

ORIGINALNI NAUČNI RAD

DOI: 10.5937/reci2518114S

UDC: 82.09-2

792.2.091

orcid.org/0000-0003-2217-1559

Mozhdeh Sameti*

Doctoral School of Literature

University of Szeged, Hungary

CLOSET DRAMA AND STAGE FRIGHT: DIEGETIC AND MIMETIC TARGETS OF ATTENTION

Abstract: This paper reconsiders the tension between mimesis (imitation) and diegesis (narrativity) in the history of drama through the lens of closet drama and its relation to *stage fright*: a cognitive displacement of theatrical attention from the visible stage to the imaginative sphere. Traditionally, drama has been defined as a mimetic genre oriented toward theatrical performance, while narrativity has been regarded merely as a secondary device for unstageable events. However, from Plato's dialogues and Seneca's rhetorical tragedies to the Romantic and modern closet dramas, the genre has demonstrated that speech and narration can themselves constitute a dramatic world. Building on Martin Puchner's notion of stage fright, this paper argues that closet drama does not signify a retreat from the stage but a reconfiguration of attention. By replacing immediate with delayed perception, diegetic closet drama activates the audience's imagination through techniques such as messenger reports, descriptive stage directions, deliberate concealments, and Brechtian alienation effects. These strategies continuously redirect attention between showing and telling, generating a heightened responsiveness that rivals mimetic theatre. Ultimately, the paper contends that in modernity it is not diegetic closet drama that suffers from stage fright, but mimetic theatre itself, which fears the superior attentional power of diegesis.

* mjd.sameti@gmail.com

Key words: modern drama, diegesis, mimesis, audience attention, narrative drama.

Introduction

In its classical definition, drama is understood as a literary genre written for performance on stage. Although this definition is widely accepted, it remains overly general and insufficiently sensitive to the historical and theoretical diversity of dramatic forms—particularly those not intended for performance. When a drama is not designed for the stage, its representational mode necessarily shifts: it ceases to show and instead tells. The theatrical world is no longer realized through embodied enactment but through verbal imagination. Such a mode of dramatic construction challenges the Aristotelian paradigm that grounds drama in mimesis—the act of showing—and regards diegesis—narrativity and speech—merely as a substitute for what cannot be performed.

Nevertheless, the history of theatre demonstrates that drama has not been entirely governed by mimetic principles. At various historical moments, playwrights have turned to narration and introspection to extend theatricality beyond the limits of the stage. A striking example of this tendency is the *closet drama*—a historically and theoretically contested form that redefines the experience of theatre through language and imagination rather than through performance. Its antecedents can be traced to Plato’s philosophical dialogues and Seneca’s tragedies, yet the closet drama achieved the status of a recognizable genre in the 19th century, when fundamental changes in theatrical culture transformed the relationship between drama and its audience.

As Martin Puchner observes, Georg Lukács was among the first to recognize that 19th century theatre had lost its traditional audience, and that this loss precipitated a division between drama and theatre itself:

Now seen primarily as a critic of the novel, Lukács actually started out as a scholar of drama, and his earliest critical study describes 19th century theater as suffering from an increasing loss of the audience, a process that ultimately led to a scission between drama and theater. Lukács views this loss of the audience as the result of the theater’s failure to express the modern condition. ‘Life is no longer dramatic,’ he exclaims, concluding that drama is no longer capable of speaking to a mass audience. The symptom of this dilemma, if not its solution, is the emergence of the *closet drama*, or *Buchdrama*, which has given up on the audience entirely (Puchner, 2002: 13).

In this view, the closet drama emerges not as a withdrawal from theatricality, but as a response to a new cognitive situation—a reconfiguration of how drama addresses its public. It represents a shift from a collective, sensory mode of spectatorship to an individualized, imaginative one. The absence of a physical audience and the retreat from the stage do not

abolish the theatrical encounter; rather, they internalize it within the reader's or listener's consciousness.

This transformation can be understood as a form of *stage fright*—not in the performative sense of an actor's anxiety before an audience, but as a cognitive condition within modern drama itself, reflecting an awareness of the instability and transformation of its spectatorship. The “fright” arises not from the fear of appearing before an audience, but from the absence of one. The modern drama, inheriting the legacy of the closet form, internalizes its anxiety about presence and reception, turning the stage inward and transforming representation into reflection.

Building on this premise, the present paper redefines stage fright as a cognitive rather than performative phenomenon by tracing the transformation of attention in modern drama from mimetic to diegetic modes. Drawing on Bertolt Brecht, Samuel Beckett, and the tradition of closet drama, it argues that diegesis reclaims the audience's attentional agency through imaginative activation rather than sensory immediacy. Although the plays discussed in this paper—particularly those of Brecht and Beckett—cannot be categorized as closet dramas in the strict sense, since they have been frequently staged and widely performed, they nonetheless display a pronounced diegetic structure. Their dramaturgy often resists the immediacy of mimetic representation and turns instead toward narration, reflection, and self-commentary. In this respect, even within these performable and historically performed dramas, one can discern the same structural condition that characterizes the stage fright: a hesitation before the stage, a withdrawal from sensory presence toward mental and cognitive engagement. Thus, Brecht and Beckett allow us to examine how stage fright persists within the very heart of modern theatre. In this sense, diegetic theatre does not abandon theatricality but relocates it—from the visible to the mental, from collective performance to private cognition.

Methodologically, this study combines textual analysis with theoretical synthesis to examine how diegetic strategies reshape the structure of attention in drama. The corpus—Plato's dialogues, Seneca's tragedies, Brecht's Epic Theatre, and Beckett's minimalist plays—was selected to trace a historical continuum in which dramatic form evolves from mimetic enactment to diegetic reflection. The analysis is informed by Peter Szondi's argument that modern drama emerges from a “crisis of dramatic form,” in which the autonomous dialogue of classical mimesis gives way to mediation, narration, and reflection (Szondi, 1987: 4–6). Within this framework, Brecht's and Beckett's dramaturgies exemplify two distinct yet complementary responses to Szondi's “crisis”: Brecht externalizes diegesis through the didactic narration of Epic Theatre, while Beckett internalizes it through minimal action and recursive verbal reflection—both redirecting theatrical attention from representation to cognition.

Closet Drama

The rise of Romanticism in the 19th century profoundly affected the realm of theatre and drama. Romantic aesthetics, with their fascination for the metaphysical, the sublime, and the impossible, gave rise to plays set in unreal worlds populated by visionary or supernatural figures—scenes that were often unperformable on stage. As a result, dramatic writing increasingly became a literary rather than a theatrical pursuit. Composing plays for private reading proved more feasible than producing them in public performance, and the notion of the drama to be read gradually gained cultural legitimacy.

At the same time, the sociological landscape of theatre was undergoing a major transformation. The rise of the middle class in the 18th century and the subsequent emergence of *le drame bourgeois*—which evolved into melodrama by the 19th century—reshaped the social composition of the theatre audience. The educated elite, once the dominant theatre-going class, withdrew from an increasingly popularized and commercialized stage. As a result, the act of reading drama in private replaced the collective act of viewing it. Rather than sharing the auditorium with the working classes, members of the elite preferred to retreat to the “closets” of their homes to engage with plays as literary texts. The outcome of these intertwined cultural and social developments was the flourishing of closet drama—works written not for performance but for reflection, inviting a mental or imaginative enactment rather than a visible one.

Yet the genealogy of closet drama extends far beyond Romanticism. Its roots can be traced back to classical antiquity, to Plato’s philosophical dialogues and Seneca’s rhetorical tragedies. If Plato had been wholly opposed to dramatic expression, he could have chosen the impersonal form of the philosophical treatise or the detached mode of narrative exposition. His decision instead to cast philosophy in the form of dialogue reveals a deliberate engagement with, rather than a rejection of, the dramatic form. Plato’s dialogues preserve the essential components of drama—character, speech, and conflict—but redirect them toward intellectual rather than theatrical ends. As Tarrant observes, Plato “wanted his favorite kind of drama,” one that was calm, reflective, and intellectually disciplined rather than emotionally intoxicating (Tarrant, 1955: 84–85). In this sense, the Platonic dialogue anticipates the later tradition of closet drama, whose audience is not a crowd of spectators but a community of readers engaged in philosophical reflection.

Following Plato, Seneca in classical Rome further developed a form of drama that privileged language and introspection over action and spectacle. As Fitch notes,

Senecan drama is a drama of the word. Its speeches are eloquent, forceful, delighting in the language and in the poetic medium...Seneca’s interest in powerful utterance does not, of course, exclude an interest in other things, in action and character, but they are mediated through the rhetoric. He is a master of pace and diction (Fitch, 2002: 1).

Writing under Nero's rule, Seneca produced tragedies whose performative status remains a matter of scholarly debate. To capture Nero's attention, he employed elements calculated to appeal to the emperor's taste—spectacles of violence, war, and the supernatural—while disregarding the practical constraints of staging.

In comparison with the Greek tragedies of the 5th century B.C., Seneca's dramas have a greater inwardness ... Inner thoughts are revealed through dramatic techniques rarely found in 5th century drama but developed thereafter, the aside, the soliloquy, and the entrance monologue, in which an entering character voices his thoughts before interacting with others (Fitch, 2002: 5–6).

Consequently, the weight of dialogue and rhetorical speech in Seneca's tragedies far exceeds their mimetic or performative dimensions. Seneca's tragedies thus anticipate the defining qualities of the diegetic closet drama: the internalization of action, the primacy of speech, and the substitution of visible performance with verbal imagination. His influence on later dramatists—including Shakespeare—is well attested, particularly in the incorporation of narrative soliloquies and otherworldly scenes that blur the boundary between performance and reflection.

Stage Fright

From this perspective, the diegetic closet drama can be seen as exhibiting a particular form of stage fright. This concept, however, should not be understood in its conventional sense as an actor's anxiety before performance. Rather, it designates a structural and aesthetic condition—a drama's conscious withdrawal from the physical stage and its reorientation toward the mental and imaginative stage of the reader or listener. Stage fright, in this sense, names the drama's hesitation before the mimetic regime of theatre and its movement toward a diegetic mode of representation. It signals a shift from visual display to verbal mediation, from immediate perception to reflective cognition.

Such a displacement of theatricality from stage to page does not suggest an incapacity for performance but rather a self-reflexive awareness within the dramatic form itself. The drama "fears" the stage only insofar as it recognizes that traditional theatre—grounded in mimesis and sensory immediacy—cannot encompass the full range of its diegetic and reflective potential. Stage fright, therefore, should not be viewed as a symptom of artistic deficiency but as a productive aesthetic strategy. It marks the moment when drama turns inward, transforming the absence of performance into the presence of thought. The imagination of the reader or listener becomes the new stage upon which the drama unfolds, and the acts of reading and contemplation replace seeing and witnessing as the primary modes of theatrical engagement.

As mentioned, closet dramas are intentionally written to be read, without relying on stage performance. They employ speech as the sole means of realizing the dramatic world

offstage; without performance, there can be no direct imitation or visual presentation of action. When the audience cannot see the dramatic world on stage but must instead read or hear it, the dramatist conveys actions, events, and settings through diegetic methods. Diegesis or narrativity is a conceptual term rooted in Plato's discussions and stands in contrast to mimesis or imitation. Plato regarded mimesis as lacking in value because of its reliance on imitation and considered diegesis a broader and more meaningful expressive mode (Plato, 1978).

Martin Puchner, a contemporary theorist of modern drama, takes up this tension in his book *Stage Fright* (2002), in which he examines the evolution of diegetic drama. In the introduction, Puchner refers to Alfred Hitchcock's film *Stage Fright* (1950), which presents a mysterious murder story within the theatrical world. The audience, initially engaged in solving the mystery through the relationships between actors, is ultimately confronted with the revelation that one of them is a psychopathic murderer. As Puchner notes, "it turns out that the stage fright to which Hitchcock's film refers is not the actor's fear of the audience but the audience's fear of the actor" (Puchner, 2002: 1). From this perspective, he describes the kind of fear that "Hitchcock evokes in order to expose it to our critical appraisal" as a form of "moralizing anti-theatricalism" (Puchner, 2002: 1).

This inversion of theatrical fear—from the performer's anxiety to the audience's unease—captures the shifting dynamics of theatrical reception in modernity. The fright and distance between audience and stage, or what Puchner calls anti-theatricalism, emerged as a defining symptom of modern life and a key factor in the revival of closet drama.

Targets of Attention in Diegetic Dramas

Modern closet dramas operate within a distinct system for capturing the attention of their audience—an audience that reads in the silence of a private space rather than experiences a performance in the communal atmosphere of the theatre. This challenge is particularly acute in the modern world, saturated as it is with visual media such as cinema and television, where the eye is constantly engaged. These visual forms, whether welcomed or resisted, continually compete for the audience's attention.

Even the novel enjoys a relative advantage in this respect. As a literary genre, the novel is defined by its inherent narrativity; it functions through self-narration and thus has a clear mode of engagement built into its form. The diegetic closet drama, by contrast, remains tied to the dramatic tradition—a tradition whose very etymology in the Greek *thea* refers to "seeing." By its generic nature, drama belongs to the world of the stage and the spectacle of watching. The challenge for the closet dramatist, therefore, lies in bridging the distance between the mimetic stage and the diegetic text—between the visible act and the imagined event—by developing techniques capable of sustaining attention in the mind of the reader.

At first glance, the task of capturing and maintaining the audience's attention in diegetic closet drama may appear difficult, if not impossible. How, then, can diegesis—the act of telling—rival mimesis—the act of showing—in holding the audience's focus and overcoming the “stage fright” critics have often attributed to non-performed drama?

Elaine Scarry, in *Dreaming by the Book*, distinguishes between two modes of aesthetic responsiveness: immediate perception and delayed perception (Scarry, 1999: 7). While some arts—painting, sculpture, music, film, and theatre—appeal to immediate perception through direct sensory engagement, the verbal arts rely on delayed perception. In the latter, the audience does not perceive the work directly but reconstructs it imaginatively over time. Accordingly, when the audience of drama and theatre is invited not to see an action but to read or hear about it, their imaginative faculties are activated. Through the mind's eye, they experience a form of delayed perception that substitutes mental visualization for sensory immediacy.

This delayed perception, however, is not passive; it requires a specific kind of mental activation or attentional agency. As Fogarasi describes it, attention entails “an effort to somehow bridge a special gap, and create a mental link between the attentive self and the thing attended to” (Fogarasi, 2016: 76). In this formulation, attention “refers to an erect state of mind full of expectation and readiness, a state open for input...to reach a goal by overcoming a distance” (Fogarasi, 2016: 76). In the case of closet drama, this distance is precisely that between the closet—the private, cognitive space of the reader—and the stage—the imagined visual field of theatrical representation.

Methods of Turning Attention

The dramatist plays a crucial role in activating the audience's attention through various diegetic methods. In other words, the dramatist must engage the audience's awareness with different intensities, using techniques that guide perception away from passive viewing and toward active cognition.

At times, this manipulation of attention is deliberate and self-conscious. A clear example appears in the work of Bertolt Brecht, the leading theorist and practitioner of Epic Theatre—a profoundly diegetic form of drama. Brecht employed the technique of *Verfremdungseffekt* or the *alienation effect* to continually redirect the audience's attention. His aim was to prevent actors from fully identifying with their roles, urging them instead to present the character rather than become it. As Brecht explains, “a representation that alienates is one which allows us to recognize its subject, but at the same time makes it seem unfamiliar” (Brecht, 1974: 192). To achieve this, he sometimes instructed performers to prefix their lines with phrases such as “that man said” or “that woman said,” reminding both actor and audience of the theatrical frame. This device served to expose the mechanics of

performance, prompting spectators to recognize that what they were witnessing was not life itself but its reconstruction.

Brecht used numerous distancing techniques to continually shift attention from the world of mimetic illusion to the world of diegetic reflection. Among these were narration, songs, direct address, projected scene titles, and gestic acting—all designed to interrupt dramatic continuity and transform theatrical representation into critical reflection. In *The Life of Galileo* (1938/1947), Brecht repeatedly reveals the play's structure to the audience. Each scene opens with a projected summary that discloses forthcoming events, converting the spectator from a passive observer of suspense into an active analyst of causes and consequences. Attention is thus redirected from what happens to why it happens and what social or epistemic implications it entails. Similarly, Brecht's insertion of songs and commentaries punctuates the dramatic rhythm with intellectual pauses. When Galileo and Andrea debate heroism—“Unhappy is the land that has no heroes.” / “No, unhappy is the land that needs heroes.” (Brecht, 1961: 319–320)—Brecht replaces emotional catharsis with dialectical thought.

Brecht's ultimate goal in employing such diegetic techniques was to awaken the audience's critical faculties, which he believed had grown dormant in classical mimetic theatre. For Brecht, traditional performance encouraged emotional absorption at the expense of judgment. Yet narrativity alone could not achieve his purpose; if mere narration sufficed, he would have abandoned theatre for narrative prose. Rather, Brecht's art resides in the oscillation between the dramatic and epic modes—what that can be described as the “constant turning of attention” between the mimetic and diegetic dimensions of performance. Through this continual redirection, he sought to keep the audience's minds alert and engaged.

Another strategy through which diegetic elements heighten attention involves the dramatist's deliberate elimination of the visual target of attention—removing the object of desire from the stage and rendering it through narration instead. Whether the concealed element is a person or a thing, its very absence becomes dramaturgically charged. As William Gruber observes, “important and dramaturgically powerful characters in all these plays are not merely hidden but instead are represented in terms of their hiddenness... Theatrical power is then born, paradoxically, of the deliberate act of concealment” (Gruber, 2010: 128–129).

The most striking example of this attentional dynamic appears in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (1954), where the eponymous figure never appears yet dominates the entire play. Godot's existence is purely verbal and diegetic, constructed through the ceaseless speculation of the onstage characters—Vladimir and Estragon, as well as Pozzo and Lucky. From the opening exchange—“We're waiting for Godot.” / “Ah! (Silence.) You're sure it was here?” (Beckett, 1954: 13)—the rhythm of dialogue itself becomes a mechanism of attention. Each hesitant question reiterates Godot's absence and transforms waiting into a narrative act.

In this configuration, mimesis and diegesis run side by side, oscillating between presence and narration. The audience, like the characters, becomes trapped in an attentional loop—looking at what is not there while listening to what cannot be seen. Estragon’s lament, “Nothing happens, nobody comes, nobody goes, it’s awful” (Beckett, 1954: 41), encapsulates this paradox: as external action disappears, attention intensifies. Jacques Derrida captures this paradox of absence when he writes that “pure absence—not the absence of this or that, but the absence of everything in which all presence is announced—can inspire” (Derrida, 1978: 8). One might extend Derrida’s insight by suggesting that such pure absence can also attract attention: Beckett’s unseen Godot functions as the gravitational center of the play’s attentional field.

As Gruber further notes in *Offstage Space, Narrative, and the Theatre of the Imagination*, Beckett understood that to represent Godot mimetically “would be to diminish the character’s hold on the imagination” (Gruber, 2010: 154). Godot’s indeterminacy—his uncertain existence and perpetually deferred arrival—sustains the audience’s imaginative vigilance. Vladimir’s closing line, “We’ll come back tomorrow. And then the day after tomorrow... Unless Godot comes” (Beckett, 1954, p. 88), transforms absence into an infinite postponement. Were Godot to appear, “man would stop waiting” (Gruber, 2010: 154), and the very focus that gives the drama its cognitive and spiritual tension would collapse. By withholding mimetic representation and replacing it with diegetic narration, Beckett constructs a theatre of pure attention—a dramaturgy in which contemplation, expectation, and imaginative participation replace visible action.

Conclusion

In conclusion, even though Brecht’s and Beckett’s plays are not closet dramas in the literal sense, their persistent recourse to diegetic forms reveals a drama that continues to hesitate before the stage. Their works demonstrate that stage fright—understood as the drama’s self-conscious withdrawal from mimetic immediacy—remains a constitutive tension within modern theatre itself. In both Brecht’s Epic Theatre and Beckett’s minimalist dramaturgy, performance turns inward, transforming action into thought and spectacle into reflection.

All of these examples illustrate that the presence of diegetic elements in drama and theatre—traditionally grounded in imitation—introduces a constant oscillation between mimesis and diegesis, a playfulness that perpetually redirects the audience’s attention from what is seen to what is thought. Before the rise of modern drama and the prominence of closet drama, diegesis merely served as a substitute for mimesis; yet, in the diegetic dramaturgies of Brecht and Beckett, it emerges as an autonomous and at times even superior mode of representation.

The closet drama thus does not necessarily imply an unperformable text but rather a drama capable of realizing its world without dependence on staging. In this sense, diegetic drama—whether confined to the page or projected on stage—has proven that it can engage and sustain the audience’s attention not through sensory immediacy, but through the reflective power of imagination.

References

- Beckett, S. (1954). *Waiting for Godot: A Tragicomedy in Two Acts*. New York: Grove Press.
- Brecht, B. (1961). *Plays: Volume I* (J. Willett, Trans.). London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Brecht, B. (1974). *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*. (J. Willett, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fitch, J. G. (2002). *Seneca: Tragedies, Volume I—Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra*. (Loeb Classical Library 62). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fogarasi, G. (2016). Targets of attention: An idiom and its relation to terrorism and technology. In K. G. Kállay, et al. (Eds.), *The arts of attention* (pp. 71-89). Budapest: L'Harmattan & Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem.
- Gruber, W. (2010). *Offstage space, narrative, and the theatre of the imagination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Laërtius, D. (2020). *Lives of eminent philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lukács, G. (1981). *Entwicklungsgeschichte des modernen Dramas*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
- Plato. (1978). *The republic* (P. Shorey, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Original work published ca. 375 BCE)
- Puchner, M. (2002). *Stage fright: Modernism, anti-theatricality, and drama*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Scarry, E. (1999). *Dreaming by the Book*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Szondi, P. (1987). *Theory of the Modern Drama: A Critical Edition*. (M. Hays, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tarrant, D. (1955). Plato as Dramatist. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 75, 82–89.

Mozhdeh Sameti

**DRAMA ZA ČITANJE I TREMA: DIJEGETIČKI I MIMETIČKI OBJEKTI
PAŽNJE**

Rezime: Ovaj rad ispituje dramu za čitanje kao oblik koji dovodi u pitanje klasični aristotelovski model drame tako što daje prednost dijegezi nad mimezismom. Iako se tradicionalno smatrao neutemeljen zbog toga što se ne izvodi na sceni, drama za čitanje se ovde tumači kao žanr koji redefiniše aspekte teatra pomeranjem centra dramskog iskustva sa scenskog izvođenja na maštu čitaoca ili gledaoca. Ovo istraživanje otkriva da takozvana *trema* u kontekstu drame za čitanje – odsustvo mimetičkog izvođenja – zapravo proizvodi specifičnu dinamiku u pažnji publike. Umesto da se oslanjaju na neposrednu vizuelnu percepciju, drama za čitanje i dijegetičke drame podstiču osvešćeno viđenje, angažujući publiku kroz maštu, rasuđivanje i aktivno učešće.

Kroz istorijsku i teorijsku analizu – od Platonovih filozofskih dijaloga i Senekinih retoričkih tragedija do Brehtovog epskog pozorišta i Beketove dramaturgije – rad pokazuje da dijegetičke strategije poput efekata otuđenja i namernog prikrivanja ne samo da kompenzuju odsustvo vizuelnog izvođenja, već i pojačavaju fokus pažnje publike. Ove tehnike kontinuirano okreću i preusmeravaju pažnju, održavajući povišeno stanje kognitivnog i kritičkog angažovanja.

U radu se zaključuje da moderni dijegetički komadi za čitanje nisu suprotnosti teatru, već alternativne dramske forme sa jednakim, ako ne i većim, kapacitetom da privuku i održe pažnju u poređenju sa mimetičkim pozorištem. U krajnjoj liniji, mimetičko pozorište, a ne dijegetička drama, pati od treme u modernosti – taj strah proizilazi iz prepoznavanja da naracija, mašta i odsustvo mogu biti pozorišno moćniji od same reprezentacije.

Ključne reči: moderna drama, dijegeza, mimeza, pažnja publike, narativna drama.

Datum prijema: 22.8.2025.

Datum ispravki: 9.11.2025.

Datum odobrenja: 14.11.2025.