

1963, 1964); it looks for the contradictions in the action and the ideologems involved (PAVIS 1983b), for the relationship between ideology and the literary text, the individual and social aspects of the characters, and how the performance can be fragmented into a series of social *gestus**.

3. Between Semiology and Sociology

Dramaturgical analysis goes beyond a semiological description of stage systems. It asks, pragmatically, what the spectator will get out of the performance, how theatre relates to the audience's ideological and aesthetic frame of reference. It integrates and reconciles a semiological (aesthetic) perspective on the performance signs with a sociological examination of the production and reception of these same signs (*sociocriticism**).

4. The Need for Reflection

A *mise-en-scène* necessarily involves dramaturgical work, even (and especially) if this is denied by the director in the name of "loyalty" to tradition or a desire to be faithful to the text "to the letter." Any *reading** and, even more so, any performance of a text presupposes a knowledge of the conditions of *enunciation**, of the situation and the acting, etc. This conception, even when it is embryonic or unimaginative, is in effect a dramaturgical analysis that involves a reading of the text.

5. The Decline of Dramaturgical Analysis

During the 1950s and 1960s, text analysis was widely political and critical, under the influence of Brechtian dramaturgy. The "crisis" of the 1970s and 1980s, however, has seen analysis stripped of its political dimension to some extent, and a refusal to reduce the play to its socioeconomic substratum by stressing its specific form and the *signifying practices** that may be applied to it. Directors such as VITEZ therefore forgo preliminary work on a text and endeavor to experiment as soon as possible with actors on the stage, not knowing what discourse will eventually emerge from the *mise-en-scène*. The same ideological "disengagement" can be felt in former Brecht-

tians such as B. BESSON, B. SOBEL, J. JOURDHEUIL, R. PLANCHON, J.-F. PEYRET, M. MARÉCHAL, and in the new generation of the 1990s who have no ties to Brecht or a sociocritical reading of the classics.

Further reading: Brecht 1967, vol. 17; Girault 1973; Jourdheuil 1976; Klotz 1976; Pavis 1983a; Bataillon 1972.

DRAMATURGY

(From the Greek *dramaturgia*, to compose a drama.)

Fr.: *dramaturgie*; Ger.: *Dramaturgie*; Sp.: *dramaturgia*.

1. Evolution of the Concept

A. ORIGINAL AND CLASSICAL SENSE OF THE TERM

Dramaturgy is usually defined as "the art of composition of plays."

1. In its broadest sense, dramaturgy is the technique (or poetics) of dramatic art which seeks to establish the principles of play construction, either inductively on the basis of actual examples or deductively on the basis of a system of abstract principles. This notion presupposes a set of specifically theatrical rules that must be known in order to write a play and analyze it properly.

Until the classical period, dramaturgy, often developed by playwrights themselves (cf. CORNEILLE'S *Discours* and LESSING'S *Dramaturgy of Hamburg*), was intended to discover rules, or even recipes for composing a play and dictating rules of composition for other playwrights (for example, ARISTOTLE'S *Poetics*, D'AUBIGNAC'S *Pratique du théâtre*).

2. J. SCHERER, author of *Dramaturgie classique en France* (1950), distinguishes between the internal structure of the play (or dramaturgy in the strict sense) and the external (performance-related) structure: "The internal structure [...] is the set of elements which [...] constitute the basis of the play; it is what the play is about from the playwright's point of view, before staging

considerations come into it. In opposition to this internal structure we have the external structure: it is always a structure, but consists mainly of forms, and forms which put into play the modalities of writing and performance of the play" (SCHERER 1961).

*Classical dramaturgy** seeks to identify the constitutive elements of dramatic construction for any classical text – *exposition**, *knot**, *complication**, *conflict**, resolution, *epilogue**, etc.

Classical dramaturgy examines the playwright's work and the narrative structure of the play (text and performance) exclusively. It does not concern itself directly with the realization of the performance on stage, which explains a certain disaffection among critics today with this discipline, at least in its traditional sense.

B. BRECHTIAN AND POST-BRECHTIAN DRAMATURGY

Since BRECHT and his theorizing on dramatic and epic theatre, the notion of dramaturgy seems to have been expanded to become:

1. Simultaneously, the ideological and formal structure of the play.
2. The specific link between form and content in the sense of ROUSSET, who defines art as the "solidarity between a mental world and a tangible construction, a vision and a form." (1962, 1).
3. The all-encompassing work that produces the text staged, and is intended to produce a particular effect on the spectator. Thus, BRECHT considers "epic dramaturgy" to be a form of theatre that uses the devices of commentary and alienation-effects to better describe social reality and contribute to changing it.

In this sense, dramaturgy has to do with both the original text and the resources used to stage it. To analyze the dramaturgy of a performance, then, is to describe its *fabula* in three-dimensional reality, i.e. in its concrete performance, to specify the way in which an event is shown and narrated in theatre (cf. *questionnaire**, no. 9).

C. USE OF THE TERM "DRAMATURGY" TO MEAN THE WORK OF A "DRAMATURG"
Dramaturgy as the work done by a *dramaturg** consists of assembling textual and stage materials, bringing out complex meanings of the text by choosing a particular interpretation, and orienting the performance in the desired direction.

In this case, dramaturgy refers to the set of aesthetic and ideological choices made by the directing team, from director to actor. This work includes the development and *performance** of the *fabula**, the choice of stage location, the *montage**, acting, illusionist or distanced performance. Briefly, dramaturgy asks itself how, and according to what time sequence, the story materials are arranged in the text and on stage. In its most recent meaning, then, dramaturgy tends to go beyond the confines of a study of the dramatic text to include both text and performance.

2. Problems of Dramaturgy

A. LINKING AESTHETICS AND IDEOLOGY

To examine the links between world and stage, i.e. ideology and aesthetics, is the main task of dramaturgy. It tries to understand how ideas about human beings and the world are rendered in a form, i.e. in a text and on stage. This requires us to follow the process of modelling (abstraction, stylization and codification) of human reality that leads to a specific use of the theatre apparatus. Meaning in theatre is always a technical issue that has to do with materials, forms and structures.

Dramaturgy is based on an analysis of actions and their *actants** (the characters). This obliges us to determine the directional forces of the dramatic universe, the values of the actants and the sense (direction) of the *fabula*. By choosing to read and show the text according to one or several consistent points of view, the playwright clarifies the text's historicity, its roots in or detachment from the history of humankind, and any discrepancies between the dramatic situation and our frame of reference. When a play is interpreted according to various literary genres, very different *fabulae* and

characters are created, so that the choice of a specific genre gives the text a particular configuration each time. All these choices enable us to identify, if not explain, structural and historical ambiguities, what is left unsaid (whether or not it is sayable), and blank spots (problems in reading that defy all hypotheses).

B. EVOLUTION OF DRAMATURGIES

The historical evolution of ideological content and formal research explain any discrepancies between form and content that may question their dialectical unity. SZONDI, for instance, speaks of the contradiction in European theatre at the end of the nineteenth century as it uses the outdated form of the dialogue for an exchange between human beings to speak of a world in which such exchange is no longer possible (SZONDI 1956, 76; Eng. 1987, 45). It is because mankind today has a scientific knowledge of social reality that BRECHT condemns the apparently illusionary and immutable dramatic form.

C. DRAMATURGY AS A THEORY OF REPRESENTABILITY OF THE WORLD

The ultimate goal of dramaturgy is to represent the world, whether it aims at mimetic realism or rejects mimesis to represent an autonomous world. In each case, it establishes the fictional status and level of reality of characters and actions; it represents the dramatic universe using audiovisual means and decides what will *seem real* to the audience (*verisimilitude**). As in music, it chooses a key to illusion/disillusion and maintains it throughout the stage fiction. One of the main options of this representation is to show actions and their protagonists as specific cases or as typical examples. Finally, the ultimate and major task will be to effect the adjustment between text and stage, to decide how the text should be *played*, how to give it a force on stage that will make it clear for a given time and a given audience.

The stage-audience relationship determines and specifies all others: deciding whether theatre should entertain or

instruct, comfort or disturb, reproduce or denounce; such are the questions raised by dramaturgical analysis.

D. EXPLOSION AND PROLIFERATION OF DRAMATURGIES

For one who lacks an overall, unified image of the world, reproduction of reality in theatre must necessarily be fragmentary. The question is no longer one of developing a dramaturgy by artificially correlating a coherent ideology with an appropriate form, and a single performance often draws on several types of dramaturgical analysis. The performance is no longer based solely on identification or alienation effects; some productions may even try to divide up the dramaturgy by letting the actors organize their narratives according to their own world views. The notion of *dramaturgical choices* gives a better account of current trends than *dramaturgy* seen as a global and structured set of homogeneous aesthetic and ideological principles.

Further reading: Gouhier 1958; Dort 1960; Klotz 1969, 1976; Rousset 1962; Styan 1963; Calderwood 1968; Larthomas 1972; Jaffré 1974; Keller 1976; Monod 1977a; Moindrot 1993.

DRAWING-ROOM PLAY

Fr.: *comédie de salon*; Ger.: *Salonstück*, *Konversationsstück*; Sp.: *comedia de salón*.

The drawing-room play shows characters talking, often in a middle-class living room. Its comedy is verbal, subtle and witty, with *authorial interventions**. The action is confined to an exchange of agreeably formulated ideas, arguments or nasty remarks (for example, WILDE, MAUGHAM, SCHNITZLER).

DUPLICATION

Fr.: *dédoublement*; Ger.: *Verdoppelung*; Sp.: *desdoblamiento*.

See DOUBLE