There is no doubt that theatre studies laments the irrefutable fact that the direct, more specific interest of its subject matter – the theatre - and namely, an interest that could (explicitly!) be recognized, read through, cited and/or referenced from the books of Jacques Derrida – has seemingly remained modest, marginal, or (even) completely insignificant. Certainly, theatre studies is absolutely aware of the factuality of this irrefutable fact, which however, should not prevent theatre studies scholars from carefully reading and even more carefully interpreting these same books. Quite the contrary.

The seeming (literal!) Derridian marginalization of the subject matter of theatre studies, that is, the seemingly marginal place that theatre has taken in what we could (colloquially) signify/name as Derridian context (of thinking over/contemplating)¹ should be taken by contemporary theatre studies as a gauntlet thrown down, or more specifically, as an unquestionable/inherent Derridian provocation that points to the most essential: to be read as a play.

¹ "thinking over/contemplating"
One need not be much of a Derridian to be able to read and understand that in the context of Derrida’s own deconstructive thinking the term *play* signifies/implies “a kind of *elasticity* or *tolerance* (...), which opposes the idea of self-content and absolute completeness, entirety” (Sim, 2004:23). The theatre, however, has survived (it has been 25 centuries now) not only because it was founded on certain metaphysical categories, but because of the *elasticity* and *tolerance* that are inherent for any authentic *play*.

The theatrical *play*, one of the most established as well as most powerful *plays* in general, is undoubtedly a play which has only one (and a very important!) goal. Determined by the *Derridian language* (even with the Derridian pun or paradox, if you will!), the goal of this *play* with/about theatre could be formulated as an infinite interaction (infinite *elasticity*, infinite *tolerance*...) between the *presence* and the *absence*.

We will easily agree on the irrefutability of the notorious fact that throughout all the time of its existence theatre has lived (and existed) specifically because of the *playful potential* of this crucial paradox. The very being of the theatrical act, which Barthes calls *theatricality*, and Derrida himself, calling upon Rousseau, calls it *presence*, (Derrida, 1976:399-403) is essentially determined by the powerful (paradoxical!) *play*/interaction between the *present* and the *absent*.

The theatrical act is in fact an Aristotelian *mimesis par excellence*: it takes place *in front of us*, and doubtless, *now* (Hamlet dies exactly at the moment at which we are
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watching the event, which means now: just as he died now last night, as well as last year, as well as in 1601 when it was originally staged at the Globe). The protagonists of a theatrical event are living and real (even when if they are puppets, because puppets have to be moved by a living and real animator). Theatrical action is truly imitated, because imitation always presents/represents action, and action, even when fictional, could not be but truly happening, which means not only in front of us but now as well, precisely as we are watch it.

Theatre, as we have known it (for 25 centuries now!) works by presenting, as well as because it presents. It simply overwhelms with the presence.

Simultaneously and along with this surge of presence, we, who sit below (“in the dark hollow of the salon”), have to keep solving the huge problem with which the theatrical mimesis (par excellence) inescapably confronts us. Namely, when imitating (some “living truth”) all the time we are very well aware that what is being presented/imitated just now (and just before our curious eyes), is however lacking one very important dimension. I am not sure if Derrida would have agreed with us in naming this dimension truthfulness, because such a name seems to refer a priori to something metaphysical (the Derridian thought, we all know, is absolutely transmetaphysical!).

What are we talking about here? What kind of absence (of truthfulness) are we referring to? Most likely to that which Victor Hugo had in mind when he wrote somewhere that theatre is not really a land of reality;
realnosta: дека нејзините стебла се од картон, нејзините палати од насликано платно, нејзиното небо од свиткани завеси... Или за она што големиот Станиславски — втемелувајќи на еден од најсериозните системи на театрализацијата (презенција) во целата историја на театарскиот медиум — постојано го дефинирал како „магично како-да“ (...если бы). Параодоксално, навистина: Станиславски, кој таканаречената реалистичка театарска поетика/естетика ја доведува до самиот раб на нејзините можности, објаснувајќи го предметот на својата дејност (театарот), постојано прибегнува кон магичната формула што самиот ја смислил. Да, неговиот театар верно го подржава реалниот живот, ама во тоа подржавање секогаш има и едно „магично како-да“ (...если бы), коешто сигнализира дека „вистинската реалност“ нужно и неизбежно отсуштува од театарскиот чин.

Sharing the truthfulness of imitation (the mimesis) with the actors and with everyone accompanying/serving these, we, still, still!, know the whole time that such truthfulness of theatrical mimesis is completely conditional, that it is conventional, and that it is a result of the previously made covenant between us, who sit down there (“in the dark hollow of the salon”) and those who for our sake do what they do, namely, imitate a certain/given action which needs to play out the very truth/reality. Both we “down there”, and they “up there” know that there is a significant difference between our perception of reality (“as such”) and the so-called theatre “reality” which a given play is trying to imitate, bringing it to its full presence, as Derrida says. It is exactly this difference between the truthful/real and the presented that we are talking about when we consider the eternal theatre oxymoron, i.e., the eternal play/interaction between the present and the absent.
The broad Derridian context suggests that this significant interaction (in fact, a procedure) not only is able, but it also has to be signified/described as deconstructive.

The famous term deconstruction, which otherwise works as a cornerstone of the overall Derridian thinking, is undoubtedly an example of a specific, thoroughly open, as well as thoroughly provocative category which keeps “slipping away” from any attempt of defining it (precisely). Nevertheless, no matter how much deconstruction confirms itself (with such a “slipping away”) as fluid (“undetermined”/open), at least when it comes to the theatrical act, an otherwise thoroughly fluid, ephemeral and open phenomenon in its essence! – the easiest/most explicit way of explaining it is, namely, through the interaction of the two mentioned elements of the crucial Derridian (performative, of the present) binary opposition present-absent.

Namely, theatre studies has a sense that this significant doubling (present-absent) in particular could serve as a unique cornerstone on which the procedure (strategy) of deconstructing the theatrical act, in particular finding those “blind spots” (“white stains”, as Derrida would say) towards which all its presence inevitably inclines. Namely, the process of deconstructing the theatrical act should offer/develop some new (different) techniques of viewing it, techniques which should be equivalent to some new/different techniques of reading conventional literary texts (including theatrical ones). However, such an outlook to theatre (perhaps we should call it a deconstructing outlook) could become relevant only if it...
was prepared/qualified to view the entirety of a theatrical presence, i.e. if it permanently considered its stunning diversity/difference. Had he had the opportunity to deal more with the art of theatre, I am sure that even Derrida himself would inevitably have called its stunning diversity/difference with his famous term différance.

Theatrical presence, as we know, is a synaesthetic phenomenon, an act overloaded (“burdened”) with a multitude of different codes, a highly contingent act. Theatrical presence is “comprised”/“aligned” exceptionally numerous different semiotic systems: linguistic, phonetic, paralinguistic, kinetic, prosemic, spatial, chronological…. We should be thankful to the diligent theatrical semioticians, who during the seventies of the twentieth century were actively studying all these systems, putting great efforts into decoding/defining the true functions of their constituent elements (Ann Ubersfeld, Patrice Pavis…), for establishing the theoretical notion which accordingly determines as well as efficiently puts to work the very synaesthetic nature of theatrical presence.

Not only did these efficient operatives bring it into use, but they also definitely promoted (advancing it into a serious theoretical category) the exceptionally important expression “the text of the play” (or the play as a text), explaining that not only does it imply, but it also literally describes the synaesthetic nature (“the entirety”) of the
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complicated presence of a theatrical act. We are talking about a synaesthetcity simultaneously “composed”/constructed equally by the text and its voice, all that we understand as acting, as well as kinetics/proxemcs of the actors, both the way the director moderates the whole process of theatricalization, and the system of all spatial-audio-light signs which accordingly support that theatricalization, as well as the system of reception of the play itself “as such”....

That the expression text of the stage show has been shown and proven as appropriate, functional and particularly productive theoretical category, is confirmed by its later modifications. In one of his not particularly numerous texts on theatre issues, Roland Barthes was the first to use the exceptionally functional term, undoubtently derived from the initial semiotic category the text of the stage show, however indisputably simplified/adapted for “everyday use”. Soon after, this term – and we are talking about the term weaving! – would become quite popular (for instance, in the theatre studies texts of Eugenio Barba, in the theoretical system of Michel Foucault...), and eventually even Derrida himself promoted it into one of the important concepts in his strategy of deconstruction (Derrida, 1976).

What does Derrida Have in Mind When He Talks About the Stratagem Formulated as “Weaving of Deconstruction”?
in reading, above all! – which keeps “multiplying”/disseminating through cognition/reading of new (and newer and newer) experiences, above all reading experiences! Continuing to think in the context of the net, this “experienced” reading should function as a figurative tying of new (and newer and newer) knots. Every reading (not only that which we already have “gone through”, but the one that we are yet to read as well) is automatically “tied” and becomes part of the network as a new/additional knot “in the multilingual – philosophical, literary, political, ideological, ethical – weaving of deconstruction” (Biti, 2000:61).

Derrida, obviously, pleads for a specific, exceptionally active and productive (deconstructive) reading. The experience of such a deconstructive reading has been proven as particularly unique. It is aimed – always and along with – not only at a single text that is being read at a particular moment (a knot that is being tied), but at the text (the weaving) as well in which it is automatically “networked”, establishing with it as well as through it intensive intertextual relations. The context thus understood is named by Derrida as **framing**, while the meaning of this term, again, remains fairly complex.

The framing “covers” the author’s existing interest in the so-called marginal:border zones of the text (interest in titles, genre stipulations, signatures, notes, margins...), that is, his interest in relations (correlational doublets and binary oppositions) which Derrida obsessively deconstructs. We are questioning precisely those doublets or binary oppositions that western thought traditionally calls upon: internal/external, centre/margin, soul/body, verbatim/paraphrased, speech/writing, object/sign....
Nevertheless, the framing also refers to the paradox of one’s own functioning. Namely, insisting on clarifying why the meaning of a given text (the meaning, can never be determined at all only through “neutral” (“aseptic”, isolated) reading of that same text, Derrida explicitly refers exactly to its inevitable framing in other texts, in other types/kinds of texts, in all the texts in the world, and finally – in the culture understood as a text! Namely, he has an uncompromising opinion that such an “endless” framing is necessary for every text because it is this kind of framing of texts (of any given text, and therefore of all the texts in the world!) that helps them create meanings as well as secure their own “multi-significance”, which is a result of exactly this kind of endless “play of differences”. We could grasp the meaning of a text – of a performance read and understood as a text! – only through the different meanings of the texts framing it. The difference (not the “sameness”) is the key that breaks the code of meaning, which is - always! - the result of infinite framing, but framing that is never enclosed within a frame (Derrida, 1988).

The circulating witticism - “framing exists, but there is no frame” – represents yet another of the intriguing Derridian paradoxes. However, this is not a mere witticism, quite the contrary.

We will attempt to deconstruct not only its wittiness, but its unquestionable redundancy while relying precisely on the theory and practice of theatre.
How is the Theatrical Text Framed and Into What?

To answer this seemingly simple question we need to specify the meaning of the term *text* as it is understood by contemporary theatre studies.

When contemplating and speaking about *the text*, theatre studies thinks of and speaks about something much more complicated than what is suggested in the laconic expression *theatre writing*, which usually does not even imply anything more ambitious than the famous “content fixated on paper”. Of course, not even this “content” is simple enough for reading through, especially if we are talking about a reading intended to dramatize it (Derrida would say *presence*). The *text play writing* is a very specific kind of literary writing. Written on at least two levels, that is to say, followed along and supported by at least two types of writing, which otherwise are generally differentiated through standard binary opposition dialogue/stage direction – “at first glance” the dramatic text already suggests its demanding status. Doubtless, this involves a *hybrid text*, that is, a *hybrid literary genre* which comes into being specifically through a permanent combination of many types/kinds of discourse.

Even at the moment when it is (already) lucidly “combined” and completely “written on paper”, however, the *dramatic text* is not yet complete. It lacks one very important “addition”. Derrida calls this “addition” *supplement*! (Derrida, 1976:188-213), clarifying that it is a term that marks precisely that paradoxical movement which de-centres every signification. The paradox is inherent in this term because it simultaneously means both supplementing something incomplete as well as making up...
That which we have become used to calling a dramatic text (“drama as writing”), is undoubtedly a type of literary (as well as theatrical!) text that is deeply aware of its own “incompleteness”, but at the same time certain that its supreme power is condensed precisely in this “incompleteness”. The “incompleteness” and/or “shortage” that are inherent for the dramatic text (they are something like a manufacturing flaw) not only was detected, but it was also defined in a superior fashion by good old Aristotle, who simply called the phenomenon opsis.

The term opsis is usually translated as “stage apparatus” or “staging”. In the Macedonian translation of the Poetics, Mihail D. Petruševski has decided to do an indirect translation in defining opsis by getting help from the expression “stage presentation”. Here is this important place, which is firmly rooted in the sixth chapter of the Poetics:

“...[S]tage presentation of truth is what captivates the soul the most, but it is barely related to art and is least characteristic of poetics, because the effect of tragedy should be achieved both without a presentation and artists. Furthermore, in the stage design process the skill of the scenographer is more important than the art of poetics” (Aristotle, 1990:46).

What we usually refer to as staging, or according to Petruševski “stage presentation” (we have seen that Derrida himself is using the term presence!), in theatre practice has been materialized and has always materialized as a collective name for a whole set of “incompletes” / “insufficiencies” (supplements), which are inherent for

и тој едновремено значи и дополнување на нешто непотполно, но и надоместување/замена на нешто потполно и целосно“ (Biti, 2000:92).

Она што сме свикнале да го именуваме како драмски јгекси („драма како писмо“), неосмнено е тип на книжевен (но и театарски!) текст кој е длабоко свечен за сопствената „непотполност“, ама и сигурен дека токму во таа „непотполност“ е кондензирана неговата најсилна моќ. „Непотполноста“ и/или „недостигот“, кои му се инхеретни на драмскиот јгекси (тие се нешто како негова фабричка гречка!) не само што го детектирал, туку и супериорно го дефинирал уште добриот стар Аристотел, наредувајќи го просто ойис.

Поимот ойис обично се преведува како „сценска апаратура“ или „инсценација“. Во македонскиот превод на „Поетиката“, Михаил Д. Петрушевски решил да преведува индиректно, детерминирајќи го фамозниот ойис со помош на синтагмата „сценско прикажување“. Еве го тоа важно место, цврсто позиционирано во шестата глава од „Поетиката“:

„...[C]ценското прикажување вистина најмногу ја плени душата, но е во најслаба врска со уметноста и најмалку својствено на поетиката; зашто ефектот на трагедијата треба да се добие и без претстава и без артисти, а освен тоа во уредувањето на сцената поважна е вештината на сценографот одшто поетската уметност“ (Аристотел, 1990:46).

Она што вообичаено го именуваме како инсценација или, според Петрушевски, „сценско прикажување“ (самиот Дерида, како што видовме, го користи терминот презенција!), во театарската практика отсекогаш се постварвало и се постварува како збирно име за цела редица „непотполности“/„недостатоци“ for/replacing something complete and finished (Biti, 2000:92).
the dramatic text, that is, for the drama as a unique kind of writing. Overall, it seems as though the dramatic text is faithfully marked first with its many “incompletes”, and only then with certain arche-traces (as Derrida used to call them), which - fortunately! - keep a few memories of them. Such memories, you would agree, have been preserved on paper, prior to which they have been fixated on it by means of writing.

For a long time, almost until the appearance of Derrida, western thought had treated writing as a banal “technical device for capturing speech” (Culler, 1991: 86). Hence the reason writing is approached cautiously, with a clear understanding of its mediating role, which can even endanger the authenticity of the speech itself, bringing into question (endangering!) the functionality of communication. Such a serious precaution towards writing has seriously complicated its capability of transmitting real meanings, as if only living speech, and not dead paper, can “capture” the authenticity of meaning.

Like all technical devices, writing as well was considered completely stereotypical, unstable and prone to “bending”. On the other hand, for a long time (until the era of Saussurean structuralism!) speech had been considered an authentic, natural, and unquestionably functional medium, which besides establishing direct communication - at the same time means (carries meaning) – but it also proves the presence! In contrast to speech, which has always stood in direct correlation with meaning itself, writing was considered distanced, absent and ambiguous.
For a long time, almost until Derrida emerged, western philosophical and cultural tradition had taken pride in its logocentrism. Maintaining in good faith the traditional view of speech, sound and living word as being naturally superior to text, letter, and “dead” writing respectively, western tradition had been systematically nurturing the stereotype of the *metaphysics of presence*, which, as Derrida said, was one of its biggest and most dangerous illusions.

However, *Derridian deconstruction* is a *strategy* that is aimed at the “heart” of this big and dangerous illusion defined as a metaphysical “darkness”. Subversive and determined, this *strategy* challenges the tradition of illusionist logocentrism (of the spoken, of speech) with pragmatic graphocentrism (of the written, of writing, of text). It has been a few decades now (since the end of the sixties of the previous century!) since this challenge proved quite fresh as well as fairly productive!

Let us go back, however, to the dramatic text and to its specific nature, which we have already defined as *hybrid*, but also as *playful*. Coming back to it, we will not forget its important “incompletes” (supplements), whose indisputable *traces* recorded and stored in its complex texture (written as “contents on paper”) not only provoke, but also enable theatricalization (Derrida would say *presence*). It is exactly through this unavoidable process of theatricalization that the dramatic text is necessarily transited into action (imitating all kinds of actions, among others the action that we refer to as *spoken*). There is no doubt that the transition of the *text* (dramatic writing) into different types/kinds of actions (among
That such theatricalization has been written “in advance” into the dramatic text itself – that, in other words, the written/the textual is inadvertently a prerequisite for the imitation (theatricalization) that will follow – is attested by Aristotle’s view: yes, the effect on tragedy could be achieved even through a “sheer reading”, which means, “without the stage show, and without artists” (Aristotle, ibid.), but that could happen only because of the fact that such an effect is inherent for its nature. The aforementioned diligent semiotic operatives (Ubersfeld, Pavis) have successfully turned this famous conclusion into a definition. Namely, they say that every text written in the hybrid dramatic form is but a description of its innate theatrical performance (Ibersfeld, 1982).

This definition seems to sit well with Derrida. It entirely supports not only the graphocentric concept of the world (concept of the “prevalence” of writing over speech and of text over its presence), but the crucial view of the text as “a network of differences, weaving of traces which infinitely point to something else/other than themselves, to other traces which again point to differences” (Biti, 2000: 62). Namely, every staging of a dramatic text, every transposition/transition of it into that which we call absolute text or text of the stage show, becomes possible and creative only because of the fact that it is inevitably operationalized as a specific kind of

говорно). Неспорно е дека транзитирањето на шекспиринот (драмското писмо) во различни типови/видови дејства (меѓу другите и во говорното дејствие) треба да се сместа за смисла на неговото постојање. Драмскиот текст му е наменет на активниот учесник во неговата театрализација и на нејзиниот подеднакво активен гледач, а не на пасивниот читаш.

Дека таквата театрализација е „однаеден“ вписана во самиот драмски текст – дека, со други зборови, пишаното/текстуалното несомнено е услов за подоцнежното поддржавање (театрализација) – докажува и цитираниот став на Аристотел: да, ефектот на трагедијата може да се добие и со „голо читање“, што ќе рече „без претставата, и без артисти“ (Аристотел, ibid.), ана тоа може да се случи само поради фактот што тој ефект ќе е иманентен на нејзината природа. Спомнувањата агилни семиотичари-оперативци (Иберсфелд, Пavis) оваа ноторна констатација успешно ја претвори во дефиниција: имено, тие веле дека секој текст што е напишан во хибридината драмска форма и не е друго освен опис на шеширарската йреисиава којашто му е иманентна (Ibersfeld, 1982).

Дефиницијата како да му е по мерка на Дерида. Таа целосно го поддржува не само неговиот графоцентричен концепт на светот (концепт на „приматот“ на писмото пред говорот и на текстот пред неговата јрезенација), туку го поддржува и круцијалниот став за текстот како „мержа на разлики, ткаење на тргани коишто бесконечно упатуваат на нешто друго/поинакво од себе, на другите тригани што одново упатуваат на разлики“ (Biti, 2000:62). Имено, секоја инсценација на драмскиот текст, секоја негово трансформирање/транзитирање во она што го именуваме како шошален тексист или тексист на йреисиавација, others the spoken action) should be considered as the meaning of its existence. In its theatricalization the dramatic text is intended for the active participant and for its equally active viewer, not for the passive reader.
According to Derrida, every concept contains in itself traces of some other concept. We could even say that every concept is contaminated by the otherness of the previous one (or the next one, all the same), and such contamination is referred to as a *trace*. On the other hand, the contents of a given concept are not limited to that concept only, but it expands, “it spills out of itself”, and by doing so it contaminates the other concepts, leaving its *trace* on them. Through this complex way, the process of writing becomes a process of “infinite weaving of *traces*”, of causing *differences*, and of infinite *networking*.

Doubtless, this is a kind of infernal contrivance: a process of permanent *play*, unceasing, and boundless *play*. *Play* as an aim in itself.

*Playing* is not only one of the key concepts in Derrida’s philosophical system, but also one of the dominant stratagems which develop this system keeping it in good shape. Some experts even argue that it could be concluded that “his plays with the philosophical text itself, eventually ‘result in a philosophical style which is far more reminiscent of game playing or creative writing than of a traditional philosophical discourse’” (Dzeparoski, 2004:32).

*Unfortunately, the fact that Derridian deconstructivist *play* has (for the time being?) lived to see an outstanding*
игра доживеала (сега-засега?) некоја помаркантна или посрдечна рецепција. Ниту, пак, предизвикувачкиот deridaовски модел во рецентната театарска практика дочекал (сега-засега?) некоја посериозна апликација, било на ниво на инсценација (пренезенција), било на ниво на теорија и критика. Со други зборови, театарот – барем засега! – не умеел да профитира (кој-знае-колку) од интригантното deridaовско наследство. Како сè уште да не знае што би можел да почине со него.

Самиот Дерида, испишувашки ги сопствените театарски „мargиналии“ (заради кои и започнаа да го пишувам овој текст), одбиаа (во нив) да се занимава само со една театарска поетика, онаа на Антонин Артауд (Antonin Artaud).

Изборот воопшто не е случаен, напротив!

Очекувано, Дерида, имено, кон Артауд ја има насочено пардоксалноста на езотеричниот театарски концепт. Анализирајки го тој концепт (за театарот и за неговиот двојник), Дерида точно препознал дека театарот на суровоста, за каков што пледира Артауд, претставува луциден, но и сосема уторписки обид да се театрализира/препензира „чистото присуство, (...) единството пред раздвојувањето, сосема ослободено од внатрешните разлика што секогаш ги обележува пишувањето“ (Derrida, 1978:174).

Театарот на Артауд никогаш не се постварил како „вистински“ и „практичен“, ниту пак можел („како таков“) да се поствари. Магичната убавина на тој театр несомнено е содржана токму во неговата „непраксност“ – тој постои само како запис/писмо („содржина на хартија“) и функционира исключително како сугестивна визија (за идеалното), како or more cordial welcome is hardly noticeable in modern theatrical science, nor has the challenging Derridian model seen in the recent theatrical practice (for the time being?) had a more serious application, whether at the level of staging (presence), or at the level of theory and criticism. In other words, the theatre – at least for now! – has not been (all that much) successful in profiting on the Derridian legacy. It seems that it still does not know what it could spark with it.

Writing his own theatrical “marginalia” (because of which I started writing this text), Derrida himself chose (in them) to deal with only one theatrical poetics, that of Antonin Artaud.

The choice is hardly coincidental! Quite the contrary!

As might have been expected, Derrida directed the paradox of the esoteric theatrical concept towards Artaud. Analysing that concept (for the theatre and its double), Derrida recognized that the theatre of brutality, which Artaud advocates, represents a lucid as well as an entirely utopian attempt to dramatize/present the “pure presence, (...) the unity before separation, an attempt completely freed from the inherent differences that the writing always marks” (Derrida, 1978:174).
The paradox of that quest, a paradox understood even by Artaud himself, is contained in the precise feeling of its creator: “such an authentic presence has to exist beyond both time and consciousness” (Carlson, 1993:428). Once achieved, it would immediately face the banality of repetition, and it would immediately take its disastrous “double” on its back.

Unfortunately, “practical theatre”—that prosaic/pragmatic theatre with which theatre studies deal on a daily basis—is simply destined to function in this way: repeating its presence (until the point of exhaustion), quite unaware that ever since its inception it has been doing nothing (else) but constantly repeating the unrepeatable.

Translated from Macedonian by Goran Stoev

Notes:

1. Formally/statistically the study of theatre is explicitly thematized only in a few of Derrida’s texts: in the fourth chapter of the second volume of his landmark book On Grammatology (see Theorem and Theatre) and in two essays dedicated to Antonin Artaud, published in the book L’écriture et la différence (1967). There is an impression that Derrida had directly/explicitly thematized the study of theatre in the ’60s.
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