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Introduction

In recent years, there has been a spate of interest in how ‘texts’ hold dialogues with each other as part and parcel of an on-going artistic dialectic. This interest is due to the rediscovery of Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogic theory of the novel thanks to Rostal, Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist’s translations of his works into English in the early 1970s and 1980s. Since then the study of the dialogic dimensions of novels has become an important aspect of literary criticism and literary theory. However, studies of the dialogic dimensions of other genres like drama and the essay are surprisingly poor, even if Bakhtin himself has never indicated that his theory applies solely to the novel, which he defines as being essentially ‘anti-generic’. On the contrary, he has suggested on several occasions in his essays that the novelistic tendency to dialogue has shed on other genres, and that consequently, the application of his theory can be extended to their analysis.

This application is particularly feasible in the case of Black American Renaissance drama of the mid-1960s as represented by Le Roi Jones’s Dutchman and The Slave. However, there are as yet few critics who have tried to look at his plays from the dialogic perspectives developed by Bakhtin. Indeed critics like Werner Sollers and Henry C. Lacy have each in his own way pointed to the autobiographical dimension of Jones’s plays, which they have viewed as a drama of the self. Among other textual evidence, they have underlined the occurrence of such elements in Dutchman as the dramatist’s middle name “Everett”; his family history; the age of his protagonists, Clay who is 20 years old, i.e., LeRoi Jones’s age when he joined Greenwich Village”, and Lula who is 30, which corresponds to the dramatist’s age when his play Dutchman was performed in Cherry Lane theatre, off-Broadway in 1964; and finally the recurrence of imagery from his earlier Beat poetry.

Le Roi Jones and Plato

Sollers and Lacy are to the point in their affirmation that autobiography forms an important dimension of the dialogue in Dutchman. However, they have failed to identify the type of dialogue in which Jones has engaged
himself in the play though the dramatist himself has hinted to it in one of his public pronouncement about his novel The System of Dante’s Hell where he says that “characters take on different elements that, may be, I reflected on. Much of it is autobiography – from situations I have been in, but most of it is projections of ideas”. It has to be observed that Jones has shifted to the writing of drama just after the publication of The System of Dante’s Hell to confirm to the agenda of the Black Arts Movement, which he has helped to establish with Larry Neal, and in which the novel is dismissed as an alien form for African-American artists urged to shift to drama on the occasion. Drama is regarded as the means through which the really committed African-American artists can contribute more efficiently to the Black Revolution of the mid-1960s.

It is the purpose of the following paper to argue that Jones’s qualification of his characters in The System of Dante’s Hell as a reflection on and projection of ideas is one of the basic tenets in his artistic agenda which we consider as being mainly inspired from Plato and Ovid. This tenet finds its full realisation in Jones’s Dutchman; it recalls in many of its aspects the Platonic dialogues, also called Socratic because of the predominance in them of Socrates as a character, and his principles in the construction of discussions of ideas.

Jones has for long defended art as process rather than artefact, and for this reason the Socratic dialogue fits his propensities. It has enabled him to show thought at work and to avoid the mere exposition of its finished product. Werner Sollers is to the point when he says that “Clay and Lula are not merely depersonalised absurd, two-faced social symbols, but are also endowed with elements of their creator’s self”. However Sollers omits to underline that this way of discussing a subject inside the individual mind in much the same way as it is disputed in a circle of talkers is peculiar to the Socratic dialogue. We shall argue that the dialogue in Dutchman, just like the Socratic dialogue in Plato’s works, is this process of the individual mind made concrete, with its stages translated into persons, or characters.

Dutchman reminds us of Plato’s simple dialogues, like The Hypias, The Criton, The Euthyphron. It involves two characters engaged on a no less weighty subject than racial cross-dressing and the construction of American whiteness and blackness. Just as in some of Plato’s dialogues like Gorgias, the dialogue between Clay and Lula in Dutchman is improvised; it starts with Clay a male Negro, and Lula a white female striking up an acquaintance in a night subway train. What is remarkable about the dialogue in which they are soon engaged is that the views presented by one of the characters are set up only be to demolished by other views held by the other characters until the end when each of them utters the final truth about white/black relations in America. Just like in Socratic dialogues, Jones starts with the criticism of common opinion about racial questions. It
is Clay, who essentially, fulfils the Socratic role of questioner in the play, and leads Lula, who with her eloquence recalls the Sophists in Socratic dialogues, to utter the views of ordinary opinion about the Negro.

Hence, just as in Socratic dialogues, Lula as a white female Bohemian/hipster, appears on the stage and gives utterance to the cherished view that the Negro “is a well-known type”. Prompted by Clay, Lula moves further in her reasoning and says that no matter what façade of imitation-whiteness the former hides behind, he remains “a black nigger”; that he will continue to lie to her and by extension to America even when he professes to love her. Pushed further by Clay’s queries, Lula enacts the dramatic truth that she can deal with the Negro only as a type in her own “story”, and not as a man with his own complexities, and that since “every story has an end” she carries her own to its logical conclusion by being determined to get her orgasm without regard to the embarrassment it may cause Clay. At this stage Lula’s words seem to be borrowed directly from Norman Mailer’s view of the black man in his article: The White Negro: Superficial Reflections on the Hipster. Norman Mailer completes his notorious statement about the Negro by saying that Jazz is orgasm, and so does Lula “the white Negro” i.e., the Negrophile white man or woman, when she tells the embarrassed Clay:

Come on, Clay. Let’s rub bellies on the train. The nasty. The nasty. Do the gritty grind, like your ol’rag-head mammy. Grind till you lose your mind. Shake it, shake it, shake it! OOOweee Come on, Clay. Let’s do the choo-choo train shuffle, the navel scratcher.

Once Lula has carried her story to its logical conclusion Clay, who, until then, has been rather self-effacing “gets up”, grabs Lula and slaps her “as hard as he can, across the mouth”; however, one has the impression that this physical violence is there only to satisfy the demands of modern drama because as soon as Lula is silenced, Clay steps up to expound his views of what “blackness” is just like Socrates sometimes corrects the Sophists in Plato’s dialogues. In a three-page address, considered as the most famous section in Dutchman, Clay proceeds to dismiss Lula as a “know-nothing bohemian”, and to posit a Black mystique whose terms are partly Fanonian in its celebration of cathartic violence, Senghorian in its insistence on “the pumping black heart”, Césairean in its surrealistic rhetoric, and Jonesian in its appeal to Jones’s early critique of Afro-American music in The Blues People. Clay counters Lula’s prima facie views about “blackness” by telling her

You don’t know anything except what’s there for you to see. An Act. Lies. Not the pure heart, the pumping black heart. You don’t ever know that... You great liberated whore! You fuck some black man, and right away you’re an expert on balck
people. What a lotta shit that is. The only thing you know is that you come if he bangs you hard enough. And that’s all. The belly rub? You wanted to do the belly rub? Shit, you don’t even know how. You don’t know how. That ol’dipty-dip shit you do, rolling your ass like an elephant. That’s not my kind of belly rub. Belly rub is not Queens. Belly rub is dark places, with big hats and overcoats held up with one arm. Belly rub hates you. Old bald-headed four-eyed ofays popping their fingers...and don’t know what they’re doing. They say, « I love Bessie Smith”. And don’t even understand that Bessie Smith is saying, “Kiss my ass, my black unruly ass. » before love,, suffering, desire, anything you can explain, she’s saying, and very plainly, « kiss my black ass, » and if you don’t know that, it’s you that’s doing the kissing... If Bessie Smith had killed some white people she wouldn’t have needed that music. She could have talked very straight and plain about the world. No metaphors. No grunts. No wiggles in the dark soul... Crazy niggers turning their backs on sanity. When all it needs is that simple act. Murder. Just murder! Would make us all sane ... Ahhh. Shit. But who needs it? I’d rather be a fool. Insane. Safe with my words, and no deaths, and clean, hard thoughts, urging me to new conquests. My people’s madness. Hah! That’s a laugh. My people. They don’t need me to claim them. They got legs and arms of their own. Personal insanities. They don’t need all those words. They don’t need any defense. But listen, though, one more thing. And you tell this to your father, who’s probably the kind of man who needs to know at once. So he can plan ahead. Tell him not to preach so much rationalism and cold logic to these niggers. Let them alone. Let them sing curses at you in code and see your filth as simple lack of style... (pp. 96-98).

Dutchman shows all the qualities that Mikhail Bakhtin has ascribed to the Socratic dialogue. The confrontation between Lula and Clay reminds us of what Bakhtin calls Sunkrisis. We shall elaborate further on what is said above by saying that this confrontation (Sunkrisis) involves Baraka’s poetic self at two turning points (what Bakhtin sees as “thresholds” in the Socratic dialogue) in his literary career. Clay Williams is said to be twenty in the stage directions, Jones’s age when he dropped out of Howard University in 1954 to join the United States Air Force. What is described as Clay’s “fifth flight” in the New York underground in Dutchman points to Jones’s “last flight” in the United States Air Force before being discharged “undesirably” from the service to join New York’s Bohemia, Greenwich
Village wherein he met the Jewish American avant-garde poetess Hettie Cohen to whom he got married in 1958.

Lula is older than Clay; she is said to be thirty, Jones’s age in 1964 when his play was performed for the first time off-Broadway, at The Cherry Lane Theatre. In 1965, Jones left Greenwich Village and Hettie Cohen in the wake of the assassination of Malcolm X to move uptown to Harlem, declaring himself a black cultural nationalist, that is, one committed to black people as “a race, a culture, a nation”. This last point permits us to conclude that the death of Clay in the confrontation that opposes him to Lula stands for the death of Jones the Bohemian/ avant-garde poet. On the other hand, Lula’s triumph represents the triumph of a new poetic self (the black poet) preparing himself to return “home”, to “blackness” after his bohemian spell.

Dutchman is also Socratic in the construction of its dialogue in the sense that speech is a provocation of another’s speech (what Bakhtin calls Anakrisis). The dialogue between Clay and Lula is kept going on as each of them in turn provokes the other to voice his/her opinions and prejudices. However, the confrontation between them can be conceived of, as our analysis above shows, other than as a drama of the author’s poetic self. In other words, the confrontation is a wrestling that involves not only the old and new poetic selves of the author himself but the writer and his white avant-garde fathers. Lula stands for the white avant-garde intellectual. (Here we have characters representing ideas just as in the Socratic dialogue). As a Jazz critic, she is made to voice opinions similar to the ones that Norman Mailer defends in his famous essay “The White Negro”. Like the latter she holds that Jazz is “orgasm”, and she is decided to get it from Clay even if it costs him his life. She also recalls the bohemian poet Lawrence Ferlingetti. She quotes from the latter’s poem “Long Street” when she invites Clay to play “the choochoo train shuffle”. Jones’s train in Dutchman evokes that of Ferlingetti’s in “Long Street”; on both trains, a tragedy occurs.

If Lula stands for the white avant-garde intellectual, Clay represents Jones (re-named Baraka) the rebelling black poet. In response to the last provocation of the white bohemian (Lula) he counters with what he considers as the truth about the black man’s music and identity. In the verbal battle that has opposed him to Lula, his last intervention to “correct” her skewed views of the Negro is a triumph. He manages to make her run short of arguments. But then he exposes himself to Lula’s violence. His murder is symbolic on more than one count. The first truth that it teaches us is that the white avant-garde intellectuals/ bohemians, the so-called friends of the Negro, are ultimately as dangerous as the conservatives to the black man. As soon as the latter decides to rebel
against the white cultural domination in terms other than the ones they have formulated for him, he is hunted down just as if he were a run-away slave.

The bohemia is the plantation of the twentieth-century America from which the Negro can escape only if he takes the Underground the reference here is to the historical underground that slaves from the South took to escape to the North during pre-bellum slavery times. But Clay’s death, as we have said above, is also positive in the sense that Clay represents LeRoi Jones (the older poetic self). Clay’s talk about “Blackness” is a sign that the LeRoi Jones of the early Beat poetry has come to the realisation of his ethnic belonging because of the provocation of the white Bohemian, and that the Baraka of the cultural nationalist period is ready to bundle out the older poetic self out of the bohemian train. Jones re-baptised himself as Imamu Amiri Baraka just after the performance of Dutchman in 1964.

From what has preceded we can draw the provisional conclusion that Dutchman meets all the five criteria of the Socratic Dialogue as defined by Mikhail Bakhtin in his Problems of Dostoevesky’s Poetics. The first criterion is the principle of Sunkrisis by which Bakhtin means the confrontation of several points of view on a given topic of discussion. The second criterion of the Socratic dialogue is no less evident in Dutchman. Bakhtin calls it Anakrisis, which consists of the various techniques that interlocutors in Socratic dialogues call upon to provoke speech, discussion. Through these techniques of speech provocation the other interlocutors are obliged to expound their opinions to the point wherein they come to realise the incompleteness of what each considers as his own complete ‘truth’.

Thirdly, according to Bakhtin the heroes in the Socratic dialogue are ideologues, that is characters holding and representing a system of beliefs and ideas. This is the case of both Clay and Lula in Dutchman, who, as we have attempted to show above, are from being life-like people since they are there as a projection of the predominant ideas about the racial problem in circulation in the America of the 1960’s. Finally, Bakhtin writes that the heroes in the Socratic dialogue are always in a liminal position, i.e., “on the threshold of something”, a situation that gives them an exceptional freedom of speech.

It has to be pointed out here that Dutchman was written and performed at the eve of the Black Revolution in America, i.e., at a transitional/liminal period in African-American history which had witnessed the failure of the integration politics and poetics of the previous decades. In this respect, we have tried to suggest all through our analysis of the play that the characters Clay and Lula are nothing else than the playwright himself split into two persons, standing for ideas that he has held at different periods of African-American history. Furthermore, the playwright, just like Socrates in Platonic dialogues like The Republic, The Symposium, and Apology, uses the trial of his previous Self to inquire into the ‘Negro problem’. Indeed
like Socrates, Jones willingly accepts the death of the Beat poet Clay to be reborn as Lula i.e., as Imamu Amiri Baraka the playwright belonging to the Black Arts Movement.

Le Roi Jones and Ovid

The Socratic dimensions of Dutchman hides other no less important aspects in Jones’s aesthetics. These aspects can be defined as basically Ovidian. It is perhaps important at this stage to mention that Jones wrote his play in a period of African-American history known as the Black Renaissance. Jones’s pose as a Black Renaissance Man shows itself as much in the Socratic dimensions of his drama as in the ‘metamorphosis’ that the characters Clay and Lula (the alter-egos of the playwright) undergo in Dutchman. Metamorphoses is a title of one of Ovid’s mock-epics.

With reference to Ovid’s influence on Renaissance arts in Italy, Barolsky Paul writes that “the story of Italian Renaissance art abounds in images inspired by the fables of Ovid’s Metamorphoses, pictorial “poems” by Pollaiuolo, Botticelli, Corregio, and Titian, among others”. (1998:1) This statement can be generalised to the arts in other Western countries that have witnessed the Renaissance of the arts at different periods of their histories. For example, George Chapman wrote a poem entitled Ovid’s Banquet of Sense (1595), which suggests the strong influence that Ovid had exerted on British Renaissance writers. It is one of our arguments here that Jones as a Black American Renaissance of the mid-1960s has not escaped this influence.

Jones’s absorption of Ovid into his drama is perhaps more obvious in The Slave considered as a sequel to Dutchman. As if in a hint to the Ovidian aesthetics of the former, he adds to its title the subtitle “a fable”. Indeed, Ovid’s Metamorphoses is a collection of Greek fables rewritten to suit the temperament of Augustan Rome. In addition to this Ovidian title, The Slave starts with a prologue wherein an old minstrel figure/slave metamorphoses himself into a black American revolutionary leader Walker Vessels, whose name is reminiscent of Denmark Vesey an important historical figure in the Black resistance to American slavery system.

Even though the subtitle of “fable” comes in the singular in the play, The Slave contains, to paraphrase Northrope Frye, many “fables of identities”, since we learn later in the play that Walker Vessels is a “tall, thin, forty-year-old Negro” who has left his career as an academic intellectual and poet in order to become one of the leaders of a black revolutionary army about to take the city where the Easleys live. The Easleys are a white American bourgeois family. Walker Vessels has come ahead of his troops to recuperate his two daughters from his former wife Grace. The latter is now married to his former university drama master Easley. All the play takes place in the Easleys’ living-room against a background of war.
Other Ovidian fables of identities are unfolded in the drama and we are made privy to the previous intimate life of Walker as the protagonists confront each other about their experiences in the Easleys’ living-room. We learn, for instance, that before he answered the call of the revolution, Walker loved Grace passionately. He was appreciated both as a poet and a ritual dramatist by his drama master Mr Easley. With the accusations of infidelity exchanged in the living-room the characters assume other identities reminiscent of those of Othello, Desdemona, and Iago/Shakespeare in the latter’s play Othello.

The above comparison between Shakespeare’s and Jones’ plays are from being fortuitous. Apart from the fact that Othello and Walker are warlike, poetic in temperament, and passionate lovers of women belonging to another race; that the woman protagonists in both plays are invested with “grace”; and that their stories are stories of love gone wrong happens against a background of war, both plays obey to aesthetic principles that are at once Platonic and Ovidian, two principles recognised as basic to Renaissance arts.

Textual evidence from The Slave has already been adduced to support the view that Ovidianism is central to the play. Perhaps, it is necessary to support the assertion made about Shakespeare’s play with examples. The space in the following paper does not permit us to expand on this aspect. Yet, it is enough to look at the metamorphoses that Othello undergoes in Shakespeare’s play under the urge of Iago, which critics like Bradley have associated with the playwright, i.e., Shakespeare himself. For instance, Shakespeare transforms Othello the Moor into a Christian convert and makes of him a metic at the service of the Venetian state. A blue blood himself this metic marries another blue blood Desdemona from Venice at the eve of a war with the Turks.

The metamorphosis is felt even at the level of the plot since Shakespeare twists his play into a domestic tragedy in the second act. The Turkish fleet advancing upon Cyprus one of the Venetian outposts is defeated by the winds, a wink perhaps to the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1580 in the same circumstances. The association is possible since Catholics at that time were also called Turks and infidels. In this second part of the play, Othello now governor of Cyprus gradually loses his bearings before becoming at the end of the play a were-wolf, a peculiarly Ovidian metamorphosis at the time of Shakespeare. This metamorphosis is shown in the following quotation from Shakespeare’s play:

Cassio: What’s the matter? / Iago: My Lord (Othello) is fall’n into an epilepsy./This is his second fit; he had one yesterday. Cassio: Rub him about the temples./Iago: No forbear./The lethargy must have his quiet course;/If not, he foams at mouth, and by and by/ Breaks out to savage madness. Look he stirs...
Othello's transformation into a were-wolf through the instigation of Iago who makes him believe that Desdemona betrays him with his friend Cassio announces the murder of Desdemona at his own hands in the final scene. Thus, Shakespeare's play runs full circle from Platonic ideas about love as a union of two perfect Renaissance individuals flouting the racial prejudices of their own peoples, to an ovidian celebration of senses gradually overtaken by dementia. Caught in the tempest of poisonous words breathed out by Iago/alter-ego of Shakespeare, Othello loses control of himself, commits a murder and kills himself the moment he recognises his mistake.

From the above we can see that one of the Ovidian dimensions of The Slave consists of a variation that Jones plays on Othello. Jones has kept most of the important elements in the latter play, but he takes care to underline his drama master's/Shakespeare’s complicity with his white female character Desdemona/ Grace Easley. In the final analysis, The Slave reads as a revenge play wherein Jones and Shakespeare have engaged in a verbal battle, or to use Swift’s parlance, a “battle of books”. The term “fable” added to the main title The Slave points to this dimension since the term “fable” comes from the Latin fabula meaning “small talk”. This “small talk” ends with a bomb falling on the Easley household, and Walker Vessels assuming the role of commander of the black army again.

The Ovidian dimension of Jones’s The Slave shows not only at the level of inter-text but that of intra-text as well. We have already pointed out that this play is a sequel to Dutchman and is intended at the beginning at least to be one of its constituent parts. From here follows the impression that Walker Vessels in The Slave is but a metamorphosis of the Clay in Dutchman. This metamorphosis indicates the change in the status of the black man from victim to that of hero, whose army has blasted out the Easley household built on “the idealism of rational liberalism”.

Metamorphosis is one of the essential constituent features of Dutchman and can be regarded as the root cause of the transformation of the play from a Platonic Symposium to what Frank Kermode calls the Banquet of Sense, i.e., a mock symposium. About the former, so much has already been said in the first part of this paper, and it is, therefore, not necessary to expand on it further here. The emphasis will be rather on its Ovidian features at the level of characterisation, plot, imagery and theme.

Characters have already been analysed in terms of the Socratic dialogue and have been qualified as being primarily ideologues, i.e., characters standing for ideas. This still remains a valid categorisation, but it overlooks the transformation that they undergo in the play. One of these transformations is at the level of mythical associations and their ironic displacements. Hence Lula enters the train as a tempting Eve “eating an
apple" and turns herself successively into such mythological surrogates like Dido, Cleopatra, Juliette, Duessa, Delila, Lilith, and Calypso. The transformations of Clay are no less significant since he is associated in turn with figures like Romeo, Othello, Christ, Dionysus, fugitive slave and so on.

The transformation is also evident at the level of mythos, viz., plot. From the dialectic festivity of the Platonic Symposium characteristic of the first part wherein the plot seems to move towards the synthesis or integration of opposing views of race (Lula and Clay have agreed to go to an interracial banquet), the play develops along a Dionysian mythos, which climaxes with a cannibalistic ritual at the hands of “Lula the hyena”. The myth of Dionysus, it should be observed here, is one of the fables included in Ovid’s Metamorphoses.

The transformation at the level of theme appears in the text, but it is more obvious if looked at from an inter-textual perspective. Indeed, the play reads as a dream turned into a nightmare, in other words a Platonic Symposium turned into an Ovidian fasti. Readers cognisant with racial issues in the America of the 1960s cannot fail to see that Dutchman is concerned with the parody of the Platonic solutions that Jones’s fellow Afro-Americans like Martin Luther King Jr and James Baldwin have suggested for the resolution of the racial problem. King Jr’s speech “I have dream” made at a public occasion in Washington DC turns into a nightmare of hate. This nightmare comes in the shape of a mythological ship called Dutchman doomed to roam the seas because of the incapacity of its captain (Lula) to love.

Similarly, Dutchman parodies Baldwin for his illusion about a possible Platonic solution to the racial problem in his essay The Fire Next Time. It has to be observed that an “essay” is just that, an “attempt” lacking finesse or finish, i.e., a non finito. This form is one of the dominant forms in Renaissance times both in England and else where in the Western world. Furthermore, a “personal essay”, according to Edward Hoagland, is like the human voice talking, its order the mind’s natural flow, instead of a systemized outline of ideas…. (One of its emphases) is upon mind speaking to mind”. (Quoted in Curry Dean, 1988:26-27) Hoagland definitions of the essay strangely reminds us of Bakhtin’s definition of the Socratic dialogue.

However, as an essay Baldwin’s The Fire Next Time remains a non-finito that Jones completes with Dutchman. This completion is of the order of parody that grades down the call for Platonic love between races into a cannibalistic banquet, the victim of which is the black man. In other terms, it is of the order of an Ovidian response by the nephew Le Roi Jones to his uncle James Baldwin who has addressed the following letter to his kinsmen imprisoned in the Platonic cave of the American Republic:
Now my dear namesake...if the word integration means anything, this is what it means: that we, with love, shall force our brothers to see themselves as they are, to cease fleeing and begin to change it. (Emphasis mine) (Baldwin James, 1993:6-10)

To all evidence, Jones’s response is that Baldwin’s call for a Platonic integration of the races has remained a pious wish, for Platonic statesmanship is compared to a Dutchman, fleeing non-stop in “the flying underbelly of the city” just like most of the persecuted heroes and heroines in Ovid’s Metamorphosis.

Conclusion

It follows from the above that in Dutchman and The Slave Jones has tapped on two complementary Greco-Roman aesthetic sources: Platonism and Ovidianism. These plays emerge essentially as a “mind speaking to mind” both at the individual and collective levels. Jones’s Platonistic/Ovidian dimensions show themselves in his capacity to speak his mind on stage/i.e., in public, after the manner of the Greeks, and to parody both himself and his fellow Afro-American fellows involved in an absurdly Ovidian pursuit of love without knowing it. As plays steeped in Plato and Ovid, Dutchman and The Slave are comparable to contemporaneous plays like Irish Murdoch’s Acastos: Two Platonic Dialogues, and Edward Albee’s absurd play Zoo Story. Edward Albee is one of the three producers of Dutchman for its first presentation at the Cherry Lane Theatre on March 24, 1964. Zoo Story was staged at the same theatre and at the same date as in emphasis of their kinship in the Theatre of the Absurd.
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