

Both Crimp and Kane are genuine innovators of the dramatic form. The issues dealt with in their works are related; they share similar concerns about the dangers of nowadays' society – and, with it, theatre. This might not be apparent at first sight because of the divergence of styles. Crimp's style is language-centred, hyper-realistic at times, drawing a lot from the theatre of the absurd. He provides a characteristic mixture of satirical edge, ironic detachment and hidden threat. While Crimp works exclusively with the contemporary sensibility, Kane's proximity to the tradition of tragedy can be seen in what she employs in her plays – the big passions, "love, hate, death, revenge, suicide."¹ Kane differs from both modernists and postmodernists by her refusal of detachment and by her requirement of emotional involvement. Both the playwright and her characters are absolutist, truth-seeking and provocative. Crimp prevents emotional identification even in the plays that at first sight seem realistic; in the experimental dramas, the distancing device of having stories narrated rather than just shown "allows Crimp to mix acerbic satire with rapid shifts of tone and focus,"² asking intellectual questions in a convincingly dramatic form. The intense emotional content, which in Kane is delivered by the explicit, larger-than-life gestures, is evaded in Crimp by the stories' rapid formal mutation.

Both authors challenge individual categories of theatre. Kane disrupts realistic space and time, and negates the logical coherence of the action. In her incessant experiment, she strives to find a new, "truthful" portrayal of reality. Crimp, in some of his dramas, pursues the realistic portrayal but makes it multilayered through the language level. In his experimental plays, alternatively, almost no notion of the classical drama is preserved.