

# Dramaturgies of Memory: Generative Procedures in the Theatre of Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frljić, and Robert Lepage

*Tomaž Toporišič*

Academy of Theatre, Radio, Film and Television, University of Ljubljana, Trubarjeva 3, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
Email: [tomaz.toporiscic@agrft.uni-lj.si](mailto:tomaz.toporiscic@agrft.uni-lj.si)

The article examines the artistic approaches of three major contemporary theatre makers – Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frljić, and Robert Lepage – whose intercultural backgrounds shape their work. It explores how they challenge the tension between official historical narratives and fragile, subjective personal memory. Drawing on the legacy of ‘memory-theatre’ developed by figures such as Samuel Beckett, Heiner Müller, Ariane Mnouchkine, Hélène Cixous, and Thomas Bernhard, these artists treat memory as a fluid, evolving construct made of texts, images, and narratives. Through this, they create performances in which the real intrudes upon representation, revealing memory as unstable, porous, and politically charged.

KEYWORDS: contemporary theatre, historical narratives, Oliver Frljić, Wajdi Mouawad, Robert Lepage

## Introduction: Theatricalisation of Memory

This article deals with the artistic procedures of three outstanding contemporary theatre directors and authors within memory-oriented performance practices: Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frljić, and Robert Lepage.<sup>1</sup> They highlight a key paradox of contemporary society: the tension between official narratives and personal memory, especially the fluid and unstable nature of individual recollection. This study begins with the hypothesis that the theatricalisation of memory discourse created highly relevant theatrical performances and concepts that are reworking the methods of well-known dramatic and theatrical methods tactics of their predecessors like Heiner Müller, Ariane Mnouchkine and Hélène Cixous. The artists discussed in the paper use memories as a material with which they produce specific fiction-faction effects through which they stage a distinct irruption of the real.

During the latest decades, memory studies have become an important field within performance studies, stressed in numerous monographs and readers devoted to the aspects of collective, personal and other memories. In the introduction to *History, Memory, Performance*, one of the most intriguing readers in this field, David Dean, Yana Meerzon, and Kathryn Prince underline:

Theatre practitioners and scholars have long (perhaps always) been concerned with the relationships between the real and the fictional, from Aristotle’s musings on mimesis

<sup>1</sup> The article was written in the framework of the research programme ‘Theatre and Interart Studies’ (P6-0376), co-financed by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency.

to Denis Diderot's concern with the actor's ability to elicit genuine emotion in an audience by feigning it himself. Through a variety of theatrical genres, notably verbatim, documentary, and autobiography, theatre has explored the possibilities and challenges of performances grounded in real events in the actual past.<sup>2</sup>

In his book *Performing Histories*, Freddie Rokem elaborates this exploration as a specific way in which actors can connect history and present time. Thus, they become a kind of historian, what I call a 'hyper-historian', who makes it possible for us – even in cases where the re-enacted events are not fully acceptable for the academic historian as a 'scientific' representation of that past – to recognize that the actor is 'redoing' or 'reappearing' as something/somebody that has actually existed in the past.<sup>3</sup>

We cannot but agree with them and add that our concern will be with works of Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frlić, and Robert Lepage that mix the made up and documentation. As readers and the spectators, we are (just as in, for example *Incendies*, *Damned Be the Traitor of His Homeland*, or *887*) witnessing the interchanges of the past and the present. The performances discussed produce specific temporality that is heterochronic and produce the artistic examination of the themes of time and memory. They see memory as a phenomenon that is highly personal but also re-defined by a history. Their performances thus connect history with the present and the future. This connection is emphasised by a combination of verbal and non-verbal signs in new entities.

### **Mouawad and Inner Theatre as a Memory**

Let us take Wajdi Mouawad, a Lebanese-Québécois playwright, novelist, and theatre director, a typical alter modernist artist as cultural nomad, as the first example. He was born in Lebanon, grew up in Beirut and Paris, immigrated to Montreal, Canada, where he founded various institutions, and today is the head of Théâtre de la Colline in Paris. In *Incendies* (2004)<sup>4</sup> he tells us the story of a twin brother and sister who set out to unravel the enigma of their mother's past and the quiet that defined her final years. As Yana Meerzoon points out in her essay 'Staging Memory in Wajdi Mouawad's *Incendies*: Archaeological Site or Poetic Venue',

A contemporary re-telling of the Oedipus myth, the play examines what kind of cultural, collective, and individual memories inform the journeys of its characters, who are exilic children. The play serves Mouawad as a public platform to stage the testimony of his childhood trauma: the trauma of war.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *History, Memory, Performance* 2014: 2.

<sup>3</sup> Rokem 2000: 13.

<sup>4</sup> The original 2004 stage play *Incendies* was written and directed by Wajdi Mouawad and produced for the Théâtre de Quat'Sous in Montreal. This renowned French-language theatrical work was adapted into the 2010 film by Denis Villeneuve.

<sup>5</sup> Meerzoon 2013: 1.

The performance shows us how the memory of past people and events makes us afraid, how it shapes the space around us. How artists shaped by exile in the previous generation often seek to move beyond the limits of post-memory – a blend of inherited, fragmented recollections and imagined pasts shaped by family narratives – by projecting their own exilic imagination onto the cultural landscape of their adopted home. In this context, Mouawad engages the symbolic language of *mise-en-scène* to reach beyond these inherited constraints. For the writer and director, *Incendies* thus became a public platform to stage the testimony of his child, a type of memory that allows ‘the intra-generational horizontal identification’,<sup>6</sup> and is often located in the families’ ‘objects, images, and documents, in fragments and traces of the past lost to eternity.’<sup>7</sup>

Using the devices of poetic language, Mouawad elevates in his specific tactics of the storytelling, *mise en espace* and *mise-en-scène* his personal story to the universals of abandoned childhood in order to transform memories into a separate, almost tangible entity on stage. Using his memories he creates a new history transferring the Lebanese civil war from the zone of memories to the zone of his affiliative post-memory, a type of memory that, according to Marianne Hirsch, allows ‘the intra-generational horizontal identification’,<sup>8</sup> enabled within author’s usage of various documents: the family’s objects and images. Or, as Yana Meerzon points out, ‘in its complex plot and philosophical inquiry, the play insists on the necessity of communal memory and personal testimony. It asserts the need for telling individual stories of horror as the mechanism of collective healing.’<sup>9</sup> As we will see while discussing the work of Oliver Frljić, it is this very necessity of communal memory and personal testimony that is used to a great extent in today’s verbatim and devising theatre, enabling the actors or performers on stage to fully absorb the spectators and produce a specific post-Brechtian alienation of V-effect.

Both Frljić and Mouawad deliberately produce a specific mix using the issues of memory, history, and survival in order to get through the problems of living through past traumas and, at the same time, finding a way to creatively define one’s present. In *Incendies*, ‘the testimonial chronotope<sup>10</sup> engages with the dichotomy of dramatic past and present that unfolds simultaneously in the space of a single theatrical locale.’<sup>11</sup> What we are witnessing is a specific artistic project combining the virtual archive of the author’s memory with his insights into today’s society.

6 Hirsch 2008: 115.

7 Ibid.: 119.

8 Hirsch 2008: 115.

9 Meerzon 2013: 7.

10 Bakhtin described the literary-artistic chronotope as the site where spatial and temporal indicators fuse into a concrete whole: where time thickens and takes on flesh, and space becomes charged with the movements of time and history.

11 Meerzon 2013: 10.

Mouawad's plays and Frljić's performances can therefore be interpreted as attempts to produce 'theatrical vehicles transmitting the processes of post-memory'.<sup>12</sup> They show in which way the experience of divided self-constitutes the identity of the exilic subjects and creates a specific exilic imaginary. Alternatively, to put it in words of Yana Meerzon,

As the works of Wajdi Mouawad demonstrate, however, very often artists who are children of exile strive to overcome the confines of their post memory (a combination of the children's distorted memories and fantasies catalysed by the family narratives) and extend their own exilic imaginary to the cultural referents of their adopted land. Thus, the phenomenon of 'my nation is in my imagination', as it appears in Mouawad's theatre, is created in a dialogue with the artist's imaginary 'back-home' culture and geography.<sup>13</sup>

In *Incendies*, the dramatic landscape is shaped both by evocative images of war-ravaged Beirut and by the playwright's own recollections of the catastrophe, intertwining collective history with personal memory. His theatre becomes a theatre that blends memory, hallucination, deceptive memory, dreams, soliloquy, and the stream of immediate perceptions. Bourriaud would most probably interpret that as an alter modernistic 'valorising of connections, which establish between the text and images as special paths, which artists establish in multicultural landscapes, transitions, which they impose in order to connect the ways of expressing and communication'.<sup>14</sup> Through his theatrical, literary, and poetic strategies, Wajdi Mouawad illustrates how memories of past people and events may transform into sources of fear that structure and shape the spaces we inhabit. Thus, he produces a specific metaphor of the inner theatre, whose owner is at once actor, audience, and playwright.

### Theatre as an Attempt to Erase the Amnesia of Memory

That metaphor will take us to our second example, the Croatian-Bosnian director Oliver Frljić, who lately has been working mostly in German-speaking theatre, also in Ljubljana, Warsaw, and elsewhere. While the dramatic setting of *Incendies* is marked by the historical imagery of the war-torn Beirut and at the same time by the author's personal memory of the catastrophe, Frljić's theatre has its dramatic settings in a war-torn Bosnia and former-Yugoslavia. Within this context, he deals with both his personal and collective memory of a catastrophe. In his *Balkan Trilogy* (*Turbofolk*, 2008), *Damned Be the Traitor of His Homeland*, 2010, and *Cowardice*, 2011), Frljić stages the disintegration of Yugoslavia with its consequences as seen and interpreted in individual and collective memory. His theatre creates connections of fictions and facts.

<sup>12</sup> Hirsch and Spitze 2010: 203.

<sup>13</sup> Meerzon 2013: 20–21.

<sup>14</sup> Bourriaud 2009b: 44.

Like Mouawad, Oliver Frlić produces a space of wandering, where the author uses signs whose meanings are difficult to determine, and where the reader is invited to move between what is shown and what it might mean. The works of both authors verge on the unreal and surrealistic, in which the protagonists might be victims of illusions of the senses, products of imagination or political reality in which the fictional reality seems to be ‘controlled by laws unknown to us’. Similar to Mouawad’s work, the geography of theatre of Oliver Frlić often oscillates between the given<sup>15</sup> realities of the region, the director’s memory of it, and his interaction with the environment in which he produces his performances.

The reader is enticed to a fundamental architecture of Frlić’s theatre, in which he will meet with the narrator (or narrators-actors), not that it would enable him to either unambiguously identification or a clear distance. The meetings in the text and in theatre are nothing less intense because of it. I quote his thoughts from an interview with Duška Radosavljević:

Dramaturgically speaking the performances are made by means of creating a counterpoint between those two kinds of memory on the one hand and the collective betrayal of a particular system of values, which happened as part of the disintegration of Yugoslavia.<sup>16</sup>

As I stressed in my essay, Oliver Frlić claims that

‘we live within a field of *transcultural business*, which persistently translates the artistic actions into the logic of the possibilities of exploitation of the transpolitical, globalist economic and political lobby. It is clear to him that theatre today (just as every artistic work in the era of technical reproduction) cannot escape the social-economic-technological supremacy, which determines its aesthetic dimension.<sup>17</sup>

He thus attempts to erase the specific amnesia of memory.

### Emancipated Spectator as an Eyewitness

In the majority of his productions, Frlić uses the spectator that he activates with his directorial skills as an eyewitness who through autopoietic feedback loop (Fischer-Lichte) activates himself or herself as a secondary eyewitness, someone who follows the primary eyewitness of historical events or the testimony of them. In the performance *Kukavičluk* [Cowardice], he uses a process of eyewitnessing of the audience in order to force the spectators to accept their own ‘responsibility for what they physically experience, that is to say, what they register with their own eyes and ears’<sup>18</sup>. Frlić thus develops a distinctly personal, post-Brechtian variation of the V-effect. In this performance, he explores a specific mode of distancing that combines the spectator’s

<sup>15</sup> Todorov 1973: 25.

<sup>16</sup> Frlić 2018: n. p.

<sup>17</sup> Toporišič 2019b: 41.

<sup>18</sup> Jakiša 2016: 87.

traumatic transformation with strategies of aesthetic interruption. At its most effective, this approach seeks to generate what Jacques Rancière describes as an emancipated spectator, one who is not merely observing but actively and responsibly participating in the performance. To quote the interpretation of Jakiša,

Frljić's court theatre reverses the court's normal judicial process. The Guilty verdicts are pronounced at the beginning, whereas the presentation of the case and the hearing of witnesses take place afterwards, only to come to a halt at the end of the Srebrenica scene, where the reading-out of the charge takes place.<sup>19</sup>

A key dimension of his approach to memory studies and theatre lies in a sustained critique of nationalistic narratives. By questioning revisionist readings of political history, he demonstrates how nations actively construct collective memory in the service of homogenisation and the production of patriotic consensus. This critical stance is further reinforced through his use of documentary strategies: in works such as *25,671*, which addresses the erased in Slovenia,<sup>20</sup> he mobilises documentary theatre to foreground silenced experiences, thereby granting visibility and voice to what might be termed 'speechless memories' excluded from institutionalised remembrance.

Within the broader field of post-Yugoslav memory studies, his work assumes particular importance as it confronts the 'unwanted memories' of the wars of 1991–95. Rather than reproducing the dominant trauma paradigms, he engages in a form of memory activism that stages, questions, and destabilises inherited narratives of suffering and responsibility. In this sense, his theatre operates performatively: by deliberately provoking discomfort, deploying irony, and reiterating images of death, his performances activate what could be described as 'socially raw nerves'. Such strategies work to disrupt social amnesia and to challenge the presumed authority and fixity of memory in the Balkan context.

His notable performances in *Damned Be the Traitor of His Homeland!* and *Kukavičluk (Cowardice)* are often cited as crucial examples of navigating Yugoslav memory without relying on simple nostalgia. Drawing on Gramsci's idea of hegemony – where particular interests are presented as universal – Frljić works to disrupt the audience's automatic reception. In a provocative monologue, echoing the neo-avant-garde strategy of Peter Handke's *Offending the Audience*, an actor directly and politically incorrectly confronts spectators. As he describes it:

Through the inflation of death, through the incessant repetition of the unrepeatable to emphasise the theatre mechanism that always remains the representation of certain external realities ... The repetitions of death, which occur onstage in almost regular intervals and after which the performers 'return to life', reveals the deadlock of theatrical representational mechanisms. Precisely those mechanism for manufacturing fictions,

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.: 89.

<sup>20</sup> The performance reconstructs the erasure of 25,671 persons from the register of permanent residents of the Republic of Slovenia in 1992.

which most often remain hidden, push out any type of content-thematic frame and thus remain the only visible.<sup>21</sup>

With this, Frlijić introduces elements of the theatre of the oppressed in the tradition of Augusto Boal, bringing an exchange of roles between the performers and the audience. He thus, so to speak, forces the audience into active participation. Precisely that violent effect of reality is the point in Frlijić's theatrical or performative procedure that interests us. It is a special procedure, with the help of which the director achieves that fiction and 'faction' are not in opposition, but that with the help of the dialogical relationship, which is stressed among several different performative, textual and visual procedures, structures his theatrical 'grieving'. This approach is quite far from Mouawad's or Lepage's manoeuvring and intentional avoiding the open politics of theatre and drama. Yet despite that, the effect on the spectator is not radically different. Just as we cannot affirm that, the political range of Frlijić's theatre is larger than that of Mouawad or Lepage.

Johannes Birringer comments on this in his notes about Frlijić's production *Our Violence and Your Violence* (although in comparison to other subjects), when he writes:

It is the loudness of the affecting that turns me off. I wonder whether current dance theatre productions pursuing a more abstract spiritual technique of ritual, more subtle tonalities, are able to dig deeper, make us listen differently. And I wonder whether their withdrawal from political sensationalism can shape other awarenesses or mobilize other creative collectivities that are not whole or united and do not share the same cynical despair or political disappointment.<sup>22</sup>

However, this does not change the fact that the purpose of both Frlijić's and Mouawad's plays and theatre is the deconstruction of the postcolonial discourse of the First World or Western Europe. In her review for *Theater Heute*, the critic Eva Behrendt argues that Frlijić directs his critique not only at his explicit targets but also at another group—the supposedly 'superior' Central European theatre and cultural elite, whose craving for originality and refinement he exposes as unbearable.<sup>23</sup> However, the purpose of all the artists discussed in this chapter is the same: the deconstruction of the postcolonial discourse of the First World or Western Europe.

### **Lepage: Theatre as a Transformation of Events through the Distorting Lens of Memory**

Let us proceed to our last example. Robert Lepage's highly autobiographical multi-disciplinary performance, *887*,<sup>24</sup> inventing new artistic forms from the gathering

<sup>21</sup> Frlijić 2017: n.p.

<sup>22</sup> Birringer 2016: 642.

<sup>23</sup> Behrendt 2016: 7.

<sup>24</sup> World premiere during the Arts and Culture Festival of the 2015 Pan Am and Parapan Am Games, Toronto (Canada), 14 July 2015.

of scientists and playwrights, set painters and architects, is named after the apartment building of his childhood: 887 Avenue Murray in Quebec City. Through a gloriously intricate series of folding boxes, scale models, and video projections, the director, scenographer, writer presents the apartment building as a specific palace of material memory: a mnemonic device brought to life. He plunges us into the depths of his personal past of his early years growing up in the 1960s Quebec, questioning the underlying mechanisms and relevance of certain memories.

In 887, the narrator invites the audience to question the authenticity of Québécois collective memory. Acting as a guide, he leads them through fragments of his own recollections, shaping and connecting them while transmitting them to the audience. Marie Mendehall recognises Lepage's minor device of adopting the film technique for the theatrical performance to explore cultural memories 'through the distorting lens of personal and cultural memory'.<sup>25</sup>

The performance presents memory as fragments, and by the epilogue, the audience begins to shape these images themselves, ultimately completing the individual's Québécois identity. In this way, collective and personal memory merge within the spectator.<sup>26</sup>

The works of Lepage are largely concerned with the themes of memory, loss of memory, and identity. While revealing the historical and social realities that shaped his personal as well as his country's political identity, Lepage invites us to reflect on the nature of personal and collective memory. His performance invites the spectators to travel through his imaginatively remembered places, pieces of complex information, and theatricalised walks through memories. When describing his performance 887, Robert Lepage opens the very question of memory: he admits that he would have never guessed that the exploration of personal memory he had embarked upon to create this show would lead him to the complexities of the class struggle and identity crisis of Québec of the 1960s:

It's as though the most distant memories of personal events are incomplete if they don't take into account the social context in which they happened. This show is, therefore, not the discourse of an adult promoting a cause but rather a journey into a pre-adolescent's memory, where the political and the poetic are often conflated.<sup>27</sup>

In 887 Lepage uses video projection as a technology of memory to show us the extent contemporary technology is externalising memory and producing pitfalls and limitations, thus linking memory to the politics of visual and mediated language. In his performances, Lepage reflects a special dialectic of art and social,

<sup>25</sup> Mendehall 2001: 102.

<sup>26</sup> This topic is elaborated on in the essay 'The Direction of Memory in 887: Collective Memory and the Construction of Québécois Identity' written by Mitsuko Sumida. *Bull. Hiroshima Inst. Tech. Research* Vol. 56, 2022: 19–28.

<sup>27</sup> Rickard 2018: n. p.

within which fluid, uncontrollable subjects constantly change the contours. He shows us that artists can steer contemporary theatre and drama through the complexities of the discourse and societal reality of neoliberalism.

For Lepage when creating a memory in our society that ‘has lost its oral memory’, we have to rely ‘more and more on written or visual documents to immortalise the past, to store the things we remember, our history.’ According to him ‘our memory does not function anymore because it no longer has to make the effort to store things.’ He sees one of the most crucial roles of art in today’s society in its ‘ability to recount events through the imperfections of our memories. [...] What really counts is how we transform events through the distorting lens of memory. It’s the blurred, invented aspects of storytelling that give it its beauty and greatness.’<sup>28</sup> In order to create one has to be a mythomaniac, have an ability to give large dimensions to stories you hear or invent, ‘transform them to legends and myths.’<sup>29</sup>

Art is thus not about reconstructing the reality of the past but about giving the past a possibility to produce personalised artistic memories producing plurality of narratives. By means of mediated theatre, in 887 Lepage narrates his own story, telling who he is and at the same time inviting and involving audiences in his own past and present. Memory thus produces changes in our perception of today’s reality. He uses theatre for a specific performative storytelling using a non-linear, multiple narrative commenting on a pluralistic cultural identity of today’s world.

Remembering the past and dealing with the trauma constitute an important narrative in Lepage’s theatre. Within his specific theatrical medium, he creates syncretic genres in which prose and theatre can dialogically join other genres and create a cohesive intertextual, inter-genre, and even inter-media structure. While his theatre is implicitly political, he nevertheless (in procedures that are not far from those of Mouawad) intuitively introduces ‘the ultimate Facebook of the undead of its own unhappy century.’<sup>30</sup> Alternatively, something that could be described as the violent effect of reality.

He creates a unique, hybrid form that blends epic theatre with other genres and media into a cohesive whole. These elements interact and reshape one another at both the story and structural levels. The result is a kind of a meta-genre that pushes beyond familiar boundaries, forming an open, ever-evolving theatrical hybrid. At its core, however, Lepage’s work remains narrative and rooted in post-Brechtian epic theatre, often carrying a subtle, melancholic echo of Balzac’s *La Comédie humaine*.

<sup>28</sup> Lepage 1997: 20.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid: 19.

<sup>30</sup> Elsaesser 2014: 35.

## Conclusion: From Continuity to Discontinuity of Memory

As we have seen in the cases discussed, contemporary drama and theatre often engage with memory, despite the apparent absolutism of the present that it repeatedly represents. However, memory is no longer treated as continuity in the sense articulated by Saint Augustine in his *Confessions*. Instead, it is approached as discontinuity: exemplified by Beckettian characters whose memory deconstructs the very validity of remembering. Our aim was to reveal and analyse examples of contemporary theatre. Through these, we outlined the transformations of theatre and performance dealing with memory and remembrance: from uncertainty and erasure of memory in later works of Robert Lepage, through the explorations of memory and both personal and collective identity in the performances of Oliver Frljić, to the post-dramatic juxtapositions of collective memory of recent history and the present in Wajdi Mouawad's dramatic texts.

These artists explore a dynamic relationship between art and society, where shifting, unstable subjects continually reshape the field. Influenced by Deleuze, they treat reality not as something to discover, but as something to create. For them, creation also involves destruction: art must transcend fixed identities and what we can easily understand. As a result, the reality that their works present exceeds both what we know and what we could fully know. They all 'believe that some complete views of reality can only be expressed through acts of creative experimentation. They show that they can steer contemporary theatre and literature through the complexities of the discourse and societal reality of neoliberalism, also in the era of terrorism.'<sup>31</sup>

As stated in our presentation at EASTAP II Conference in Lissabon on Shared Memory(ies),

While exhibiting a strong preoccupation with questions of memory Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frljić and Robert Lepage use structures of repetition, conflation, regression, echoing, and simultaneity that perplex the reader and spectator. While evoking the memories of individual and collective pasts, their plays and performances reopen tabooed discourses and thus bring to the politics of memory a new engagement targeting the audience with a specific technique of the dialogue between the creation and loss of memories on both sides: that of the authors and the spectators or readers.<sup>32</sup>

They establish a contrast between these two forms of memory and, on the other hand, the collective betrayal of a particular system of values characteristic of today's neo-colonial and neoliberal societies. Their exploration of the personal often leads

<sup>31</sup> Toporišič 2019a: 125.

<sup>32</sup> Toporišič 2019: 117.

them into the complexities of political history and the present, as if even the most distant personal memories remain incomplete without considering the broader context in which they occurred.

The artists discussed create their works for readers and spectators who possess the ability to engage with and interpret them thoughtfully. ‘They all play with the readers or the spectators a specific performative hide-and-seek game with contemporary civilisation, which recalls the themes of history in order to speak about the present and, depending upon the desires and projections of the reader/spectator, perhaps also of the future.’<sup>33</sup> Through repetition, they invite the reader or spectator to take an active, shared role in shaping the meaning of the text or performance, much like in Italo Calvino work.

Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frlić and Robert Lepage ‘destroy the reader or spectator’s horizon of expectation, and simultaneously they play with Wolfgang Iser’s implied reader.’<sup>34</sup> Their post-dramatic memory theatre mixes conflicting styles and ideas that shift in sudden, sometimes confusing ways. While each work approaches memory differently, they all share a sense of a troubled and traumatic relationship to the past.

Received 22 March 2026

Accepted 22 April 2026

## Bibliography

1. Augustine of Hippo. *Confessions*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford University Press, 1998.
2. Behrendt, E. Was hat das mit mir zu tun? Arpad Schilling, Oliver Frlić und Andras Dömötör kommentieren in Wien und Berlin Europas Ruck nach rechts. *Theater Heute*. August/September. 2016. 8: 4–9.
3. Bertin, R. Maudit soit le traître à sa patrie! Théâtre extrême. *Jeu*, 1. Jun., [www.revuejeu.org/critiques/raymond-bertin/fta-maudit-soit-le-traite-a-sa-patrie-theatre-extreme](http://www.revuejeu.org/critiques/raymond-bertin/fta-maudit-soit-le-traite-a-sa-patrie-theatre-extreme). 2012.
4. Birringer, J. Really Actually Windy: On Environments, Technologies, and Dividual Performances. *Theatre Journal*. 2016. 68(4): 633–647.
5. Bourriaud, N. Altermodern. In *Altermodern: Tate Triennial*. 11–23. London: Tate Publishing, 2009a.
6. Bourriaud, N. *The Radicant*. New York: Lucas & Sternberg, 2009b.
7. Dundjerovic, A. *The Cinema of Robert Lepage: The Poetics of Memory*. London: Wallflower Press, 2003.
8. Elsaesser, T. Contingency and Coincidence as the Ruins of Time: Text, Image and Motion in W. G. Sebald’s *The Rings of Saturn*. *Primerjalna književnost*. 2014. 37(2): 25–37.
9. Frlić, O.; Šeparović, B.; Toporišič, T. On theatre corpses. *Mladinsko Theatre*. 2017. <https://mladinsko.com/en/program/19/damned-be-the-traitor-of-his-homeland/>
10. Frlić, O. Oliver Frlić interviewed by Duška Radosavljević. *Interventions* 28.2. Part of *Contemporary Theatre Review*. 2018. June. <https://www.contemporarytheatrereview.org/2018/oliver-frljic-interviewed-by-duska-radosavljevic/>
11. Gibbons, A. Altermodernist Fiction. In *Routledge Companion to Experimental Literature*. J. Bray, A. Gibbons, B. McHale (eds.). London: Routledge, 2012. 238–252.
12. *History, Memory, Performance* (Studies in International Performance). D. Dean, Y. Meerzon, K. Prince (eds.). Palgrave: Macmillan, 2014.

<sup>33</sup> Toporišič 2019a: 124.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

13. Hirsch, Marianne. The Generation of Postmemory. *Poetics Today*. 2008. 29(1): 103–28.
14. Hirsch, M.; Spitzer, L. *Ghosts of Home. The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
15. Jakiša, M. The Evidence of Srebrenica: Oliver Frlić's Theater Court in Cowardice. In *Post-Yugoslav Constellations: Archive, Memory, and Trauma in Contemporary in Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian Literature and Culture*. V. Beronja, S. Vervaet (eds.). Berlin: De Gruyter. 2016. 83–98.
16. Lehmann, H. T. The Political in the Postdramatic. *Maska*, 2002. 17, ¾: 64–67.
17. Lepage, R. *Connecting Flights – In Conversation with Rémy Chaiest*. London: Methuen, 1997.
18. Meerzon, Y. Staging Memory in Wajdi Mouawad's Incendies: Archaeological Site or Poetic Venue? *Theatre Research in Canada/Recherches théâtrales Au Canada*. 2013. 34(1). <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/TRIC/article/view/21195>
19. Mendehall, M. Through the Lens of Robert Lepage: Special Effects in Theater and Film West Virginia University Philological Papers. 2001. 96–102.
20. Rickard, H. Robert Lepage's 887: Or, How Does Memory Work? *Walker Art Magazine*: Fourth Wall. 2018. Mar 29. <https://walkerart.org/magazine/robert-lepages-887-or-how-does-memory-work>
21. Robertson, R. Glocalization: Time – Space and Homogeneity – Heterogeneity. In *Global Modernities*. M. Featherstone et al. (eds.). London: Sage Publications. 1995. 25–44.
22. Rokem, F. *Performing History: Theatrical Representations of the Past in Contemporary Theatre*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2000.
23. Todorov, T. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Trans. Richard Howard. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press, 1973.
24. Toporišič, T. Pet vprašanj za Oliverja Frlića = Pet pitanja za Olivera Frlića. *Gledališki list Slovenskega mladinskega gledališča in Hrvaškega narodnega gledališča Ivana pl. Zajca Reka – sezona 2016/2017*. 2016. (1): 4–6.
25. Toporišič, T. Memory as a generator of specific dramaturgical procedures in the theatre of Wajdi Mouawad, Oliver Frlić and Robert Lepage. I: *Shared memories: creation, research and politics in the European contemporary stage*: EASTAP II conference, Lisbon, 23–25 September 2019: 117.
26. Toporišič, T. Negotiating the discursive circulation of (miss) information in the face of global uncertainties. In: *Ideology in the 20th century [Elektronski vir]: studies of literary and social discourses and practices*. Koper: Založba Univerze na Primorskem, 2019b.
27. Toporišič, T. Death and violence in contemporary theatre, drama, and novel (O. Frlić, A. Hilling, S. Semenič, G. W. Sebald). In: *Meno istorija ir kritika = Art history & criticism*. 2019a. 15(1): 117–129.

*Tomaz Toporišič*

## Atminties dramaturgijos: kūrybinės procedūros Wajdi Mouawado, Oliverio Frljičiaus ir Roberto Lepage'o teatre

### Santrauka

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjama, kaip, remdamiesi savo tarpkultūrinėmis patirtimis, Wajdi Mouawadas, Oliveris Frljičius ir Robertas Lepage'as kvestionuoja įtampą tarp oficialiosios istorijos ir asmeninės atminties. Teigiama, kad visi trys menininkai atmintį suvokia ne kaip nekintamą praeities fiksavimą, o kaip konstruojamą procesą, kurį formuoja pasakojimai, vaizdai ir tekstų fragmentai. Jų kūriniai atskleidžia, kad atmintis iš esmės yra nestabili ir turinti politinį krūvį. Tai nuolat perrašomas reiškinys, priklausantis nuo požiūrio, perspektyvos pokyčių ir kultūrinio konteksto. Pateikiamos fragmentiškos ar ginčytinos istorijos rodo, kad vyraujantys istoriniai naratyvai dažnai prieštarauja asmeniniams ar marginalizuotų žmonių prisiminimams. Tokiame teatro kontekste tikrovė dažnai sutrikdo pačią vaidavimo formą, drumsdama ribas tarp dokumentikos ir vaizduotės. Analizė rodo, jog tarpkultūriškumas W. Mouawadui, O. Frljičiui ir R. Lepage'ui yra ne tik teminė problema, bet ir metodologinė priemonė, kuria kvestionuojamos dominuojančios istorijos versijos. Jų teatras tampa erdve, kurioje atmintis yra svarstoma, ginčijama ir pertvarkoma, taip pabrėžiant jos kaip meninio ir politinio veiksmo vaidmenį.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: šiuolaikinis teatras, istorinis naratyvas, Oliver Frljić, Wajdi Mouawad, Robert Lepage