead is open to many different interpretations.

The abandoment of a unique point of view creates a *polyphonic* concept of the theater text. The use of fragmentation as a composition principle brings about "plurality, rupture, multiple points of view,

---

[16] Danan, J., in *Lexique du drame moderne et contemporain*, coord. J.-P. Sarrazac, Circé / poche, Strasbourg, 2005, p. 138.

[17] Vinaver, M. *Écrits sur le theatre 1*, Paris, L'Arche, 1998, p. 290.

[18] For the difference between montage and collage, see Montage in *Lexique del drame moderne e contemporain.*, coord. J.-P. Sarrazac, Circé / poche, Strasbourg, 2005, p. 131. "

heterogeneousness"[19]. This a consequence of an extended concept of theater - or maybe the word theatricality - that is open to experimentation and mixture of arts. With the beginning of directing, a process began to make scenic languages autonomous. As I explained at the beginning, the explosion happened during the second part of the 20th century, with the advent of the neoavanguardia artists, in which the arts test their limits and mix together to create hybrid, interdisciplinary works such as "Einstein on the beach". As Bernard Dort explains:

> Today, we can see a progressive emancipation of the elements from the production and we are seeing a change in their very structure: giving up an organic unity prescribed a priori and the recognition of the theatrical act as significant polyphony, open to the spectator.[20]

Beyond the logic of abandonment adopted by the author - which we discard in favor of an idea of coexistence between the different ways of doing (and writing) theater - it is important to note how theater writing has been affected and has conformed to this abandon of the organic and unitarian vision of theater. Marie Chrystrine Lessage, in *L'interartistique: une dynamique de la complexité,* tells us:

> The interartistic theater scene tends - this is a hypothesis - to explore other forms of spectator experience: it is less concerned with bringing a dramatic story to life, which is experienced through the senses, mind and body of the spectator. It is moving the spectator's normal areas of comprehension and feeling.[21]

The notion of polyphonic theater text lies in this fact, in moving the axis of drama to perception, from the story with a complete meaning to the fabric of sounds/images/etc. through the juxtaposition of heterogeneous fragments put together through the art of montage (the art par eccellance of today's dramatist), to spark short circuits that tend to produce meaning only during the spectator's active participation. Bachtin, the theorist of polyphony with regard to the novel, which is fundamental for all literary criticism through the 1900s up to the present, explains that the classic character (which he calls the hero) is locked into a monological design, because it is pre-constructed in the author's world. "The character's self-awareness is included in a solid armor, which is inaccessible from the inside, of the author's conscience that determines and portrays him, and emerges from the solid backdrop of the external world."[22] In the dialogic novel, "self awareness acts a principle of dissolution for any fixed idea, like a principle of tormenting division"[23] Bachtin thinks that the hero in Dostoevskij's polyphonic novels is, instead, "*pure voice*; we don't see him, we *hear him*; and all that we see and know in addition to his words is not essential and is swallowed up by the word itself, as part of its material, or it remains outside of what he says , like a provoking and simulating factor". This is the case of Fage, "the anti-hero" in Vinaver's *Situation Vacant*, which becomes evident with a frayed edge, through the sounds of fragments floating on a sea of words.

Lehmann speaks of *musicalization* of theatrical vehicles as a feature of post-dramatic theater, characterized by independent sonorous semiotics.[24] To design the new drama works that use phonetic

---

[19] *Lescot, D. e Sarrazac, J.P.,* in *Lexique du drame moderne et contemporain*, coord. J.-P. Sarrazac, Circé / poche, Strasbourg, 2005, p. 89.

[20] Dort, B. cit. in Lesage, Marie-Chrystine. *L'interartistique: une dynamique de la complexité*. in Revue d'Études Theatrales, Printemps, 2008, Paris, Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, p. 12

[21] Lesage, Marie-Chrystine. *L'interartistique: une dynamique de la complexité*. in Revue d'Études Theatrales, Printemps, 2008, Paris, Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, p. 25

[22] Bachtin, M. cit. in*:* Sini, S., *Michail Bachtin, una critica del pensiero dialogico*, Roma, Carocci, 2011, p. 118

[23] Bottiroli, G. cit. in: Ibidem.

[24] Lehmann, H.T., *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

material such as matrix, he use the terms *Textscape* or *Teatro delle voci* and talks about the post-dramatic "audio-landscape" of Bob Wilson, which (as Wilson says) creates a surface of associations in the spectator's mind.[25] This is the case with *Situation Vacant*. For Lehmann, "[...] post-dramatic theater does not aim so much to let us hear a subject's voice, as to disseminate many voices". Even if Fage, in fact, appears as character around which the dance of fragments is organized, the fallen hero looking for a job, the meaning of the text is not found in telling his story, but in disseminating the voices of the characters, which are all looking for their meaning. With regard to the theater of John Jesurun (American writer, director and multimedia artist), Lehmann speaks of text as a "voice machine", in which a plot (and a main character of reference) do not actually exist, but can be inferred. Vinaver's theater goes in this direction. In fact, the author and theorist, has identified the rather important distinction between the landscape play (pièce *paysage*) and the machine play (*pièce machine*), that it recalls Lehmann's point of veiw. The term landscape play comes from Gertrude Stein, in *Geography and plays* of 1922. She defended distancing from action as a foundation of drama in favor of the landscape's *existence* in which interior movement was created by the spectator in assembling the elements. Stein believed that it was not just a landscape image, but instead a music: the refusal of linearity in favor of an interplay of variations, repetitions and rhythms. It is not causal that her works were used by Bob Wilson, as texts-material. Vinaver picks up this notion, adopting it in his theatrical practice as we can see in *Situation Vacant*, and countering it on a theoretical level with the machine text, in which action develops through a causal mechanism. On a theoretical level, for him, the notion of landscape play is broader than Stein's, because it also applies to authors ranging from Strindberg to Fosse, but in fact her work brought her to that avant-guardist radicalism announced by the American writer in her own musical definition.

Writing in the future

In conclusion, we will first try to summarize the focal points of this paper. The dramatist asks how to react to the opening created by the performance activity characterized by hybridism in the new forms, called post-dramatic, which have become common in later years. The question pushes the dramatist further and causes him to abandon the label of dramatist in favor of a broader definition, theater author, or more precisely, in my own opinion, *theater montage author*. The study of beauty and new ways of producing it is characterized mainly by a search for *heterogeneousness* and *incompleteness* as aesthetic ideals, using *juxtaposition* as a basic poetic principle of the art of *textual montage*. In doing this, he rehabilitates the role of the text, without returning to a text-centered form. In fact, the modern theater author thinks (or should think) of his text always in relation to the other languages implicated in the presentation of the play. And this is surprisingly what renews the artistic work of the theater writer and reaffirms the autonomy of the text as literature. I believe that, for example, my work with musicians has taught me that leaving a space for other people in writing does not necessarily mean losing the autonomy of the textual composition. In "Appena prima, appena dopo", a text that I began to write as a libretto for a chamber opera, turned out to be a theater text in the complete sense of the term, in which some scenes were autonomous suggestions, carefully mounted for a job according to the composer/director. As Jean-Luc Nancy says, "The arts fight against each other".[26] A text "with holes", "fractured", or "unresolved" is absolutely not a synonym of being dependent/appendix of something else. This does not mean being vague; it means knowning how to compose a work. Recently, I

---

[25] Lehmann, H.T., *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

[26] Nancy, J.L., *Art, regard, écoute. La perception à l'oeuvre,* Saint-Dennis, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2000, p. 159.

read "IN ON IT" by Daniel MacIvor (Canadian author, actor and director) and I found it interesting enough to mention it as an example of fertile coexistence between drama and post-drama. This text apparently belongs to the Anglo-Saxon modality of writing, very realistic, also because the direction is still very dependent on the test for the reason that it contains its own direction. Thus, it contains an abundance of captions, with changes in lighting, specific musical instructions, etc. To the two-tiered narrative structure, a third level is added which contains the here and now of the performance: that interruption of the real that is very dear in post-dramatic. Therefore, to answer the question "Can conceptual categories linked to Post-dramatic theater be sufficient for analyzing modern theater?", my answer is no. It is necessary to draw from tradition and develop new concepts to understand the contemporary theater text. I have emphasized a few of what I consider to be more important.

I would like to end with a quote from Vinaver that helps me in my writing, beyond all intellectualism: "The theater text must remain an unsolvable object," and it does not matter how.