



Research Article

Copyright © All rights are reserved by Dr. MUDr. Tomáš Hájek

On Defining Typology of the Relationships between Philosophy and Theatre

Dr. Mgr. MUDr. Tomáš Hájek*

Sexological Society of J.E.P. Czech Medical Society.

*Corresponding author: Dr. Mgr. MUDr. Tomáš Hájek: member of the Sexological Society of J.E.P. Czech Medical Society.

Received Date: June 17, 2023

Published Date: July 16, 2024

Introduction

The author has been studying the topic of typology of the relationships between philosophy and theatre on a long-term basis. Two outcomes can be mentioned in this context:

- Hájek T., *K topografii vztahu filosofie a divadla [On topography of the relationship between philosophy and theatre]*, Inštorisová D. a kol., *Vzdělávání divadlom*. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, Filozofická fakulta, Ústav literárnej a umeleckej komunikácie, 2013, p. 179-197, ISBN 978-80-558-0499-6, EAN 9788055804996
- Hájek T., lecture *K topografii vztahu filosofie a divadla (jako cesta k vymezení škály divadelnosti a za hranice divadelnosti vůbec) [On topography of the relationship between philosophy and theatre (as a journey towards definition of a variety of theatricalities and beyond the boundaries of theatricality as such)]*. Poznaň: Zakład Komparastyki Literackiej i Kulturowej w Instytucie Filologii Polskiej, Zakład Bohemistyki w Instytucie Filologii Słowiańskiej UAM, prof.dr.hab. Bogusław Bakula, prof. dr.hab.Mieczysław Balowski, the lecture was presented on 1st June 2015

On Topicality of the Theme and on Proposition of Typology

Psychology, clinical psychology, psychiatry, as well as neurosciences have produced scientific findings suggesting that theatricality is an essential parameter of the social reality and a person's navigation in this space. To quote the words of a specialist in dramatherapy, "Our role system is fully transferable, and we can

step into it at any given moment." In addition, the current psychology, clinical psychology and psychiatry introduces the term spontaneity in an attempt to address the issue of the widening gap between the "necessity to play a social role" and the "necessity to be oneself" in the process of individualisation and maturing.

Why focus on typology of the relationships between philosophy and theatre at all?

Private information means information, which is not stored or copied without the knowledge of an individual. Digitalisation of all aspects of life rapidly deepening since the beginning of the 21st century threatens the loss of control over private information. Digitalisation of social life involves external monitoring and control, for example with camera systems, which expand the controlled public space to the detriment of the private space. Digital transformation of the society as a wider phenomenon is intertwined with digitalisation of social life. In the case of digital transformation of the society, private space disappears from the inside of the world as a whole, while in the case of digitalisation of social life, private space is usurped from the outside and more selectively.

Digital transformation of the society including digitalisation of social life unavoidably strengthens the self-control of those who actively engage in public space. Optimisation of self-perception for the outside world will strengthen the awareness of the human existence as a role in the theatre of the world. Increasingly absent securities of entitlement to untouchable privacy may result in increasing theatricality of the human existence and this may

destabilise the human existence as such, including sexuality. Naturally, this can only be stated at the theoretical level, as there is no empiric data as yet. These issues should therefore be subject to scientific study.

The objective of this paper is to define the relationships between philosophy and theatre or drama in terms of typology. Rather than provide a static description, the aim is to capture the dynamics of the relationships, as philosophy and theatre enrich each other, or more precisely, as philosophy is significantly enriched by theatre and theatre helps philosophy enter spaces that would otherwise remain untouched. This paper does not aim to map systematically how philosophical categories, opinions and ways of thinking are used in works of specialised theatre theorists, despite the application of philosophy in this context being exceptionally extensive, knowledgeable and creative. This is an attempt to map a terrain characterised by various degrees and shades of mutual dynamic interactions and the text aims at an objective that cannot be attained without a degree of simplification. The paper aims to present model typology, rather than exhaustive typology in terms of types, as well as philosophers within these types. The text draws inspiration from respected theatre personalities, yet at the same time paves its own way. The typology is expressed in the definition of the following subchapters. The conclusion is dedicated to a separate discussion of issues that cannot be unambiguously classified in the system, at least within this paper.

- a) Philosophy and theatre in close “genetic” interconnection in the interpretation of essential questions of the world
- b) Systematic philosophy of theatre as a separate and unique philosophical system
- c) Systematic philosophy of dramatic arts and theatre within a philosophical system seeking universal interpretation of the world
- d) Drama and theatre serving as a “momentum” in the philosophy’s endeavour to interpret the world
- e) Philosophers applying their philosophical interpretation of the world to certain specialised issues of dramatic arts and theatre
- f) Theatre character as demonstration of philosophical ideas and philosophy taking over a theatre play as a whole

Philosophy and Theatre in Close “Genetic” Interconnection in the Interpretation of Essential Questions of the World

The permanent cooperation between philosophy and dramatic arts can be clearly demonstrated on examples. However, periods when this interconnection was historically unique can be clearly identified. These were eras when the option of *mutual substitution and permeation* of both disciplines was evident in essential answers to essential questions as part of primordial exploration of the world. It should be pointed out that myth is probably the axis allowing for permeation, substitution and mutual strengthening of philosophy and theatre. As we associate myth with mythopoetic

thinking, it is a symbolic representation with an expressive function and is able to gain insight into and describe the contradictions in the arrangement of the world.

Although this option of substitution and permeation applies permanently, it was historically manifested during the unique era of gradual establishment of philosophy as a specialised discipline, i.e. in the fifth and fourth century BCE. Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides wrote their tragedies during these centuries. The ancient Greek thinking typically saw poetry including tragic poetry and comedy as being close to philosophy, yet this was not the case with historiography. The situation began to change in the fourth century BCE, partially also under the influence of Aristophanes’ drama and the occurrence of the ancient Greek comedy. The emerging notion was that a new basis needed to be found for resolving major topics and mainly philosophy was meant to be the new basis to be relied on. Tragic poetry as a method of exploration was to be replaced with theoretical study, and Plato counterposed poetry and philosophy against each other rather strongly. While the paths of philosophy and theatre parted, at least their genetic interconnection remained and could be demonstrated in open interconnection and cooperation at any time under suitable conditions.

Systematic Philosophy of Theatre as a Separate and Unique Philosophical System

The aim of this subchapter is to demonstrate that philosophy of theatre, i.e. a separate philosophical system stemming from the reality of theatre, is irreplaceable in its uniqueness also in pure philosophy and that theatre discovers depths in philosophy that would otherwise remain hidden to philosophy alone.

The French thinker Henri Gouhier should be mentioned in this context. Irena Sławińska holds his work in high esteem:

“... he embarked on the most ambitious attempt to date and the only attempt to describe the truly philosophical issues of theatre. He asks questions concerning the essence and existence of theatre, ontological status of a character, drama types and the substance of tragedy and drama.”

Gouhier, who was strongly influenced by existentialism, specifically by Gabriel Marcel, opposed the conception of Aristoteles’ Poetics, which stresses out mimesis, i.e. mimicking with the requirement for theatre characters being as authentic as possible, as the main artistic method. According to Gouhier, observation of life is merely a starting point, but creation of a new world must be the final objective. Instead of illusive imitation of the reality and deceiving the audience, the intention of theatre is “surpassed Aristoteles”.

Similarly to Gouhier, von Balthasar also saw theatre and drama as an application space for using philosophical categories and procedures, and theatricality as the most accurate mode of portraying the world. While Gouhier stays within the boundaries of theatre in his thinking, bringing philosophy into theatre, von Balthasar writes from the sphere of theology and philosophy, saturating it with theatre. Therefore, the vectors in which theatre

is applied differ. Saturation of theology with theatre introduces a term crucial for this study – *Topos Weltheater*, meaning *topos* of the world as a theatre, where von Balthasar seeks the conditions for fulfilment and salvation of the human existence, while continuously observing theatricality of the world as a whole.

Von Balthasar's work is an extensive synthesis of theology, philosophy and theatre studies. It is a broad compendium of the history of thinking as regards its relation to dramatic arts and theatre. Historical events, such as the Trojan War, are mere play before the God's eyes; they are conceived and staged events and therefore dramatic events from the very beginning. The consequence for the human being is obvious; people can only act out their roles assigned by the God. This approach is applied in stoic philosophy, specifically by Epictetus and his role reductionism: people need to be perceived exclusively as actors in a drama. The role played by an individual is not important, the way the individual plays their role is what matters.

Epictetus' ideas give rise to interesting ambiguousness in relation to theatricality as such and to theatres as institutions. He claims that an individual is an actor in a drama determined by the poet. It is up to the man to play the assigned role well, but the choice of the role is in someone else's hands. On the other hand, it is not necessary to visit theatre often.

However, role reductionism gives rise to a moral dilemma: the God is clearly serious about controlling the world, yet the drama people are forced to act out is playful. Plato addresses this discrepancy with a compromise. According to his notion, a soul entering the world selects its *daimon*, not vice versa. The soul is then bound to its *daimon* by Necessity. The character of a soul is determined by the life the soul chooses. The choice of a life is a crucial moment, as the decision between good and evil is made at this point.

Stepping back to essential theatricality of the world is another option, which is applied for example in Christianity. Christianity also underwent certain development on its way to this notion. The role motif was gradually internalised, until it became intimate. However, when theatre was transformed into circus in late antiquity, the seriousness of theatre was replaced with the principle of mere entertainment for the audience and theatre degenerates. Pogroms in Alexandria shook up the principle of pleasure, which is typical for theatre as entertainment, and it was gradually replaced with the principle of martyrdom. Finally, the Christian philosopher Augustin went as far as radically rejecting the notion of the world as a theatre.

The Greek notion of similarity between the world and theatre is only revived in humanism. Calderón was the first author to give the world as a theatre its theological dimension. The God's free will decides what an individual will play, and each individual decides how they will play their role. The general concept of the role motif changes; the concept of a role as a certain "dress" common in antiquity is transformed into perception of a role as an eschatological entitlement; the role motif changes into a calling. Calderón's perception opens the world as a theatre to the baroque

worldview. Theatre is perceived as the life itself, a connection between Self and a role becomes deeply entrenched.

To conclude the section dedicated to von Balthasar and his concept, it can be stated that von Balthasar still captured the deep source giving rise to highly upsetting content as regards possibility or impossibility of transitioning from a role, in which we play someone else, to the formation of our own personality, the *Persona*. He finds solution to some extent in perceiving the entire human existence as a dramatic structure.

However, this chapter includes even a thinker, who only studied theatre marginally – the psychiatrist and philosopher Sigmund Freud. However, this does not mean that Freud's contribution would not be essential and that it would fail to bring light into the philosophical depths of theatre and dramatic arts. It should be mentioned that the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur stated the following about Freud in connection with interpretation of artwork: "*However, Freud embarks on a very deep analysis in this narrowly defined framework.*"

Firstly, attention will be paid to the interesting study entitled "*Psychopathic Characters on the Stage*". Sigmund Freud wrote his text in German under the title "*Psychopathische Personen auf der Bühne*", probably in 1905 or 1906. Freud never published this text. It was only published in 1942. Drama focuses on a conflict involving, among others, the conflict between conscious and unconscious impulse in the psychoanalytical sense – a psychopathological drama is thus created. The conflict in drama brings a strong negative emotion – dread, which is transformed back by a masochistic character into pleasure.

In the case of psychopathological drama, dramatic conflict only brings pleasure to neurotic individuals, as they are the only ones capable of perceiving the revelation of the effect of suppressed impulse as pleasure. Freud's idea can be interpreted as a claim that only a neurotic person with weak repressive capability sees the conflict between conscious and unconscious impulse as a conflict in real time; those who are not neurotic have the ability to repress promptly and the conflict therefore disappears before it can be transformed into emotion. Generally it can be said that only people feeling inferior and having masochistic inclination are capable of taking pleasure in the theatrical illusion of the reality and identifying themselves with the main character. Theatre is always substitute for the world.

In "*Psychopathic Characters on the Stage*", Freud also discusses the source of attraction of the tragic character of Hamlet. The interpretation of this play arrives at the following propositions:

- a) The main character is not affected by psychopathology, he develops psychopathology during the play;
- b) The suppressed impulse in Hamlet is the same as the suppressed impulse in all of us, it is probably represented in the mystery of patricide as part of the Oedipus complex;
- c) For this reason, it is easy for the audience to identify themselves with the main character;

d) While the conflicting principles in Hamlet are easily identified, it is difficult to define them and the audience is seized by emotions without paying much attention to the development of the story.

Freud interprets tragicity, this time in the case of Oedipus, in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Freud analyses the persuasiveness of Oedipus' story, concluding that Oedipus' story is shared by us all. He states: *"Perhaps we were all destined to direct our first sexual impulse to our mother and the first hatred and violent wish to our father; our dreams convince us of this."*

In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud examines Hamlet's so-called "indecisiveness", which Goethe contributes to the inability to decide due to excessive thinking, which thwarts the action. Freud's verdict is that Hamlet is perfectly decisive, with one exception – the moment when he is to be put into action the repressed wishes of his early childhood sexuality; eliminating the father and having a sexual relationship with his mother.

S. Freud also focuses on the essence of tragicity of Greek drama in his work entitled *"Totem and Tabu"*, where he shows its connection to the so-called totem feast as an event that, according to Freud, stands at the beginning of key institutions of social arrangement, moral limitation and religion; the totem feast means celebration of the killing of the so-called forefather by his sons.

Naturally, other thinkers, such as André Green, built on Freud's interpretation of the issues of drama owing to its intellectual strength.

Another thinker, who is worth mentioning, is mainly a composer and music theorist, but at the same time a philosopher focusing on aesthetics. Otakar Zich's work dedicated to theoretical questions of theatre gradually gains increasing reputation. In a comment to the 1980s reedition of Zich's major work, which was first published in 1931, Ivo Osolsobě states that *"Zich was certainly not the first person to claim that theatre or – to use the author's own term – dramatic arts are an independent, self-sufficient and single art. However, he was the first to go beyond mere statement of this independence, as he drew moral (if there is a new, separate art, I am obliged to do something for this art, as a person focusing on aesthetics) and logical consequences from this claim."* Zich's philosophical theory of dramatic arts, which is also a general aesthetics theory, is truly theoretical. Instead of diverting to history, it analyses theatre from the point of view of the observer, i.e. the audience, and finally presents a synthetic view, which comes close to a comprehensive philosophical system, almost in Hegel's mode.

Attention should also be paid to Jan Czech, who is educated in philosophy, as well as theatre. His work *"The Philosophy of Drama"* from the early 1990s is predominantly a philosophical review, as it summarises the key philosophical foundations for understanding drama, while pointing out their legitimacy, and in doing so allows for understanding drama and theatre in its theoretical and general character. Czech examines categories such as "drama", "story", "dramatic characters", "story extension", "dramatic plurality" and "author subject" in light of philosophical categories such as "sense", "relationship" and "truth".

The author resembles Aristoteles in his notion of art as a highly effective method for discovering truth, as well as H.G. Gadamer with his interpretation of image retrospectively influencing that which is depicted. He emphasises Martin Heidegger, who describes the journey to artistic understanding and creation in "lingering responsiveness" and confirms the interpretation of sense as something with which the world appeals through human speech, referring to Edmund Husserl.

He seeks the subject of mimesis in drama. Is it the phenomenon or the essence? He discusses the aesthetic or ontological difference between drama and purposeful reconstruction, analyses the double being of an artwork (in being a "natural object", as well as a "window into the world"), considers the conditions of plasticity of drama in its natural life extension and presence as the key characteristic of a dramatic story, asks about the relationship between a part and the whole in the teleological structure of drama, analyses the required motif structure in relation to the truth of the work, and defines story as historicity of the human existence and a hero as the creator of unconditioned decisions.

The author characterises artistic truth in the final chapter as adherence to the truth, rather than correlation of the depicting and the depicted.

Systematic Philosophy of Dramatic Arts and Theatre Within A Philosophical System Seeking Universal Interpretation of the World

Naturally, Aristoteles is referred to in this subchapter as the essential representative. Characterisation of the tragic hero plays an undisputable central role in Aristoteles' theory of drama. Aristoteles describes the fate of a hero, which incites fear and sympathy in tragedy, as follows: *"We are therefore left with a person in the middle of these extremes. This is a person that fails to excel with their virtue or fairness, yet at the same time does not fall into misfortune due to their immorality or evil nature – it is a result of a mistake..."*

Drama in antiquity assumes that the tragic hero's mistake cannot be rectified. However, what is the ontological foundation of a situation, in which even individual mistakes cannot be rectified? Mistakes cannot be rectified in settings, where the world has no notion of redemption or salvation, where the world lives through cycles repeating until the final fall. Even unintentional mistakes, which cannot be rectified, point to the negative outlines of nothingness and lacking order, there is chaos. An unintentional mistake of a hero, which cannot be rectified, does not seem to be limited to thinking about drama and theatre, it seems to be the core of thinking in antiquity.

However, this means that Aristoteles approaches his systematic philosophy in general from the very beginning instead of deliberating it in parts. His theory of dramatic arts therefore seems to be the beginning of his philosophical work. His theory of tragic poetry refers entirely to antiquity, i.e. to something that is yet to come in his philosophy. This is also reflected in the opinions dating Poetics to the beginning of Aristoteles' philosophical work. This confirms the prepositions of unique truthfulness of philosophising

from the experience of theatre, as described in the previous chapter.

Hierarchisation of individual types of art directly linked to the ontological basis of the philosophical system is a major part of aesthetics in philosophical systems in the modern history. The thoughts of systematic philosophers, I. Kant, G.W.F. Hegel and A. Schopenhauer on drama and theatre in their aesthetic theories are essential from the point of view of hierarchisation of individual arts in aesthetic theory and this hierarchisation allows for capturing the specificity of drama and theatre through speculative means.

Immanuel Kant opens the topic of drama in his philosophical system in the Critique of Pure Reason, which is undoubtedly a major contribution to aesthetic theory. Kant's third critique significantly contributes to the theory of drama also with his interpretation of the play as such. However, Kant fails to analyse the specificity of theatre in greater detail and his systematics of theatre and dramatic arts remains rather sparse. In the chapter entitled On the Division of Fine Arts, Kant structures fine arts into literary arts, visual arts and the art of play. Drama is only mentioned in the subsequent chapter On the Combination of Fine Arts in One and the Same Product, where drama is the combination of rhetoric with depiction of subjects in painting. Rhymed tragedy is perceived by Kant as connection of beauty with depiction of grace.

G.W. F. Hegel organically places drama and theatre in his philosophical system, while systematically analysing them through their individual aspects in his aesthetics. He states that drama should be observed as the highest level of poetry and art as a whole. The reason behind this is that speech (rather than stone or tone) is the element for conveying spirit. Drama combines two artistic genres using speech – the objectiveness of epos with the subjective nature of lyric poetry.

According to Arthur Schopenhauer, different arts depict individual ideas of the primeval will, but only music depicts the primeval will itself. He builds on the tradition of German classical philosophy, which creates hierarchisation of individual arts as part of the aesthetic theory. Schopenhauer divides poetry into lyric poetry, novel, epos and drama. Hierarchisation stems from the subjectivity or objectivity of the art; lyric poetry is placed on the lowest level of poetry, being the most subjective. On the other hand, drama is at the highest level as the most objective form of poetry. Tragedy depicting the horrific side of life is the superior form of drama. Schopenhauer states: *"Demonstration of great misfortune is the only important objective in tragedy."* Tragedy delivers its fundamental objective in three ways: through exceptional corruption of a certain character, through the fault of the blind fate, i.e. through a coincidence or mistake, and through posing characters against each other.

Drama and Theatre Serving as A "Momentum" in the Philosophy's Endeavour to Interpret the World

The term "momentum" refers to the initial impact. It allows for the entirety being built from individual parts. It does not make any difference and the author does not need to put any emphasis on the momentum of his philosophy.

The cornerstones of the work by Marcus Aurelius involve the

structural notion of "two stages": *"At first, tragedy appeared on the stage, reminding the audience events in life, the fact that everything happens from natural necessity and that they should not let the events that entertain them on the stage bother them on the greater 'stage.'"*

Although tragedy is mentioned rather marginally, the overall relativisation of the human life in cosmic dimensions due to the theatricality of the world gives Aurelius' philosophy the basic ethical and philosophical dimension. As regards composition of the structure of philosophy, theatricality as clear or even model space allows for a limited selection of the philosopher's moralism being arranged in a well-structured system with clearly visible horizons of sense, which can be referred to as philosophy.

The same approach can be observed in the work of Erasmus of Rotterdam. This leading personage of humanism during the era preceding reformation accepts the notion of life as a theatre play, in which different individuals play their roles under various masks until the director calls them off the stage. He applies theatricality in two ways: theatricality is a major aspect of the arrangement of the world; however, the method used to construct the author's own philosophy is also theatrical, as his philosophy is delivered in a monologue from the stage of the imaginary theatre of one actor, while foolishness speaks.

Theatre, drama arts and philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche is a vast and complex topic. Nietzsche's work is usually divided into three periods: the early romantic period, the middle positivistic period, and the peak period, during which he drafted the metaphysics of the will to rule. Nietzsche's philosophical concept of tragedy as a dramatic genre was created during the first era [31].

This generally known concept stems from the two prototypes of artistic creation entrenched in the human mind, i.e. Dionysian and Apollonian art. While Apollonian art focuses on the external reality and specifics, Dionysian art is deeper and more authentic, and does not beautify the reality as Apollonian art does. It applies the aesthetic principle by letting people face the terrifying mythical theatre of unrestrained will, which is where Nietzsche is inspired by the philosophy of A. Schopenhauer.

Dionysian art includes music, Greek lyric poetry and tragedy. However, tragedy also includes an Apollonian element. The chorus tells a story highlighting the triviality of the human existence, yet its Apollonian element points to possible reconciliation. This study presents the opinion that the concept of Greek drama as a conflict of the two principles – the Apollonian and the Dionysian principle is not limited in Nietzsche's work to capturing the aesthetic and artistic uniqueness of the Greek drama, instead it permeates other phases of Nietzsche's philosophizing activities, acting as the initial impulse that drives Nietzsche forward and guarantees comprehensiveness of Nietzsche's creation, which proceeds in rather differing stages. The situation is similar to that of Aristoteles, with the exception that Nietzsche is more encyclopaedical and coherent and not as unbalanced.

Eugen Fink mentions that Nietzsche's Critique of Culture is predominantly a philosophical critique of the western metaphysics. Although Nietzsche purposefully reassesses the western values,

he does not yearn for utopia and signals the beginning of nihilism instead.

Hans-Thies Lehmann talks about Roland Barthes as follows: *“Barthes repeatedly refers to the topoi of theatre, such as the scene, performance, mimesis.”*

However, from the point of view of this paper, theatricality in the work of Roland Barthes, the philosopher, semiologist and literary critic, appears as the “momentum”, as the dynamizing impulse mainly in issues of the so-called manuscript. Instead of communicating, its function is to express what is behind the language. Manuscript is an act of historical solidarity with an enclosed character, which is foreign to the spoken word. This is manifested especially strongly in the so-called political manuscript. The key mention of theatre appears precisely in this context, as theatricality is unveiled here in its almost slavish service to power, ideology and violence. While any art can be enslaved by ideology, theatre obviously has specific predispositions for this. *“As manuscript is a theatrically engaged form of speech...”*

It would seem that theatre (more so than other arts) is forced to continuously expend energy to ensure that it does not become a tool for the control by the powerful. At the same time, however, the world drama benefits from the political nature of theatre and flourishes as the art of tribune, for example in Bertolt Brecht, who is studied by Barthes the most, along with Racine.

Philosophers Applying their Philosophical Interpretation of the World to Certain Specialised Issues of Dramatic Arts and Theatre

Denis Diderot as the leading spirit of the French encyclopaedic rationally structured thinking of the 18th century was active in several disciplines, including natural sciences, mathematics, philosophy and fine arts. Although he also wrote plays, his contribution to the theory of acting, which is expressed in the so-called “paradox of the actor”, is seen as significant as regards theatre and dramatic arts. At the time, the French classicism was beyond its zenith, the Italian Commedia was in decline, and acting was being replaced with rhetoric or primitive folk comedy. The “Paradox of the Actor” depicting the contrast between the actor’s cool, mainly rational mind and his exalted, emotional expression on the outside is based on a deeper philosophical consideration. Diderot sees a major, almost ontological conflict in the actor: *“How could nature without art create a great actor if nothing on the stage happens exactly the same way as in nature?”*

This leads to the perception of the actor as a non-living automatic machine that does not influence anything and from the principle cannot be natural. He builds on the general idea of the French Enlightenment, which perceives the world as a massive mechanism of bodies, masses and forces that obediently carries out impulses of its sensual and rational nature. Diderot opens a new era with his “paradox of the actor”; on the one hand, he is contradicted in the history of theatre by the theorist and practitioner of symbolist theatre, E. G. Craigh, who lets the actor disappear, because the actor is not a machine enough. After all, an aeroplane is better than a

person with wings attached. On the other hand, the director K.S. Stanislavskij rejects Diderot’s concept of the acting dummy by striving to build acting on authentic human “creative sense of the truth”; the real acting needs to seek the internal reality of the man and avoid the concept of the man-machine [34].

Analysis of acting from the anthropological point of view is an important application activity of Helmuth Plessner, a key personage in German anthropology of the 20th century. The philosopher’s mastery is revealed in its full strength here. Plessner claims that when actors play a different being, they become existence transparent right to its foundation. Acting as demonstration in the material of one’s own existence and embodiment of theatrical character through one’s own body points to the man’s ability to dissociate from himself; the human ability to demonstrate is heightened in an actor to the ability to embody. This points to the basic anthropological fact of representativeness of the human existence, which is expressed as existence in a role. The man is aware that the body, talent or character bestowed on him are essentially random. The man is a broken originality, which does not have control over itself, and therefore makes sense of everything by becoming the bearer of a role, representation. Through his existence in a role, the man finds his place in a meaningful context, and this is what makes him human. To quote Plessner: *„Naked existence is only half human.”*

Besides acting, philosophers also focus on the issues of comedy from the point of view of their philosophy as a whole. On the other hand, they study tragedy, but tragedy does not become a dynamizing element that gives momentum to their philosophising, as in the case of F. Nietzsche. According to Henri Bergson, art always focuses on individual arts – music, fine arts or poetry. Comedy as the only exception to this rule essentially focuses on everything typical, repeating. It would seem that comedy does not fall under art in this sense. Harpagon is not an individual, he is an embodied type. Bergson is of the opinion that unlike comedy, tragedy always captures all unique and fleeting. If comedy is based on observance from the outside, tragedy rises from the author’s self-observation.

Walter Benjamin draws distinction between tragedy and tragic drama in a stimulating manner. In tragedy, the hero dies, as one cannot live after their time has come. Therefore, the hero’s death in tragedy is ironic, predetermined. On the other hand, tragic drama does not end with the hero’s death.

Theatre Character as Demonstration of Philosophical Ideas and Philosophy Taking Over a Theatre Play as a Whole

Moments when the playwright personifies philosophical virtues without an intermediary and in a textbook-like manner through a theatre character are clearly examples of philosophy interfering in theatre. For example, Molière presents the tractate “On nature” by Lucretius Carus as a major epicurean work, which prefers the sound judgement of reason, and cooperates with libertines, who are characterised by their scientific approach to the world and atheism. This somewhat philosophical engagement

undoubtedly forms several major Molière's characters. However, only some of them are clearly authentic theatrical transformation of a specific philosophically perceived virtue. In the play *Misanthrope*, in contrast with *Alceste* and even more so with the unsettled 17th century, Philinte is depicted as a didactically instructional image of the renaissance ideal of the "orderly person". He is sensible, avoids extremes and keeps to the middle ground from the philosophical perspective, yet without any signs of opportunism.

Philinte is a good example of a situation where philosophy takes over theatre to demonstrate and apply its own processes; despite the fact that in this case, there was a philosopher in Molière, he was an active playwright, actor and theatre enthusiast. Philosophy only hijacks theatre in this manner to the limited extent through a theatre character. However, the world's dramatic arts have also produced pieces where philosophy takes over a theatre play as a whole. Lucius Annaeus Seneca and Jean Paul Sartre are examples of philosophers or predominantly philosophers, who were also successful playwrights in the world of professional theatre.

Let's summarise the phenomenology of philosophy taking over a theatre play as a whole. Seneca's interest does not lie in the story itself. His tragedy is catastrophe, announced from the beginning and mercilessly pursued to the end. Dialogues are the author's dialogues with himself, rather than dialogues between characters. Long monologues that do not move the story along in any way are essential. The play presents numerous static scenes with rhetoric and pathos. The story culminates through culmination of terrors. Even murder is carried out in the audience's face. Seneca's drama displays little interest in psychological motivation. There is no space for surprise and turns in the storyline. Drama is developed in stages, the same way as philosophical work. Terror is depicted purely externally.

Sartre's drama is a modern update of the above principle. While Seneca presented his philosophising and dramatic activities as two adjacent and overlapping spheres, J.P. Sartre subordinates theatre play to philosophy entirely. Sartre states: *"No more characters, the heroes are freedom caught in a trap like all of us."* Naturally, even Sartre cannot escape the traditional perception of theatre character creation. However, theatre characters become more or less a tribune of political allegories for reasons associated with the era and for reasons arising from the general character of the 20th century. Drama by J.P. Sartre tends to be described as being literary and influenced by essay; having his own insight into this, Sartre admits that as a playwright, he ought to write situations rather than words.

Final Summary

The paper aims to present model typology, rather than exhaustive typology in terms of the number of types, as well as philosophers within these types. The text draws inspiration from respected theatre personalities, yet at the same time paves its own way. The labyrinth of relationships between theatre and philosophy includes authors who do not fit in the presented system easily. These are mentioned in the conclusion.

Antonin Artaud's theatre of cruelty

It is a question whether, for example, *The Theatre and Its Double* by Antonin Artaud, the iconic figure of the European avantgarde of the 20th century, is a philosophical text that may resemble the style of Friedrich Nietzsche. This paper does not strive to resolve questions unresolvable in this text – whether something is or is not philosophy. This is why model typology, rather than exhausting typology is pursued.

This paper aims to apply analytical approach, avoiding evaluation and judgment. Antonin Artaud is only mentioned in the final section as someone who influenced philosophers such as Gilles Deleuze, Félix Quattari, Jacques Derrida significantly, meaning that Artaud's theatre of cruelty entered the mainstream of the western philosophy after WWII. However, Artaud is mainly an actor and playwright, not a philosopher, and his work is not generally perceived as philosophical. However, since philosophy uses almost poetic imagery instead of the traditional philosophical order and terminology, and the legitimacy of this remains unquestioned or even increases, even the theatre of cruelty may be seen as a philosophical concept.

H. G. Gadamer and play as such

To quote: *"If we were to determine the highest category (the most general denominator) of all elements of paratheatrical systems, it would certainly be the phenomenon of play."* H.G. Gadamer has his place in the conclusion of this paper, because he places the ontology of the aesthetic existence of a work of art side by side with the notion of play. He opts for an interdisciplinary approach and a range of definition styles can be observed here. Johan Huizinga and Roger Cailios are considered major theorists of play; according to Huizinga, voluntariness is a key characteristic of play. Play is arbitrary, but observes fixed boundaries in time and space, the experience of play transfers the subjects of play away from everyday settings, yet they are free to step out. This type of play is based on arbitrary determination of rules and therefore applies a post-Kantian approach.

H.G. Gadamer strives to free play from subjectiveness surrounding it since Kant and Schiller. Passage from one side to the other is a motion typical for play, so it does not matter who the subject of play is. Therefore, play takes precedence over the players, and this makes it attractive. Theatre is also a play and a world closed to the outside world. When a play becomes theatre, a major turn in methodology must occur. The audience becomes the player, and the play is acted out within the player and for the player.

Dan Rebellato as performative discourse of the West

Rebellato's work seems to be growing out of the dialectics of excessive expansion; on the one side, there is the expanded and increasingly expanding consumerism of the West after WWII, which is counterbalanced by the expanded and increasingly expanding academic reflection. This gives rise to a special phenomenon that cannot escape the attention of an attentive reader. There is certain release of elements from their original mental context or from the traditional fluent mental inductive and deductive curve. As if the

statement by Erika Fischer-Lichte applied not only to theatre, but also to debate on theatre: "Since the 1960s, performances repeatedly release individual theatrical means from their contexts. These performances are not governed by the psychology of characters or the causality of the story." The work is short, confrontational and bears characteristics of a certain type of a pamphlet. This genre has specific rules that are either accepted by the reader, or the reader chooses to avoid it entirely. Rebellato's work is undoubtedly discourse on the topic of relationship between philosophy and theatre, but the structure and titles of chapters alone point to performative, highly eclectic and perhaps excessively ideological spirit of the time. While the severely ideological and political Proletkult was once incredibly confident that it knows the artistic paradigms capable of capturing the flow of history, Rebellato makes almost clueless impression in history that abolishes privileges and privileged spaces, including the enclosed theatrical space. He claims that Karl Marx was essentially a prophet of the current globalisation, that communists from the former socialist countries misunderstood Marx and therefore could only fail. However, once attention turns to theatre and dramatic arts and whether and how they strive to capture the colossal processes of globalisation, he only describes misery.

As regards explanation of the potentially increasing theatricality of the human existence, which is proposed in this paper in the context of digital transformation of the society, including digitalisation of social life, the presented typology is the initial review, and solutions will be undoubtedly sought over long term. The main conclusion can be summed up by stating that theatricality is an essential dimension of the man and the mankind, gives rise to rays of philosophical thinking in all directions, as the man and the mankind reflect their situation in general, and any changes in this parameter may or may not have vast consequences. As if everything that has been said throughout the history of human thinking needed to be at least radially reviewed.

Acknowledgements

None

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest.

References

- Aristotelés *Poetika* (2008) Translated by Milan Mráz. Praha: Oikomenh, pp. 289.
- Antonin Artaud. *Divadlo a jeho dvojník*. Translated by Soňa Šimková. Bratislava: Tália-press, Press a Press, pp. 148.
- Roland Barthes (1997) *Kritika a pravda*. Translated by Josef Čermák, Josef Dubský and Julie Štěpánková. Praha-Liberec: Dauphin, pp. 264.
- Walter Benjamin (2011) *Teoretické pasáže*. Translated by Martin Ritter. Praha: Oikomenh, pp. 331.
- Henri Bergson (1993) *Smích*. Translated by Eva Majorová, Ladislav Major. Praha: Naše vojsko, pp. 96.
- Jan Czech (1991) *Filozofie dramatu*. Praha: Nakladatelství a vydavatelství Scéna, pp. 80.
- Denis Diderot (1950) *Diderot o divadle*. Translated by Jana Šírková. Praha: Umění lidu, pp. 289.
- Sergej Michajlovič Ejzštejn (1999) *Umenie mizanscény II*. Translated by Viera Mikulášová-Škrídllová, Nadežda Lindovská. Bratislava: Divadelný ústav, pp. 261.
- Epiktetos (1957) *Rukojet'-Rozpravy*. Translated by Rudolf Kuthan. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, pp. 312.
- Erasmus Rotterdamský (1966) *Chvála bláznivosti*. Translated by Rudolf Mertlík. Praha: Odeon, pp. 138.
- Eugen Fink (2011) *Filosofie Friedricha Nietzscheho*. Translated by Daniela Petříčková. Praha: Oikomenh, pp. 223.
- Erika Fischer-Lichte (2011) *Eстетika performativity*. Translated by Markéta Polochová. Mníšek pod Brdy: Na Konáři, pp. 334.
- Erika Fischer-Lichte (2003) *Dejiny drámy*. Translated by Adam Bžoch, Jana Bžochová-Wild, Jana Truhlářová. Bratislava: Divadelný ústav Bratislava, pp. 521.
- Sigmund Freud. *Psychopathic Characters on the Stage*. From the German language translated by H.A. Bunker. Psychoanalytical Quarterly 11 (4): 459-464.
- Sigmund Freud (2005) *Výklad snů*. Translated by Ota Friedmann. Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, pp. 400.
- Sigmund Freud (1991) *Totem a tabu*. Translated by Ludvík Hošek. Praha: Práh-Martin Vopěnka, pp. 181.
- Richard Hayman (1992) *Sartre, a biography*. New York: Carrol&Graf Publishers, pp. 572.
- Immanuel Kant (1975) *Kritika soudnosti*. Translated by Jan Špalek a Walter Hansel. Praha: Odeon, pp. 272.
- Georg Wilhelm Friedrich HEGEL (1966) *Eстетika II*. Translated by Jan Patočka. Praha: Odeon, pp. 446.
- Jan P Kučera (2006) *Molière, moralista a posměváček*. Praha-Litomyšl: Ladislav Horáček-Paseka, pp. 323.
- Hans-Thies Lehmann (2007) *Postdramatické divadlo*. Translated by Anna Grusková and Elena Diamantová. Bratislava: Divadelní ústav Bratislava, pp. 365.
- Ladislav Major (1993) *Myšlení o divadle I*. Praha: Herrmann a synové, pp. 172.
- Markus Aurelius Antoninus (1975) *Hovory k sobě*. Translated by Rudolf Kuthan. Praha: Svoboda, pp. 184.
- Friedrich Nietzsche (1993) *Zrození tragédie z ducha hudby*. Translated by Otokar Fischer. Praha: Karel Stíbrál, studentské nakladatelství Gryf, pp. 81.
- Miroslav Petříček (1993) *Myšlení o divadle II*. Praha: Herrmann a synové, pp. 133.
- Platón (2005) *Ústava*. Translated by František Novotný. Praha: Oikomenh, pp. 427.
- Helmuth Plessner (2008) *K antropologii herce*. Praha: disk 24, p. 21-28.
- Dan Rebellato (2010) *Divadlo a globalizácia*. Translated by Veronika Kolejáková. Bratislava: Divadelný ústav Bratislava, p. 82.
- Arthur Schopenhauer (1998) *Svět jako vůle a představa I*. Translated by Milan Váňa. Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, pp. 432.
- Irena Slaviňská (2002) *Divadlo v současném myšlení*. Translated by Jan Roubal. Praha: Nakladatelství Studia Ypsilon, pp. 479.
- Konstantin Sergejevič Stanislavskij (1946) *Můj život v umění*. Translated by František Pišek. Praha: Svoboda, pp. 429.
- Jiří Šípek (2010) *Psychologické souvislosti scénické tvorby*. Praha: Kant - Karel Kerlický, pp. 142.
- Eva Stehlíková (2005) *Antické divadlo*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Karolinum, pp. 383.

34. Milan Valenta (2007) *Dramaterapie*. Praha: Grada Publishing, pp. 252.
35. Milan Valenta (2003) *Dramaterapeutické projektování*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, pp. 91.
36. Hans Urs Von Balthasar (1973) *Theodramatik*. Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, pp. 622.
37. Otakar Zich (1986) *Estetika dramatického umění – teoretická dramaturgie*. Praha: Panorama, pp. 412.