— Introduction >
In 1994, I attended a performance of Peter Brook’s *The Man Who*. In this theatre performance, four actors embody thirteen cases of neurological disorder. I was drawn into the world of persons suffering from autism, Korsakoff’s syndrome, amnesia, epileptic memory, Tourette’s syndrome and many other ailments.

In presenting these diseases as forms of embodiment that are both subjectively profound and symbolically significant (rather than statistically measurable external attacks on the biochemical organism), *The Man Who* does justice to the brilliant medical studies of Oliver Sacks on which it is based. Furthermore, in demonstrating unexpected relationships between particular variations of embodiment and ways of perceiving the world, *The Man Who* tackles some remarkable implications of the ‘located-ness’ of the act of looking from within a particular body.

As performed in *The Man Who*, these cases present the body as the very medium though which a vision of the world comes into being. The theatrical exposition of these neurological cases, therefore, does not simply offer a demonstration of how things are (with these patients), it contains an argument as well. *The Man Who* can be read as a critique of the strict division between vision, the body, and the other senses typical of the modern understanding of self, of the world, and of the theatre. For this reason, *The Man Who* is exemplary for both the subject of this study – dissecting visuality – and for my object of analysis – the theatre.

**The Body Seeing** — In the theatre, people gather to see other people perform. The simultaneous presence of both performer and audience is usually considered to be a fundamental characteristic of the theatre event, and crucial to the strong effects it can produce. The performer is ‘live’ – is present right there – before the eyes of the audience; a living body exposed to our look. On the contemporary stage this body seems to be more present than ever. Breaking theatre conventions, performers offer us glimpses (or more) of ‘themselves’ as living, breathing beings, by standing literally or figuratively naked before our very eyes. One is able to see all of them, to see right through them, and to feel what they feel, sensing the physical reactions of the body seen on stage as though they were one’s own, or so it seems.

The body on stage draws a lot of attention, not only from the audience but also from theorists. What is more, the powerful and fascinating presence of bodies on stage appears to be capable of capturing the attention of both audience and theorists to such a degree that the other bodies present – those of the audience – are almost or completely forgotten. The theoretical attention paid to bodies seen on stage produces a body of knowledge that testifies to a growing awareness of the way bodies are involved in meaning production on stage, and of the way bodies seen there are products of culture rather than natural givens. At the same time, this body of knowledge bears witness to a rather disembodied notion of what it means to see these bodies.
It is precisely this disembodied notion of vision that allows for a conflation to take place between what is seen and what is present 'over there.' This disembodied notion of vision supports the tendency to take what is seen for what is over there, and to understand the strong effects thus experienced as resulting exclusively from the body present on stage. What is left out, then, is the relation between the body seen and the body seeing. The latter is left in the dark, 'just looking.' Absorbed in the object of their attention, these bodies seeing and theorizing about the bodies on stage are conspicuous by their absence. This absent body, or this body seeing, will be my concern.

**Locating Vision** — A new or renewed focus on questions of vision in a wide variety of fields has begun to open our eyes to the complexity of what easily, but mistakenly, is taken for granted as 'just looking.' Martin Jay suggests that the fascination with modes of seeing and the enigmas of visual experience may well be a token to a paradigm shift in the cultural imaginary of our age: "What has been called the 'pictorial turn' bids fair to succeed the 'linguistic turn' so loudly trumpeted by twentieth-century philosophers" (Jay 1996: 3).

This does not imply, however, a simple reversal of the word-image opposition – that is, the replacement of the linguistic and the discursive by the pictorial and the figurative – but rather its replacement with a more complicated account of the ways viewing and reading, the linguistic and the visual, are intertwined. The pictorial turn reflects the lesson of the linguistic turn "to attend to the constituted rather than the found quality of seemingly natural phenomena" (Jay 1996: 3). As Stephen Melville observes, the growing interest in the visual has typically taken the form of a critique of vision, "a systematic suspicion of the apparent transparency and naturalness of vision" (Melville 1996: 103). 'Just looking' appears to be far more complicated than the expression might first suggest.

The work of leading critics like Martin Jay and Stephen Melville quoted above, as well as that of Rosalind Krauss, Kaja Silverman, Michael Fried, Jonathan Crary, Hal Foster, Norman Bryson, Jacqueline Rose, Mieke Bal, Barbara Maria Stafford and W.T.C. Mitchell, have made it increasingly clear that ways of seeing are historically determined and culturally mediated. What seems to be just 'there to be seen' is, in fact, rerouted through memory and fantasy, caught up in threads of the unconscious and entangled with the passions. Vision, far from being the "noblest of the senses" (Descartes), appears to be irrational, inconsistent and undependable. More than that, seeing appears to alter the thing seen and to transform the one seeing. Not only are words and images intertwined in many ways, but so too are the one seeing and what is seen.

Growing awareness of the inevitable entanglement of vision with what is called 'visuality' – the distinct historical manifestations of visual experience – draws attention to the necessity of locating vision within a specific historical and cultural situation. This is a situation in which what we think we see
is, in fact, the product of vision 'taking place' according to the tacit rules of a specific scopic regime and within a relationship between the one seeing and what is seen. ¹

At this point, visual theory presents a welcome complement to theories of experience and meaning production in the theatre. Visual theory allows for a reconsideration of the directness, immediateness, live-ness, presence and 'there to be seen' character of the theatrical event in terms of a relationship between audience and performance as the effect of culturally inflected visual practices. By drawing attention to the ways in which what we think we see is mixed up with desires and repressed fears, with tradition, expectations and culturally determined preferences, visual theory exposes the ways in which culture, history, race, class and gender (to mention but a few) are involved in 'just looking' at what is 'there to be seen' on stage.

At the same time, the theatre presents an excellent 'theoretical object' for exploring an aspect of the 'located-ness' of vision that tends to get overlooked in the booming business of theories of vision and visuality. Theatre, as an event that involves the simultaneous physical presence of both performers and audience in shared time and space, points to the need to reconsider the body as the locus where looking 'takes place.' The 'being there' character of the theatrical event invites a reconsideration of what we think we see as the product of bodies involved with the world through different perceptual systems simultaneously. This is not to conceive of bodies as something 'natural' as opposed to their cultural and historical frames. Instead, to reconsider the role of bodies in the activity of seeing means to direct attention to the intertwining of visuality, which consists of the social "thicknes of the visual," with one's condition of being a body in the world (De Bolla 1995: 285). Such a reconsideration engages with seeing as an activity that takes place at the intersection of the physical possibilities of bodies and how these are shaped by cultural conditioning.

**Dissecting Visuality in the Theatre (1) > The Anatomy of 'Just Looking'**

—I have given this study the subtitle *Dissecting Visuality in the Theatre.* I have done so, in the first place, because I will approach bodies seeing in the theatre through a 'dissection' of the discursive determinations that produce seeing as 'just looking.' Here, dissecting means to take apart, to analyze, and to examine how 'just looking' is produced.

I will perform this dissection by means of a series of confrontations between theatre performances and texts. Some of these texts are about theatre (Lehmann, Fuchs, Feral, Fischer-Lichte, Elam, Martin). Other texts originate from other disciplines like psychoanalysis and its feminist critique (Freud, Lacan, Silverman, Grosz, Gallop), visual theory (Crary, Fried, Jay), semiotics (Barthes, Benveniste) and philosophy (Deleuze and Guattari). I read the theatre performances and the texts alongside one another, confront them with one another and read them through one another. The texts under
discussion are not meant to explain the theatre performances. Often it works the other way round. The theatre performances are a means to question the theoretical texts and expose the assumptions underlying them.

Theatre performances function as my **theoretical objects**. I consider them instances of thought embodied in the artistic discourse of the theatre. I demonstrate how they can be read as theoretically meaningful statements. In this artistic discourse, thought 'moves' in different ways than in the theoretical discourse of the academy. Each discourse has its own possibilities for showing and telling, for taking its audiences along, and for making these audiences move in response to the address presented to them. My aim is to make these differences productive.

In this process of dissection, a series of concepts from Mieke Bal's narratology will serve as my analytical tools. Focalization, the subject of vision, the metaphor as 'searchlight,' and the concept understood as metaphor covering a story (in part I), the navel (in part II) and the gesture as discursive act (in part II and III), mediate in my readings of the theoretical and theatrical texts, and in the confrontations between them.

Bal's concepts help me to read texts and theatre performances for what they do. These concepts help me to interpret texts and performances in the sense of entering into their effects: how they proceed and what, as a result, they do to a reader. Bal's concepts help me to understand the meaning of both theatre performances and theoretical texts in terms of address and response. This relational character for which Bal's concepts allow, or even demand, will be important in bridging the gap between the one seeing and what is seen suggested by 'just looking.'

Bal also inspired my use of the term 'reading' to describe seeing as an activity of which what we think we see is the effect. Seeing as reading represents a first step towards an understanding of 'just looking' as the effect of some kind of interpretation that results from the way bodies process perceptions against the backdrop of a frame of reference. The nature of this process is the central question of this study.

**Dissecting Visuality in the Theatre (2) > Performing Analysis** — The theatre performances that I have chosen to be my theoretical objects all present critical engagements with questions of visuality. This is the second reason why my project is titled *Dissecting Visuality in the Theatre*: it presents an account of such 'dissections' as they have actually taken place in the Dutch and Flemish theatre of the '80s and '90s of the 20th century.

In their own way, these performances raise questions and propose answers concerning what is at stake in seeing, how we see what we see and in what way bodies might be involved in seeing. Often, these performances are quite explicit about their status as a theatrical sign. Many of these performances use retheatricalization as a strategy to expose the relation between what is seen and the bodies involved in seeing it as such. These
theatre performances also contain self-critical reflections on the semiotic habits that make up the discourse of the theatre. In *The Man Who*, for example, no attempts are made to conceal the fact that the same actor embodies different patients or that the actor represents the patient rather than being one. Consequently, the performance as a whole seems to double the explanatory gestures of the doctor represented within the individual scenes. This doubling turns the explanatory gestures of the doctor into a set of revealing gestures which show the truth-speak of medical discourse to be a particular type of performance rather than objective observation of 'how things are.' At the same time, the reality of the actor (as distinguished from the character represented) is shown to be part of the discursive argument presented by the performance, rather than a 'real' or 'authentic' presence. The performance can thus be read as an argument about making meaning in the theatre as well.

I call these theatre pieces 'theatre performances' instead of either 'theatre' or 'performance.' In doing so, I choose to combine two terms that for a long time have been (and sometimes still are) considered to be opposites, even antagonists. I choose to do so to describe a theatre practice where this opposition is no longer productive. On the contrary, reiterating this opposition seems to get in the way of understanding how, in much Western European theatre of the last decades, the influences of performance have been incorporated to a point where this has changed the whole notion of theatre.

Theatre makers and groups like Jan Fabre, Fura dels Baus, Raffaello Sanzio, Forced Entertainment, Hollandia, and the Needcompany, among others, combine strategies originating from theatre and performance with dance, visual arts and music to move beyond the borders of what once used to be separate disciplines. In the Dutch and Flemish theatre context, border crossing events have moved from the margin to the center of today's theatre practice. More than once, creations of choreographer Alain Platel ended up in the selection of the yearly Dutch and Flemish theatre festival. Theatre director Gerardijn Rijnders, from the leading Dutch theatre company Toneelgroep Amsterdam, worked with the Dutch National Ballet for his staging of Aeschylus' *Bacchae* (1986). Rijnders' successor, Ivo van Hove, is in the process of inviting choreographers Wim Vandekeybus and Emio Greco, as well as visual artist Aernout Mik, to work with his company of actors. Theatre groups like Hollandia and Onafhankelijk Toneel have a long history of collaboration with choreographers, composers and visual artists.

But even in those cases in which theatre performances are not explicitly conceived of as border crossing events, profound changes can be observed in the ways they are being constructed. Many theatre makers no longer work with pre-existing texts. Instead, texts are improvised or collected during the rehearsal period. If drama texts are used at all, they are often taken as starting points for the personal journey of makers who transform them freely. Hans-Thies Lehmann describes this development beautifully
when he refers to the transition from a logocentric way of structuring theatre performances by means of drama towards what he calls ‘textual landscapes’ (Lehmann 1997: 59). By using this term, Lehmann wants to evoke both Gertrude Stein’s notion of landscape play and Derrida’s notion of espace-ment.

The transition from drama to textual landscapes does not only result in profound changes in the type of texts used in the theatre and the ways in which they are structured. This transition also involves profound changes in the status of the text within the composition of theatre performance. Lehmann speaks of a change in the aesthetic logic that underlies the constellation of the various elements that together make up what he calls the ‘architecture’ of the theatre. Text loses its dominant position, as a result of which the status of other elements changes as well.

In his Postdramatisches Theater (1999), Hans-Thies Lehmann introduces a comparison of drama with perspective in painting to describe these developments in terms of the breakdown of unitary perspective. In dramatic theatre, the structure of the drama guides the audience, directs their attention and helps them to read what is seen in the right way. On the post-dramatic stage, such perspective is broken, perverted or completely absent. As a result, the audience is granted more freedom to ‘wander around,’ and is often left confused.

The theatre performances I have called my theoretical objects are representative of this development in the sense that none of them offers a conventional staging of a drama text. Artifact (William Forsythe, 1984) is a ballet constructed around words. Double Track (Beppie Blankert, 1986/99), Looking for Peter (Gonnie Heggen, 1996) and When You See God, Tell Him (Itzik Galili, 1995) also make use of words in combination with dance and music, and like Artifact, they were created by choreographers. Holoman; Digital Cadaver (Mike Tyler, 1997/98) combines elements of performance with digital projections, poetic texts and live music. Bas en Elze Dansen (Cas Enklaar and Els Ingeborg Smits, 1996) and De Zieleweg van de Danser (Gerardjan Rijnders and Krisztina de Châtel, 1997) are closer to more conventional types of theatre, in the sense that they present actors performing characters within a fictional situation, yet they do so in a way that turns this situation into a self-reflexive commentary on making theatre and addressing the audience. Explosion of a Memory/Description of a Picture (Stefan Kunzmann, 1997) is the only one of my theoretical objects that does consist of a staged text written by a dramatist (Heiner Müller’s Bildbeschreibung, 1984). It is a rather unconventional staging, however, since it is a staging without actors. It is an installation that turns the audience into its performers.

Although representative in one way, in many other ways my selection is not representative of what was presented on Dutch and Flemish stages during the ‘80s and the ‘90s. Nor is my selection intended to be so. I did not select these theatre performances as typical examples of what the audience was
confronted with during the final decades of the 20th century. I selected them because of their qualities as self-reflexive engagements with the topic with which I am concerned: dissecting visuality in the theatre.

**Perspective** — Lehmann’s comparison of drama with perspective brings to mind a history of producing vision and theorizing it. But the visions produced by perspective always involve more than what is ‘there to be seen.’ A brief look at the entry on perspective in the dictionary suffices to illustrate how the notion of perspective, far from being merely a technique of making images, is intricately intertwined with ideas, ideals and ideology.

The word ‘perspective,’ according to the *OED*, is used to refer to the science of optics or the instruments used in performing this science, like a spyglass, a magnifying glass or a telescope. It may also apply to cases where “the art of delineating solid objects upon a plane surface produces the same impression of apparent relative positions and magnitudes, or of distance, as do the actual objects when viewed from a particular point,” or “the appearance presented by visible objects, in regard to relative position, apparent distance etc” (606). Perspective can thus mean something perceived or discovered in the ‘natural’ world, as well as a technical means of making such a discovery. Perspective can be used to refer to the technique used to produce such a vision artificially, but also to the vision presented by this technique.

Perspective is used to describe something actually seen, as well as “the relation of proportion in which the parts of a subject are viewed by the mind; the aspect of a matter or object of thought, as perceived from a particular mental ‘point of view’” (606). And finally, perspective can refer to either something ‘natural,’ ‘as it really is,’ or to “a picture so contrived as seemingly to enlarge or extend the actual space, as in a stage scene, or to give the effect of distance,” or even to describe “a picture of figure constructed so as to produce some fantastic effect; e.g. appear distorted or confused except from one particular point of view, or presenting totally different aspects from different points of view” (606).

Perspective presents an image of how these different uses are intertwined in the way the concept is used. ‘Get things in perspective’ is used as a metaphor to describe seeing things in their true relative proportion. Which is actually an odd metaphor since getting the ‘right’ size, is precisely what perspective falsifies. In a perspectival drawing, this distortion is performed in order to give *the illusion* of these true proportions as they would appear from a particular point of view.

Exactly for this reason, the concept perspective can serve as a pointer that draws attention to how seeing things in their ‘true’ proportions does not result from a technique that shows us the world as it really is, but is rather the effect of the invisible logic at work in an image and the address presented by this logic to someone viewing the image. Understood as a
conceptual metaphor, perspective can help to expose how knowledge and expectations play a part in seeing things in their 'true relative proportion.' Used in this way, perspective can help us to become aware of the ways in which knowledge and expectations make us see these distortions presented by a particular perspective as a manifestation of truth, nature and beauty. Thus, perspective can serve as an indicator of how seeing is actually 'seeing things.'

In this study, I will use perspective as a model, a conceptual metaphor or 'searchlight' (Bal 1994: 40) to help me 'see' vision as it takes place in the theatre anew. The conceptual metaphor as a searchlight presents an alternative to notions of concepts as a ready-made mould, matrix, model or pattern that automatically yields accurate descriptions of an object or a conception of concepts that grants the theorist a safe position outside, detached from where he or she can see the world 'as it is.' To understand concepts as metaphors implies a different way of doing theory, one that Bal describes a 'theoretical practice' of rubbing of two forms of language use against each other to change both (Bal 1994: 44).

A 'theoretical practice' as proposed by Bal allows me to take a concept as vaguely defined, complex and varied as perspective for my point of departure, and to explore its implications and its functioning in the discursive practices in and through which we make sense of the world surrounding us, along the way. This way of doing theory also means a shift in attention to how key terms are ultimately more important for their function within intellectual practices than they are for what they may be said to 'mean' in the abstract. Such a theoretical practice does not aim at universal truths that help to predict, explain or generalize and in doing so confirms the position of the observer at a safe distance. Such a theoretical practice is a way to develop an eye for differences as well as for how these differences are related to points of view.

**Content** — In chapter 1, "The Paradox of Post-Dramatic Subjectivity," I use perspective as a conceptual metaphor as a means of taking a closer look at the implications of Lehmann's comparison of drama with perspective and its implications for understanding vision in both the dramatic and the post-dramatic theatre. In chapter 2, "'Do You See What I Mean?' > Artifact and the Subject of Vision," I introduce the concepts of focalization and subject of vision to inscribe perspective into a subjective account of experience and meaning production in the theatre. In chapter 3, "De-Theatricalizing Beholding in the Name of Truth, Nature and Beauty," I introduce the conceptual pair theatricality and absorption in order to describe the effects of interaction between the address presented by the theatre performance and the response of someone seeing. I also introduce a triangular model that allows for an analysis of vision in the theatre in terms of interaction between three subject positions: the one seeing as subject, the subject seen and the subject.
of vision mediating between the two. In chapter 4, "Being Where > Walking the Landscape Stage," I use this model for an analysis of positioning as it takes place on the post-dramatic stage.

In this first part, the focus is on theories of the theatre and on showing that what appears to be 'just looking' in the theatre is actually the effect of the perspective presented by the 'architecture' of the theatrical event. Part II includes a further exploration of the relationship between what is seen in 'just looking' and the subject involved in seeing it as such. In chapter 5, "'How Can We See the Dancer from the Dance': Navel Gazing as Critical Practice," I confront Bas en Elze Dansen (Cas Enklaar and Els Ingeborg Smits) with Roland Barthes' Camera Lucida (1993) to expose similarities between the subjective perspective involved in 'just looking' in both Barthes and in the theatre. In the chapters that follow, I continue this approach with Looking for Peter (Gonnie Heggen) and psychoanalytic accounts of gender, and The Path of the Dancer's Soul (Gerardjan Rijnders and Krisztina de Châtel) and the Lacanian mirror stage.

In the first two chapters of part III, I focus on the disembodied character of this subjective point of view. I confront Lacan’s mirror stage essay with Holoman: Digital Cadaver (Mike Tyler) and Double Track (Beppie Blankert), to show the disembodied point of view to be a product of cultural practices rather than a 'natural' given. In the final chapter, I read Deleuze and Guattari's What is Philosophy? (1994) through When You See God, Tell Him (Itzik Galili), to open onto an alternative approach to what we think we see as the product of a body involved in theatre events through various sense systems simultaneously.

Dissecting Visuality in the Theatre (3) > The Seer — To dissect is to cut into pieces, to examine part by part, to analyze and to criticize in detail. In its medical sense, dissection is the methodical division of a human or animal body to show its parts and structure and to investigate its morphology. Once one method among many others, dissection has become the model of scientific investigation as a practice concerned with producing objective visions of the world 'as it is.' Visions, that is, cut loose from the subjective point of view of a particular observer.10

With dissecting visuality in the theatre, I propose a deconstructive reversal of this movement. The object under dissection here is not some body but visuality, the state or quality of being visible or being visual. My 'dissection' does not aim at making this visuality visible as what it is 'in itself,' independent of any specific point of view, but to demonstrate that visuality does not exist as such. My aim is to expose how visuality consists of an intricate intertwining of the one seeing and what is seen as a result of which we always see more, and always see less, than what is there to be seen.
To denote this one doing the seeing in the theatre I propose the term 'seer.' I am aware that this is a rather unusual choice of terminology. A more obvious choice would have been to speak of the 'spectator.' The disadvantage of the word 'spectator' is that it has come to be associated with passivity, the onlooker at a spectacle, gaping at the given to be seen. For Crary, this is reason enough to propose 'observer' instead, a word with which he wants to stress how the one who is seeing is always doing so from within a prescribed set of possibilities, one who is embedded in a system of conventions and limitations (Crary 1992: 5–6). Crary's approach proves to be most useful in describing how this 'observer' and his or her ways of seeing are the product of cultural practices that condition how this person will see. This helps to understand why learning to see is, as Peggy Phelan terms it, "training careful blindness" (Phelan 1993: 13). We always see less than is there.

But with this term 'seer,' I want to point to the opposite as well. We also always see more than is there. The term 'seer' apart from meaning "the one who sees" and "an overseer, an inspector," is also associated with insight, revelations, prophecy, second sight and magic.\(^1\) The seer is someone who sees things that are not there: future things, absent things. Seeing always involves projections, fantasies, desire and fears, and might be closer to hallucinating than we think.

With the term seer, I acknowledge that there is no way of opening our eyes to what is actually there to be seen. We are always 'seeing things.' But, although we are much less free in what we see than we may think, we are also much freer than we think, because the subjectivity of vision opens up the possibility of change and transformation. The term 'seer' is an acknowledgement of the fact that we always see more or less than what is there and that, therefore, seeing is always affected by with ideals, values, presuppositions, fears and desires. These factors do not necessarily match our own, nor those of the ones we see. But the term 'seer' is also an acknowledgement of the possibility of opening our eyes to difference.\(^12\)

---


4. For a discussion of the terms vision, visually and scopic regime and the way they are related, see Hal Foster's Vision and Visuality. Dia Art Foundation. Discussions in Contemporary Culture Number 2. Seattle: Bay Press 1988. In the introduction, Foster explains that although vision might suggest sight as a physical operation and visuality sight as a social fact, the two are not opposed as nature to culture:
vision is social and historical too, and visuality involves the body and the psyche. Yet neither are they identical: here, the difference between the terms signals a difference within the visual – between the mechanism of sight and its historical techniques, between the datum of vision and its discursive determinations – a difference, many differences, among how we see, how we are able, allowed, or made to see, and how we see this seeing or the unseen therein. With its own rhetoric and representation, each scopic regime seeks to close out these differences: to make of its many social visualities one essential vision, or to order them in a natural hierarchy of sight (ix).


5 – My use of the term ‘theoretical object’ is based on how this term was introduced to me by Mieke Bal in the ASCA Theory Seminar. See Bal’s Quoting Caravaggio: Contemporary Art, Preposterous History. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.


7 – A closer look at my selection of theatre performances will reveal that not all of these were made by Dutch or Flemish artists, nor that they were necessarily produced in the Netherlands or Flanders. With ‘Dutch and Flemish theatre,’ I refer to a specific theatre scene as an open and dynamic place of interaction where artists originating from various countries are working or showing their work. This place is in a constant state of transformation, a development that takes place as a consequence of the development of the artists working within this scene, but also as the effect of work of artists from abroad shown over here. William Forsythe’s Artifact for example, was created in Frankfurt (Germany), and first shown in the Netherlands in the 1987 Holland Festival, where it attracted much attention. Included in the repertoire of the Dutch National Ballet in 1993 it has been performed in the Netherlands many times since.

8 – Since the beginning of the 20th century, artists as diverse as Meyerhold, Brecht and Copeau have called for the retheatricalization of theatre as a place of artifice, and the re-establishment of theatrical reality as a more productive way of representing social life than naturalism. Retheatricalization aims at highlighting the rules and conventions of the stage. Brecht conceived of retheatricalization as a better way of depicting social reality, exposing its construction and this way denaturalizing it. See Patrice Pavis Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press 1998, 395; Erika Fischer-Lichte The Show and the Gaze of Theatre: A European Perspective. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press 1997; and Hans-Thies Lehmann Postdramatisches Theater. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Autoren 1999.


12 Deleuze called Foucault a ‘seer’ [voyant] in the sense that Foucault was seeing things that were not seen; Things that were invisible but not hidden. They are invisible in the visible. (“An interview with Gilles Deleuze,” History of the Present, Spring 1986: 1). John Rajchman discusses Foucault as a seer in “Foucault’s Art of Seeing” (John Rajchman. Philosophical Events of the ’80s. New York: Columbia University Press 1991, 68–102).