

Συναγωνίζεσθαι

Studies in Honour of Guido Avezzù

Vol. 2

Edited by Silvia Bigliuzzi,
Francesco Lupi, Gherardo Ugolini



Skenè Studies I • 1

Skenè Studies I • 1

Συναγωνίζεσθαι
Studies in Honour of Guido Avezzù

Edited by Silvia Bigliuzzi, Francesco Lupi,
Gherardo Ugolini

Vol. 2



Executive Editor	Guido Avezzù.
General Editors	Guido Avezzù, Silvia Bigliuzzi.
Editorial Board	Simona Brunetti, Francesco Lupi, Nicola Pasqualicchio, Susan Payne, Gherardo Ugolini.
Managing Editors	Serena Marchesi, Savina Stevanato.
Editorial Staff	Francesco Dall'Olio, Marco Duranti, Carina Fernandes, Antonietta Provenza, Emanuel Stelzer.
Layout Editor	Alex Zanutto.
Advisory Board	Anna Maria Belardinelli, Anton Bierl, Enoch Brater, Jean-Christophe Cavallin, Rosy Colombo, Claudia Corti, Marco De Marinis, Tobias Döring, Pavel Drabek, Paul Edmondson, Keir Douglas Elam, Ewan Fernie, Patrick Finglass, Enrico Giaccherini, Mark Griffith, Daniela Guardamagna, Stephen Halliwell, Robert Henke, Pierre Judet de la Combe, Eric Nicholson, Guido Paduano, Franco Perrelli, Didier Plassard, Donna Shalev, Susanne Wofford.

Copyright © 2018 S K E N È
All rights reserved.
ISSN 2464-9295
ISBN 978-88-6464-503-2
Published in December 2018

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form
or by any means without permission from the publisher
Dir. Resp. (aut. Trib. di Verona): Guido Avezzù

P.O. Box 149 c/o Mail Boxes Etc. (MBE 150) – Viale Col. Galliano, 51, 37138, Verona (I)

S K E N È Theatre and Drama Studies

<http://www.skenejournal.it>

info@skenejournal.it

Part 3 – Παράδοσις / Reception

31. MARIA PIA PATTONI
Tragic and Paratragic Elements in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* 633
32. PAOLA VOLPE
Il Ciclope: un mostro tra antico e moderno 653
33. ERIC NICHOLSON
Finding Room for Satyrs at the Theatrical Table,
from Ancient to Modern Times 675
34. FRANCESCO DAL'OLIO
Oedipus Tyrant? Tyranny and Good Kingship
in Alexander Neville's Translation of Seneca's *Oedipus* 693
35. SILVIA BIGLIAZZI
Euripidean Ambiguities in *Titus Andronicus*:
the Case of Hecuba 719
36. VAYOS LIAPIS
On the Sources of Petros Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* (1720): Between
Lodovico Dolce, Molière, and the Commedia dell'Arte 747
37. GHERARDO UGOLINI
Il Genio della tragedia. Antigone nel *Vorspiel* di Hofmannsthal 783
38. DOUGLAS CAIRNS
Fascism on Stage? Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* (1944) 805
39. AVRA SIDIROPOULOU
Negotiating Oblivion: Twenty-First Century Greek
Performances of Ancient Greek Plays 833
40. MARTINA TREU
'Guidaci a passo di danza'. Cori comici sulla scena 857
41. ADELE SCAFURO AND HIROSHI NOTSU
Miyagi's *Antigones* 881

Part 4 – Ἐξω τοῦ θεάτρου / Theatre and Beyond

42. ANTON BIERL <i>Symmachos esso</i> : Theatrical Role-Playing and Mimesis in Sappho fr. 1 V.	925
43. WALTER LAPINI La casa dei belli (Asclepiade AP 5.153)	953
44. MAURO TULLI Plato's κάλλιστον δρᾶμα in Greek Biography	963
45. SIMONA BRUNETTI Il coraggio di tradire per poter tramandare: un allestimento contemporaneo del <i>Gysbreght van Aemstel</i> di Joost van den Vondel	975
46. NICOLA PASQUALICCHIO Piano d'evasione: carcere e utopia negli Shakespeare della Compagnia della Fortezza	1003
47. SOTERA FORNARO Il giovane rapsodo nella Stanza della Segnatura di Raffaello	1025
The Authors	1043

Appendix

Guido Avezzù's Publications (1973-2018)	1079
-----------------------------------------	------

Part 3
Παράδοσις / Reception

Tragic and Paratragic Elements in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*

MARIA PIA PATTONI

Abstract

Regarding the influence of theatrical genres on the *Pastoralia* of Longus, criticism mainly focused on the numerous and evident elements of contact with New Comedy. However, in the merging of literary genres that the cultured and refined text of this novel presupposes, also tragic models receive significant importance, often in contexts in which the characters mourn the loss of something precious. In most cases, it is a question of generic reuse of expressive forms or motifs borrowed from the tragic genre: sometimes, specific hypotexts are read in filigree, especially Sophoclean. The analysis of the steps involved in this phenomenon highlights Longus' adoption of paratragic mechanisms in various aspects similar to the ways in which comedy writers relate to the 'high' genres.

1.

On the question of the influence of dramatic genres on Longus, critics have generally focused on his novel's numerous and obvious resemblances to New Comedy,¹ while much less attention has been devoted to echoes of tragedy. In this paper I shall deal with some examples of tragic appropriation and analyse how tragic 'presences' are embedded in his narratives.

The passages which show a strong intertextual relationship

¹ Longus' relationships with the new comedy have been studied, among others, by Hunter 1983: 67-71; Billault 1991: 143-51; Crismani 1997: 87-101 (with further bibliographical references); Morgan 2004; Morgan and Harrison 2008: 224. On the influence of Attic tragedy in some episodes of Longus' novel see Pattoni 2004: 84-90; 2005: 9-16. Bowie (2007: 338-52) offers a list of tragic intertexts which might be relevant for Longus, "argued for on grounds of language or (less often) content" (340). Since he includes a large number of potential cases, not all instances are equally cogent, as Bowie's own comments often note (on this see also Battezzato 2009).

with tragedy have many features in common, most notably their situational context. A character lamenting the loss of a beloved (person or animal) consistently shows a tendency to use expressive forms taken from the typical patterns of the tragic *threnos*: on three occasions Daphnis bewails the loss of Chloe (in 2.22-3 as a consequence of the raids carried out by the Methymnaeans; in 3.26 because he is afraid that she will marry a richer suitor; in 4.28.2-3 because of her kidnapping by Lampis); in 4.8.3-4 Lamon, against the background of his family's despairing cries, utters a proper funeral lamentation for the flowers razed to the ground by Lampis and incorporates all the formal patterns which epic and tragedy employed in lamentations for young men dead on the battlefield; in 3.16.2-4 Lycaenion, playing the role of the desperate woman (ἀκριβῶς μμησαμένη τὴν τεταραγμένην, "skilfully counterfeiting that she was scared"), addresses a speech of supplication to Daphnis, asking him to bring back her stolen goose: and again the typical features of high literary genres are reworked for a situation that the reader immediately recognises as fictitious. In all these cases, where reference to tragedy is particularly evident (mostly as a reinterpretation of tragic speech in general, but sometimes as a reworking of specific intertexts), the problem which has provoked the character's suffering is finally overcome in the inevitable happy ending just as in comic genres: and it is with comedy that Longus shares a penchant for parodistic distortion of solemn language.

2.

An example of this literary situation is Daphnis' reaction to the abduction of Chloe in 2.22-3. The transition from a typically bucolic context (Daphnis was absent because he was cutting green leaves for his goats) to a tragic situation (the discovery of the raid by the Methymnaeans and the violation of the Nymphs' sanctuary, from which Chloe was forcibly snatched) is announced, in the short narrative introduction, by a gesture typical of a tragic actor: Daphnis "throws himself to the ground" (ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν χαμαί) and from there, in an attitude which recalls the one that Hecuba

often adopts in Euripides' Trojan dramas,² he delivers his pathetic monologue:

2.22.1 “Ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ἠρπάσθη Χλόη, καὶ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς ἰδεῖν ὑπεμείνατε; ἢ τοὺς στεφάνους ὑμῖν πλέκουσα, ἢ σπένδουσα τοῦ πρώτου γάλακτος, ἧς καὶ ἡ σῦριγξ ἦδε ἀνάθημα; 2. Αἶγα μὲν οὐδὲ μίαν μοι λύκος ἤρπασε, πολέμοιοι δὲ τὴν ἀγέλην καὶ τὴν συννέμουσαν. Καὶ τὰς μὲν αἶγας ἀποδεροῦσι καὶ τὰ πρόβατα καταθύσουσι, Χλόη δὲ λοιπὸν πόλιν οἰκήσει. 3. Ποίοις ποσὶν ἄπειμι παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης, λιπεργάτης ἐσόμενος; ἔχω γὰρ νέμειν ἔτι οὐδέν. 4. Ἐνταῦθα περιμενῶ κείμενος ἢ θάνατον ἢ πόλεμον δεύτερον. Ἔρα καὶ σύ, Χλόη, τοιαῦτα πάσχεις; ἄρα μέμνησαι τοῦ πεδίου τοῦδε καὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν τῶνδε κάμοῦ; ἢ παραμυθοῦνται σε τὰ πρόβατα καὶ αἱ αἶγες αἰχμάλωτοι μετὰ σοῦ γενόμεναί.”

[2.22.1 “(1) Chloe was snatched away from you: and could you bear to see this – the girl who used to weave garlands for you, who used to pour you libations of the freshest milk, who offered you these very pipes there? (2) Not a single goat of mine was ever snatched off by a wolf, but now enemies have snatched off the herd and the girl who helped me look after them. They will skin the goats, sacrifice the sheep – and Chloe will spend the rest of her life in a city! (3) How can I take the steps that will lead me back to my father and mother, without the goats, without Chloe, to be out of work? For I have nothing left to graze. (4) No, I shall lie here and wait for death – or a second war. And you too, Chloe, do you feel like this? Do you remember this plain, these Nymphs, and me? Or are you comforted by the sheep and the goats taken prisoner with you?”]³

After a sorrowful apostrophe to the indifferent and uncaring Gods, who failed to protect the pious Chloe (2.22.1) – cf. in part. Eur. *Tro.* 1060ff., 1240ff., 1287ff., where the responsibility of the fall of Troy

2 About the act of falling down to the ground in tragedy, see Telò 2002: 9ff. Hecuba is lying on the ground at the very beginning of *Trojan Women*, she gets up, but then she falls down again at 462; in *Hecuba* she falls down to the ground at 438; in both dramas, as Daphnis does in 2.22.4, Hecuba expresses the wish she would not get up ever more: *Tro.* 466-8 and *Hec.* 501-2.

3 All translations of Longus are from Reardon 1989.

is ascribed to the Gods, who forgot the honours they received –, Daphnis imagines the girl's future: this is another point of contact with the Trojan dramas, where the captive women, waiting to be deported on Greek ships, indulge in conjectures about their destination (see e.g. *Hec.* 444ff. and *Tro.* 185ff.).

However, the solution chosen by Longus – to make Daphnis speak, rather than the captive Chloe – directly recalls the Homeric archetype which is the model of the Euripidean scenes: i.e. *Il.* 6.454ff., where Hector predicts Andromache's slavery in a Greek city, working at the loom or carrying water for a foreign mistress. As often with Longus, an epic-tragic motif becomes a bucolic one: the worst destiny that Daphnis, a shepherd, can imagine for Chloe is a city-life *tout court* (no matter what she does or whose servant she is, as in the literary models here recalled), a destiny that can be compared to the cruel sacrifice of a sheep or goat (τὰς μὲν αἴγας ἀποδεροῦσι καὶ τὰ πρόβατα καταθύσουσι, Χλόη δὲ λοιπὸν πόλιν οἰκήσει, 2.22.2)⁴: the comparison with the much worse fate of the animals has an obviously ironical effect.

Daphnis' thoughts return to Chloe at the end of the monologue: he imagines her in the company of sheep and goats, which share her captivity and offer her their *consolatio* (παραμυθοῦνταί σε τὰ πρόβατα καὶ αἱ αἴγες αἰχμάλωτοι μετὰ σοῦ γενόμεναι, 2.22.4)⁵. This is another typical situation in Euripides' Trojan dramas, where a chorus of captives stands by the main character, sharing her sorrow and offering support. The analogy with a dramatic chorus is explicitly recalled by the narrator himself at the end of the episode: when Chloe is released with her animals, they gather around her “just like a chorus (ὥσπερ χορός), jumping and bleating, like people expressing joy” (2.29.1). So the sympathy of a ‘humanised’ chorus of animals changes from the initial kommatic song of sorrow to a final joyful hyporchema, in keeping with the happy ending.

If the references to Chloe are drawn from the literary model

4 “They will flay the goats and sacrifice the sheep, and Chloe – from now on will live in a town.”

5 “Do you find some consolation in the sheep and goats that are your fellow prisoners?”

of the captive Trojan women,⁶ when Daphnis says that he spared slavery but was deprived of his flock has to resort to a different dramatic model. In particular, in the question he poses in 2.22.2

ποίους ποσὶν ἄπειμι παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἄνευ τῶν
αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης, λιπεργάτης ἐσόμενος;

[“With what feet shall I return to my father and mother, without the goats, without Chloe, to be jobless?”]

we can hear an echo of the words uttered by the Sophoclean Ajax after he discovers the slaughter of the flocks:

Καὶ ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανεῖς
Τελαμώνι; πῶς με τλήσεται ποτ’ εἰσιδεῖν
γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ;
(*Ai.* 462-4)

[“And what eye shall I show appearing to my father Telamon? How will he bear to look at me when I appear naked, without the trophies?”]

Just as Ajax, deprived of his ἀριστεῖα (meed of valour),⁷ was ashamed to meet his father, so Daphnis, deprived of his goats, is

6 In the whole episode we can find many analogies between the Trojan myth and what happens on the Methymnaeans’ ship. In 2.25, for example, after describing their festive revelry after the raid (ἔπινον, ἔπαιζον, ἐπινίκιον ἑορτὴν ἐμμοῦντο, “they drank and made merry, as if they had been celebrating a feast in honour of a victory”, 2.25.3), Longus uses a narrative pattern recurring in the tales on the Trojan war: the sudden night assault against the unconscious army during a feast. And yet, here the motif is ‘bucolized’ by Longus with the presence of Pan himself as a warrior god: it is a sort of revenge of the pastoral world on the raiders from the city. And the fact that in 2.26.5 the Methymnaeans wonder if the origin of Pan’s μῆνις (wrath) could be a looting of a shrine, can be interpreted as a reference to a literary *topos* once more connected to the Trojan myth, and precisely to Athena’s μῆνις for the pillage in her temple at Ilius: the night storm which assailed the Greek fleet is here represented by the subversion of the natural elements which strikes the sailor men of Methymna, while they are bringing home their rich spoils, just as it happened to their Greek ancestors.

7 The reference is here to the arms of Achilles, which Odysseus gained without deserving them.

ashamed to go home empty-handed: and if the Sophoclean hero stressed the concept of deprivation in a double construction, of clear Iliadic origin (γυμνὸν . . . τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ, see e.g. *Il.* 21.50 γυμνὸν ἄτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος),⁸ Daphnis translates the duplication into the symmetrical, anaphoric style beloved of Longus (ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης). And the two solutions to the predicament Ajax then figures out – fighting his enemies or death (*Ai.* 466ff.) – are precisely those that Daphnis imagines for himself: “I shall wait . . . for death or for another war!” (περιμενῶ κείμενος ἢ θάνατον ἢ πόλεμον δεύτερον, 2.22.4). However, in relation to the original model, Longus introduces a subtle but important variation which creates a parodic effect. The formulation used by tragic heroes contains references to the ὄμμα (‘eye’ or ‘face’), as we find, in addition to *Ai.* 462, in the reuse of the same motif by the Sophoclean Oedipus in *OT* 1371-3: ὄμμασιν ποίοις βλέπων / πατέρα ποτ’ ἄν προσεΐδον εἰς Ἴδου μολῶν, / οὐδ’ αὖτάλαιναν μητέρ(α).⁹ Daphnis here, on the contrary, has replaced the words ποίοις ὄμμασιν (“with what eyes”) with the atypical ποίοις ποσίν (“with what feet”): the change of reference from eyes to feet produces an almost comical lowering of the stylistic tone.¹⁰ And the

8 “Naked, without helmet or shield”. For the epic formula γυμνός (or γυμνωθείς) with the meaning of ‘deprived of his armor’ see also *Il.* 13.389; 16.312, 400 and 815; 18.122, 693 and 711; 18.21; 22.124, etc.

9 “What sort of eyes would I need, to look at my father when I meet him in Hades, and at my poor mother?”. In their turn, the words of Oedipus are a reformulation – adapted to the specific context of the character who, after having blinded himself, is now justifying his gesture – of the more general concept: ‘how shall I dare to watch’: cf. also *Soph. Phil.* 110 πῶς βλέπων, *Eur. IA* 455 ποῖον ὄμμα συμβαλῶ, *Herod.* 1.37 τέοισι με χρῆ ὄμμασι . . . φαίνεσθαι, and, in paratragic context, *Plaut. Cas.* 939-40 *nec (scio) meam ut uxorem aspiciam contra oculis*. The participle βλέπων is ambiguous between a meaning related to ποίοις ὄμμασιν (“with which eyes watching”) and an absolute one (in the poetic meaning of “if my eyes could see”).

10 The formulation, so atypical that it is usually ignored by the translators (cf. e.g. *Lowe* 1908: 83: “how shall I dare to go home to father and mother”; *Thornley* 1916: 97-8: “with what face can I now come into the sight of my father and my mother”; *Schönberger* 1989⁴: 107: “wie soll ich denn vor Vater und Mutter treten”; *Balboni* 1973: 565: “chi mi darà la forza di tornare da mio padre e da mia madre”; *Monteleone* 1987: 256: “come ardirò tornare da mio

lowering to a realistic register is also stressed by the reference to Daphnis' future as "unemployed": the epic word γυμνός, indicating nudity, in the Iliadic sense of being "deprived of weapons", which afflicted Ajax, is replaced by the otherwise unattested *hap-ax* λιπεργάτης, indicating the fear of being "deprived of a job" and thus of the means of subsistence. The aristocratic ideals of the epic-tragic heroes are substituted with the more modest desires of the humble characters of the bucolic world.

Also in Daphnis' case, as we saw with Chloe, ironical distance has the function of anticipating the happy ending of the story, where the tragic patterns of the Sophoclean Ajax are reversed. If Ajax was hated by the gods (ἐμφανῶς θεοῖς / ἐχθαίρομαι, Soph. *Ai.* 457; and see also 445ff. where Athena's hatred for the hero is emphasised), Daphnis is supported by Pan, Eros and the Nymphs, who visit him in dreams to give their reassurance:

2.23.1 Τοιαῦτα λέγοντα αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν δακρῶν καὶ τῆς λύπης ὕπνος βαθὺς καταλαμβάνει. Καὶ αὐτῷ αἱ τρεῖς ἐφίστανται Νύμφαι, μεγάλαι γυναῖκες καὶ καλαί, ἡμίγυμνοι καὶ ἀνυπόδετοι, τὰς κόμας λελυμέναι καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλασιν ὅμοια. 2. Καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐώκεσαν ἐλεοῦσαι τὸν Δάφνιν· ἔπειτα ἡ πρεσβυτάτη λέγει ἐπιρρωννύουσα. "Μηδὲν ἡμᾶς μέμφου, Δάφνι· Χλόης γὰρ ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἢ σοὶ μέλει. Ἡμεῖς τοι καὶ παιδίον οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἠλεήσαμεν καὶ ἐν τῷδε τῷ ἄντρῳ κειμένην [αὐτὴν] ἀνεθρέψαμεν. 3. Καὶ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν πεφρόντισται τὸ κατ' ἐκείνην, ὡς μήτε εἰς τὴν Μήθυμναν κομισθεῖσα δουλεύει μήτε μέρος γένοιτο λείας πολεμικῆς. 4. Καὶ τὸν Πάνα ἐκείνον τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ πίτνῃ ἰδρυμένον ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐδέποτε οὐδὲ ἄνθεσιν ἐτιμήσατε, τούτου ἐδεήθημεν ἐπίκουρον γενέσθαι Χλόης; συνήθης γὰρ στρατοπέδοις μᾶλλον ἡμῶν καὶ πολλοὺς ἤδη πολέμους ἐπολέμησε τὴν ἀγροικίαν καταλιπών· καὶ ἅπεισι τοῖς Μηθυμναίοις οὐκ ἀγαθὸς πολέμιος. 5. Κάμινε δὲ μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἀναστὰς ὄφθητι Λάμωνι καὶ Μυρτάλῃ, οἱ καὶ αὐτοὶ κεῖνται χαμαί, νομίζοντες καὶ σὲ μέρος γεγονέναι τῆς

padre e da mia madre"; Burlando 1997: 61: "con quale coraggio mi presenterò a mio padre e a mia madre"; Morgan 2004: 69: "how can I go home to my father and mother"), finds its justification in the peculiar context: it is functional both to the verb ἄπειμι (the initial idea to return home involves the reference to the motor organ, the feet) and to the decision, expressed shortly thereafter, to remain lying in the same place.

ἀρπαγῆς· Χλόη γάρ σοι τῆς ἐπιούσης ἀφίξεται μετὰ τῶν αἰγῶν, μετὰ τῶν προβάτων, καὶ νεμήσετε κοινῇ καὶ συρίσετε κοινῇ· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα μελήσει περὶ ὑμῶν Ἔρωτι”.

[(2.23.1) While he was talking in this way, a deep sleep took him out of his tears and pain. The three Nymphs appeared to him as tall, beautiful women, half-naked and barefooted, their hair flowing free – just like their images. (2) First of all, they seemed to be feeling sorry for Daphnis. Then the eldest spoke, encouraging him. “Don’t blame us, Daphnis. We care about Chloe even more than you do. We were the ones who took pity on her when she was a child, and when she was lying in this cave, we saw to it that she was nursed. (3) Even now we have paid attention to her situation and made sure she won’t be carried off to Methymna to become a slave and won’t become part of the spoils of war. (4) You see Pan over there, his image set up under the pine, who’s never received from you even the honor of some flowers – well, we’ve asked him to be Chloe’s protector. He’s more used to army camps than we are, and he’s already left the country and fought a number of wars. And when he attacks the Methymneans, they won’t find him a good enemy to have. (5) Don’t make yourself anxious. Get up and show yourself to Lamon and Myrtale. Like you, they’re lying on the ground, thinking that you are part of the plunder too. Chloe will come to you tomorrow, with the goats and with the sheep, and you will graze together and play the pipes together. All your other affairs will be taken care of by Love”.]

In predicting to Daphnis that ‘Chloe will come back with goats, with sheep’, the Nymphs make use of the asyndetic and anaphoric expression μετὰ τῶν αἰγῶν, μετὰ τῶν προβάτων, which reverses the dicolon ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης of Daphnis’ lament in 2.22.3. And if there the dicolon was immediately followed by the prospect of “losing his job”, here, in a symmetrical and reverse way, the dicolon is followed by the prospect of *keeping* his job as a shepherd together with the beloved Chloe (νεμήσετε κοινῇ καὶ συρίσετε κοινῇ, 2.23.5).

A similar reversal can also be seen with Daphnis’ parents, who are represented as the antithesis of Ajax’ father. In the Sophoclean play, we are told that Telamon has an irritable temper:

in *Ai.* 1008ff. Teucer expresses profound fear at having to face his father and break the news of Ajax' death to him: a father "who, even when good fortune befalls him, is not wont to smile more brightly than before" (1010-11), "a choleric man (ἄνηρ δύσοργος), harsh in his old age (ἐν γήρᾳ βαρύς), who loses his temper even without a cause (πρὸς οὐδὲν εἰς ἔριν θυμούμενος, 1017)"; Telamon's hard reaction, which Teucer predicts in *Ai.* 1019-21 (he will be banished from home, and cast off: ἀπωστὸς γῆς ἀπορριφθήσομαι, 1019) perfectly coincides with the mythical tradition. In reversing the tragic pattern of the severe father, unable to accept his son's defeats, the Nymphs take care to stress that Lamon and Myrtale are overwhelmed by pain, no less than Daphnis, for they think that he is part of the Methymnaeans' spoils; "they also are prostrated on the ground" (οἱ καὶ αὐτοὶ κεῖνται χαμαί, 2.23.5): in this unnecessary and therefore significant detail, we can recognise the narrator's intention to establish a comparison with Daphnis' despair, which was expressed by the same 'tragic' gesture (ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν χαμαί, "there he threw himself down on the ground", 2.21.3; see also ἐνταῦθα περιμενῶ κείμενος, "I'll go on lying here", 2.22.4). Encouraged by the Nymphs, Daphnis stops weeping, picks up the foliage he had cut (the reprise of this motif, which marked the beginning of the episode in 2.20.2, warns the reader that the tragic parenthesis ends here and Daphnis returns to his usual role of bucolic character) and comes back to his parents, who receive him with open arms: ἀράμενος τὰς φυλλάδας, ἃς ἔκοψεν, ἐπανήλθεν εἰς τὴν ἔπαυλιν, καὶ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Λάμωνα πένθους ἀπαλλάξας, εὐφροσύνης ἐμπλήσας (2.24.3).¹¹ With the return to the inevitable happy ending, any tragic echo definitively fades away.

3.

After Chloe is abducted for the second time, by Lampis (4.28), Longus shows us Daphnis in a pathetic *solo*:

¹¹ "Taking up the green branches which he had cut, he returned home, where he relieved Lamon and his household of their anxiety and filled them with joy."

4.28.2 Ὁ δὲ ἔξω τῶν φρενῶν γενόμενος οὔτε εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐτόλμα καὶ καρτερεῖν μὴ δυνάμενος εἰς τὸν περὶ κηπον εἰσελθὼν ὠδύρετο “ὡ πικρᾶς ἀνευρέσεως” λέγων· “πόσον ἦν μοι κρεῖττον νέμειν; 3. πόσον ἤμην μακαριώτερος, δοῦλος ὢν. Τότε ἔβλεπον Χλόην, τότε <ἤκουον Χλόης λαλοῦσης>. Νῦν δὲ τὴν μὲν Λάμπις ἀρπάσας οἴχεται, νυκτὸς δὲ γενομένης <καὶ συ>κοιμήσεται. Ἐγὼ δὲ πίνω καὶ τρυφῶ καὶ μάτην τὸν Πάνα καὶ τὰς αἴγας καὶ τὰς Νύμφας ὤμοσα”.

[(4.28.2) He went out of his mind; but he didn't dare to speak to his father; nor could he bear it either, and so he went to the yard and expressed his misery in these words: “How horrible it is that I've been recognized! How much better it was for me to be a herdsman! How much happier I was when I was a slave! Then I looked at Chloe; then <I listened to Chloe chattering>. Now Lampis has carried her off and gone away with her; and when night come, he'll sleep with her too! While I'm drinking and living in luxury and my oath to Pan and to the goats is worth nothing”.]

Daphnis' outburst has some interesting points of contact with two Homeric monologues characterised by the most distinctive dramatic contexts: *Il.* 21.273ff. (Achilles is about to be killed by the river Xanthus) and *Od.* 5.299ff. (Odysseus, while escaping from Calypso on his raft, is hit by a sea storm).¹² After a narrative introduction which stresses the strong dismay of the involved character (ὤμωξεν, *Il.* 21.272; ὀχθήσας, *Od.* 5.298; ὠδύρετο, Long. 4.28.2), the monologue begins with a deprecatory formula – half way between *indignatio* and *threnos* – on the present situation (*Il.* 21.273-4, *Od.* 5.299-300, Long. 4.28.2-3); thus, with a flashback to the past, the character claims that he would prefer to go back to his previous state, which, although negative, nonetheless had advantages that the present one does not, rather than be in the present condition: “I'd rather have died hit by the hand of Hector”, claims Achilles in *Il.* 21.279-80, “at least a brave man would have killed me”;¹³ “I'd rather have died fighting at Troy”, claims Odysseus in

12 On the features shared by these two monologues, in which the main character believes that he will soon die, see Pattoni 1998: 29-31.

13 Cf. *Il.* 21.279-80: ὡς μ' ὄφελ' Ἐκτωρ κτεῖναι ὃς ἐνθάδε γ' ἔτραφ'

Od. 5.308-11, “at least I would have received funeral rites and the Achaeans would have honoured me”,¹⁴ “I’d rather have lived as a servant, a shepherd of flocks”, claims Daphnis in 4.28.3, “at least I could have stayed with Chloe”. Finally, after the wishful flash-back, through the transitional formula *vũn dē* (“but now”: see *Il.* 21.281; *Od.* 5.312; Long. 4.28.3),¹⁵ the character returns to a more desperate lament for his present sadness. In this case, as in the first of Daphnis’ *solos* in 2.22, the narrator seems to smile and keep his distance, because what is under threat here is not the character’s life itself, as in both the Homeric patterns, but the love between Daphnis and Chloe, in accordance with the common reductive process of Hellenistic origin which transforms heroic themes into erotic ones. However, the happy ending is soon restored: in the Homeric models thanks to a god who hears or sees the hero in distress (Poseidon and Athena in the case of Achilles in *Il.* 21.284-97, Ino Leucothea in that of Odysseus in *Od.* 5.332-53); in Longus the salvation comes from a comic version of the *deus ex machina*, namely Gnathon: after he has eavesdropped on Daphnis’ monologue, in a typically comic dramatic device, he changes from parasite into soldier and with a lightning raid he brings Chloe back to Daphnis’ arms (4.29). The vivid narration of Gnathon’s *Blitz* is also constantly enriched by parody: military terms are applied to a bucolic context (for example in 4.29.3 the narrator suggests that Lampis would have been bound and carried off “as a prisoner from a war”, *ὡς αἰχμάλωτον ἐκ πολέμου τινός*, if he had not managed to escape in time).

4.

Another place characterised by the parodic rewriting of motifs

ἄριστος· / τὼ κ’ ἀγαθὸς μὲν ἔπεφν’, ἀγαθὸν δὲ κεν ἐξενάριξε.

¹⁴ Cf. *Od.* 5.308-11: *ὡς δὴ ἐγὼ γ’ ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν / ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλείστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα / Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλεΐωνι θανόντι. / τὼ κ’ ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί.*

¹⁵ *Il.* 21.281 = *Od.* 5.312 *vũn dē me leuγαλέω θανάτῳ εἴμαρτο ἄλῶναι* (“instead, now it’s my wretched fate to perish miserably”); Long. 4.28.3 *vũn dē τὴν μὲν . . . ἐγὼ δὲ* (“instead, now she . . . and I”).

from 'high' literary genres is when Lamon's family weeps for the garden razed to the ground by Lampis (4.7.5-9.1):

4.7.5. Ἴδων δὲ πᾶν τὸ χωρίον δεδηωμένον καὶ ἔργον οἶον ἐχθρός, οὐ ληστής, ἐργάσαιτο, κατερρήξατο μὲν εὐθὺς τὸν χιτωνίσκον, βοῆ δὲ μεγάλη θεοὺς ἀνεκάλει, ὥστε καὶ ἡ Μυρτάλη τὰ ἐν χερσὶ καταλιποῦσα ἐξέδραμε καὶ ὁ Δάφνις ἐάσας τὰς αἴγας ἀνέδραμε· καὶ ἰδόντες ἐβόων καὶ βοῶντες ἐδάκρυν.

4.8.1 Καὶ ἦν μὲν καινὸν πένθος ἀνθῶν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πτοοῦμενοι τὸν δεσπότην ἔκλαον· ἔκλαυσε δ' ἂν τις καὶ ξένος ἐπιστάς· ἀποκεκόσμητο γὰρ ὁ τόπος καὶ ἦν λοιπὸν γῆ πηλώδης. Τῶν δὲ εἴ τι διέφυγε τὴν ὕβριν, ὑπήνθει καὶ ἔλαμπε καὶ ἦν ἔτι καλὸν καὶ κείμενον. 2. Ἐπέκειντο δὲ καὶ μέλιτται αὐτοῖς συνεχῆς καὶ ἄπαυστον βομβοῦσαι καὶ θρηνοῦσαις ὅμοιον. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Λάμων ὑπ' ἐκπλήξεως κάκεινα ἔλεγε· 3. “Φεῦ τῆς ῥοδωνιάς, ὡς κατακέκλασται· φεῦ τῆς ἰωνιάς, ὡς <κατα>πεπάττηται· φεῦ τῶν ὑακίνθων καὶ τῶν ναρκίσσων, οὓς ἀνῶρυξέ τις πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. Ἀφίξεται τὸ ἦρ, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀνθήσει· ἔσται τὸ θέρος, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀκμάσει· μετόπωρον, τὰ δὲ οὐδένα στεφανώσει. 4. Οὐδὲ σύ, δέσποτα Δίονυσε, τὰ ἄθλια ταῦτα ἠλέησας ἄνθη, οἷς παρῶκεις καὶ ἐβλεπες, ἄφ' ὧν ἐστεφάνωσά σε πολλάκις; Πῶς δεῖξω νῦν τὸν παράδεισον τῷ δεσπότη; Τίς ἐκεῖνος θεασάμενος ἔσται; Κρεμᾶ γέροντα ἄνθρωπον ἐκ μᾶς πίτυος ὡς Μαρσύαν· τάχα δὲ καὶ Δάφνιν, ὡς τῶν αἰγῶν ταῦτα εἰργασμένον.”

4.9.1 Δάκρυα ἦν ἐπὶ τούτοις θερμότερα, καὶ ἐθρήνουν οὐ τὰ ἄνθη λοιπόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτῶν σώματα. Ἐθρήνει καὶ Χλόη Δάφνιν εἰ κρεμήσεται καὶ ἠῤῥαχο μηκέτι ἐλθεῖν τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμέρας διήντλει μοχθηράς, ὡς ἤδη Δάφνιν βλέπουσα μαστιγοῦμενον.

[(4.7.5) He saw the whole place devastated, in a way an enemy, not a thief, would have gone to work. At once he ripped his tunic in pieces and called on the gods with a great shout, so that Myrtale dropped what she was doing and ran out, and Daphnis left his goats and ran up. Seeing it, they shouted, and, shouting, they wept:

(4.8.1) a new kind of mourning – for flowers. They cried from fear of what their master would do; but even a stranger would have cried if he had been there, for the place was completely ruined, and all the ground was now a muddy mess – except that

any flowers that had escaped the assault still kept some bloom and shine and were still lovely even as they lay on the ground. (2) The bees hung over them too, making a continuous, ceaseless humming, as though mourning. Lamon was shocked and said: (3) “Oh, the bed of roses – how they’ve been broken down! Oh, the hyacinths and narcissi, that some evil man has dug up! Spring will come, and they will not flower. Summer will come, and they will not reach full bloom. Another autumn will come, and they will not form a garland for anyone. (4) Lord Dionysus, didn’t you feel sorry for these poor flowers? You used to live beside them and I look at them, and I often made you garlands with them. How shall I show the garden to the master now? And what will be his reaction when he sees it? There’s an old man he’ll string up on one of the pines, like Marsyas; and perhaps he’ll think that goats did this and string up Daphnis too!”.

(4.9.1) At this there were even hotter tears, and now they were not mourning for the flowers, but for their own bodies. Chloe mourned too at the thought that Daphnis would be strung up, and prayed that their master might no longer come, and lived through days of utter misery, as though she was already seeing Daphnis being whipped.]

The connection of the episode to the main story shares many features with the narrative situation of 2.22: Lamon, who was about to begin his daily work, like Daphnis in 2.20.2, sees his garden destroyed and gives expression to his despair with tears, desperate acts (as Daphnis threw himself to the ground, Lamon tears off his tunic), and direct speech. The key to reading the whole passage is in the introductory statement by the narrator at 4.7.5: the whole place was devastated “as only an enemy, not a thief, could have done” (πᾶν τὸ χωρίον δεδηωμένον καὶ ἔργον οἷον ἐχθρός, οὐ ληστῆς, ἐργάσαίτο, 4.7.5). Dionysophanes’ garden after Lampis’ raid is thus compared to a battlefield after an armed fight: flowers which lie dead on the ground (κείμενον 4.8.1) correspond to young soldiers fallen in war, reversing the viewpoint of the literary tradition, where the image of a cut-off flower is introduced as a simile for mortally wounded warriors.¹⁶ And as the soldiers fallen on the

16 See. Hom. *Il.* 8.306-8, 17, 53ff.; Stesich. fr. S15, col. II 14-17 Davies; Ap.

battlefield are given a ritual lament, so the destroyed flowers also receive a regular *threnos*, which translates into bucolic language the formal patterns of funeral lamentation, already fixed by a rich literary tradition starting from the *Iliad* and continuing, through tragic versions, into the rhetorical treatises of the Second Sophistic (see Birchall 1996: 2-7).

The literary patterns are clearly perceivable in the narrative frame too. The reaction of this peasant family to the destruction of flowers recalls the distraught response of the Trojan royal family to the death of Hector in *Il.* 22.405ff. (see also Myrtale's reaction to the βοῆ μεγάλη of Lamon in 4.7.5, ἡ Μυρτάλη τὰ ἐν χερσὶ καταλιποῦσα ἐξέδραμε, "Myrtale at once threw down what she had in her hands and ran out", just like Andromache in *Il.* 22.448, who drops her spindle when she hears the loud screams). In the Iliadic patterns there is also constant reference to the community which echoes the family mourning: it could be a ritual lament of women (expressed by the formula ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες, *Il.* 19.30, etc.) or the whole city of Troy, which joins Priam's desperation in *Il.* 22.408ff. ("The dear father gave a pitiful groan, and the people around him were weeping throughout the city"; for the Trojan people weeping see also *Il.* 24.776 "So [Helen] spoke in tears, and the huge crowd joined in lament"). In Longus, as also when Dorcon is buried in 1.31.4, the relatives are joined in their lament by animals sympathetic to the dead: bees in the case of the flower. And for the bees humming, just as for Dorcon's cows bellowing, the narrator makes an explicit comparison to funeral lamentations: "bees buzzing almost as if they were lamenting" (μέλιτται . . . βομβοῦσαι καὶ θρηνούσαις ὅμοιον, 4.8.2); "this was the cows' way of lamenting their dead herdsman" (ταῦτα θρῆνος ἦν τῶν βοῶν ἐπὶ βουκόλῳ τετελευτηκότι, 1.31.4).

Finally, in the literary models, the general situation of lamentation gives prominence to the voices of the closest relatives in the form of direct speech: here the same role is played by the gar-

Rh. 3.1396-403; Verg. *Aen.* 9.435-7, 11.68-71; Nonn. *D.* 11.280ff., Q. S. 1.659ff. (for an application of this image to erotic contexts see Sapph. fr. 105c V., Cat. 11.22-3 e 62.39ff.). Cf. also Lazzeri 2006: 145-58, with further bibliographical references.

dener Lamon, whose *threnos* is based on epic-tragic *gooi*. After the introductory series of three lamenting interjections, which are a parodic echo of similar tragic formulae (“Alas for my rose garden; it’s all broken down! Alas for my bank of violets; it’s all trampled! Alas for my hyacinths and daffodils” etc., φεῦ τῆς ῥόδωνιᾶς, ὡς κατακέκλασται· φεῦ τῆς ἰωνιᾶς, ὡς <κατα>πεπάτηται· φεῦ τῶν ὑακίνθων καὶ τῶν ναρκίσσων κτλ., 4.8.3), Lamon grieves over the fact that flowers will not blossom again in spring, nor grow in summer nor decorate anybody’s head in autumn. The bucolic situation requires an adaptation of the typical motif of funeral lamentation - the regret that the dead will not enjoy any happiness in the future - according to a *topos* most frequently used for young people dead before their time,¹⁷ to whom the flowers are here assimilated (the chronological sequence of the seasons mentioned here by Lamon alludes to the length of human life, from early youth to full maturity).

The next section of the *threnos* has many points in common with Daphnis’ lament in 2.22: after an apostrophe to Dionysus, in which the god is blamed because he had no mercy for the unfortunate flowers (4.8.4; see Daphnis’ analogous reproach of the Nymphs in 2.22.1), Lamon asks himself how he will dare to show the garden to his master, whose angry reaction he fears (see Daphnis’ analogous fear of his parents in 2.22.3). In fact, as the narrator has pointed out in introducing the lament, it is precisely the fear of punishment by Dionysophanes that gives rise to the unusual lament (“It was mourning for flowers, a thing without precedent”, καὶ ἦν μὲν καινὸν πένθος ἀνθῶν, 4.7.5); the same motive is confirmed in the final epilogue too: “they were sorrowing not for flowers but for their own persons” (4.9.1). Here Longus is consciously and somewhat ironically reworking an almost constant characteristic of epic-tragic funeral laments, where, besides mourning the dead, the survivors grieve for themselves because of the tragic doom which awaits them.

17 See Alexiou: 1974; premature death is frequently associated to denied nuptial rites or to the joy of generating kids, as in Antigones’ lament on herself in Soph. *Ant.* 814ff. and 867, or in Hecuba’s lament on Astyanax in Eur. *Tro.* 1169. A parodic reprise of the motif is Luc. *Luct.* 13.

Chloe too participates in the collective weeping (4.9.1): her anguish for Daphnis is expressed by Longus with the term *διαντλέω*, following a nautical metaphor (from *ἄντλος*, ‘hold of a ship’, or ‘bilge-water’) expressed in various ways in many tragic texts (see e.g. Aesch. *PV* 84, 375; Eur. *Andr.* 1216, *HF* 1373, *Ion* 927, fr. 454.3 Kn., *Cycl.* 10, 110; Enn. *Trag.* fr. 103 R.³ *quantis cum aerumnis illum exanclavi diem*). However, as usual in Longus, the inevitable happy ending soon arrives: in this case, with an interesting reversal of the tragic norm, thanks to the arrival of an atypical messenger. If in tragedy the entrance of a messenger is usually connected to some painful news, here Dionysophanes’ messenger – reassuring in his very name (Eudromus, ‘the good runner’) and well disposed towards Daphnis (*eunous*) from the beginning – in announcing the arrival of his masters, promises to give them all possible support in resolving the situation positively, and ensuing events completely bear out his promise.

5.

In contrast to the parodic rewritings of tragedy in episodes characterised by a happy ending, in the only section of the novel which deals with a real death – Dorcon’s killing in the first book – the narrator downplays the pathos of the situation as far as possible and tries instead to exploit not the tragic, but the epic dimension of the character. Like some of the major Homeric heroes, Dorcon dies at the end of an *aristeia*, a rustic one of course, in keeping with the character’s status: when he lies on the ground, mortally wounded, he tells Chloe that the pirates tore him to pieces like an ox, while he was fighting to defend the herd (οἱ γὰρ με ἄσεβεῖς λησταὶ πρὸ τῶν βοῶν μαχόμενον κατέκοψαν ὡς βοῦν, 1.29.1). It is a bucolic version of the simile that in the *Odyssey* evokes Agamemnon’s death, in an analepsis as in Longus, at first narrated by Proteus in 4.534f., then by Agamemnon himself in *Od.* 11.409–11: “Aegisthus . . . killed me . . . as one cuts down an ox at his manger” (ἀλλά μοι Αἰγισθος τεύξας θάνατόν τε μόρον τε / ἔκτα σὺν οὐλομένη ἄλόχῳ οἰκόνδε καλέσσας, / δειπνίσσας, ὡς τίς τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτῃ).

In Longus' version, the Homeric simile, which compares a king slain in the dining room and an ox knocked down in a cattle-shed, is transferred to a new rustic context and applied to a herdsman, and so becomes even more appropriate: much more legitimately than Agamemnon, Dorcon can say of himself that he has been knocked out "like an ox"!

The end of this episode maintains the epic tone of the beginning. Like the great heroes of epic poetry, Dorcon is granted the honour of a solemn burial: a tumulus is erected, and many trees are planted all around it (γῆν μὲν οὖν πολλήν ἐπέθεσαν, φυτὰ δὲ ἡμερα πολλὰ ἐφύτευσαν, 1.31.3). This narrative detail recalls the exceptional funeral honours given to Eetion, Andromache's father and king of Thebae, by Achilles and the mountain Nymphs:¹⁸ "Achilles piled a grave mound over it (the body), and the nymphs of the mountains . . . planted elm trees about it" (ἦδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' ἔχθειν· περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν / νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, *Il.* 6.419-20). After the offerings (all of pastoral nature, of course), the ceremony ends with the atypical funeral lament of Dorcon's cows (1.31.4):

Ἦκούσθη καὶ τῶν βοῶν ἔλεινὰ μυκήματα καὶ δρόμοι τινὲς ὠφθῆσαν ἅμα τοῖς μυκήμασιν ἄτακτοι· καὶ ὡς ἐν ποιμέσιν εἰκάζετο καὶ αἰπόλοις, ταῦτα θρῆνος ἦν τῶν βοῶν ἐπὶ βουκόλῳ τετελευτηκότι.

[There was the sound of the cows mournfully mooing, and the sight of them charging around aimlessly as they mooed. In the estimation of shepherds and goatherds, this was the cows' way of lamenting for their dead herdsman.]

This scene may be viewed as the bucolic equivalent of the funeral rites of some of the greatest epic characters (Patroclus, Hector and, in the *Aethiopsis*, Achilles himself). The mournful note of the corresponding epic scenes is now fading in the bucolic elegy: if in 1.29.1 Dorcon was compared to an ox, leader of the herd, now the cows

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. τιμῆσαι in Long. 1.31.3, compared to σεβάσασατο in *Il.* 6.417, both at the introduction of the scenes. A parodic reprise of the particular motif of the trees planted around the grave is in Trimalchion's testament in Petron. 71.7.

themselves are humanised and take the role that, in the funeral laments of epic poems, was attributed to the comrades of the dead. It is thus a case – like many others in Longus – of contamination between homologous situations in different genres: the *pathetic fallacy* typical of pastoral poetry on the one hand,¹⁹ and, on the other, the funeral lament of the fellow-soldiers and the relatives of the hero who died on the battlefield. The running of the cows and their mournful bellowing are the bucolic version of the funeral honours for Patroclus in *Il.* 23.13-6 and for Achilles in *Od.* 24.68-70: as a last homage paid to their leader, the warriors, on foot or on horseback, joust around the funeral pyre, raising high their lament.²⁰ And as at the beginning of the episode with the ox-simile, at the end too the reprise of the epic model implies an inevitable distance from the model, dispelling pathos with a smile.

The middle tone – characteristic of Longus' *Pastoralia*, in constant balance between the sympathetic acceptance and ironical distance towards the treated matter – together with the aim of redeeming the character of Dorcon after his previous failures,²¹ seem to explain in this episode the choice of literary patterns that systematically derive from epic, not from tragedy. On the other hand, the tragic allusions, that inevitably activate (comic) effects of paratragedy, are more frequent in contexts where the happy ending is total and unconditional, as we saw with Daphnis' lament in 2.22-23 or Lamon's in 4.8.3-4.

Works Cited

- Alexiou, Margaret (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (1974), revised by Dimitrios Yatromanolakis and Panagiotis Roilos, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andronikos, Manolis (1968), *Archaeologia Homerica*, Bd. 3 *Totenkult*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Balboni, Gaetano (1973), "Le avventure pastorali di Dafni e Cloue", in Quintino Cataudella (ed.), *Il romanzo classico* (1958), Firenze:

19 See Dick 1968: 27-44, and Buller 1981: 35-42.

20 On this ritual see Andronikos 1968: 14-15.

21 See in part. the episode of the ambush to Chloe in 1.21.

- Sansoni editore, 525-615.
- Battezzato, Luigi (2009), review of Chris Kraus, Simon Goldhill, Helene P. Foley, Jas Elsner (eds), *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-05-47.html> (Accessed 11 August 2018).
- Billault, Alain (1991), *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque impériale*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Birchall, John (1996), "The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel", in Heinz Hofmann and Maaïke Zimmerman (eds), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel VII*, Groningen: E. Forsten, 1-17.
- Bowie, Ewen (2007), "Pulling the Other? Longus on Tragedy", in Chris Kraus, Simon Goldhill, Helene P. Foley and Jas Elsner (eds), *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 338-52.
- Buller, Jeffrey L. (1981), "The Pathetic Fallacy in Hellenistic Pastoral", *Ramus*, 10: 35-52.
- Burlando, Annalaura (1997), *Longo Sofista. Le avventure pastorali di Dafni e Clòe*, Milano: Garzanti.
- Crismani, Daria (1997), *Il teatro nel romanzo ellenistico d'amore e di avventura*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Dick, Bernard F. (1968), "Ancient Pastoral and the Pathetic Fallacy", *Comparative Literature* 20: 27-44.
- Hunter, Richard L. (1983), *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazzeri, Massimo (2006), "I papaveri di Verg. *Aen.* 9.436, Omero Stesicoro e Ovidio (con una nota a Servio)", *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 9: 145-58.
- Lowe, William Douglas (1908), *The Story of Daphnis and Chloe. A Greek Pastoral by Longus*, Cambridge & London: Bell (rpt. 1979, New York: Arno Pr.).
- Morgan, John Robert (2004), *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe*, München & Leipzig: Aris & Phillips.
- Morgan, John Robert and Stephen Harrison (2008), "Intertextuality", in Tim Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 218-36.
- Monteleone, Ciro (1987), *Longo Sofista. Dafni e Clòe*, in Onofrio Vox, Ciro Monteleone, Giacomo Annibaldi, *Storie d'amore antiche. Leucippe e Clitofonte, Dafni e Clòe, Anzia e Abrocome*, introduzione di Luciano Canfora, Bari: Dedalo, 213-325.
- Pattoni, Maria Pia (1998) "ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, (τί πάθω;). Una formula omerica e i

- suoi contesti”, *Aevum antiquum* 11: 5-49
- (2004), “I *Pastoralia* di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi. Alcune proposte interpretative”, *Materiali e Discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici* 53: 83-124.
- (2005), *Longo Sofista. Dafni e Cloe*, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Reardon, Bryan P. (1989), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press.
- Schönberger, Otto (1989⁴), *Longos, Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Telò, Mario (2002), “Per una grammatica dei gesti nella tragedia greca (I): cadere a terra, alzarsi; coprirsi, scoprirsi il volto”, *Materiali e Discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici* 48: 9-75.
- Thornley, George (1916), *Daphnis & Chloe by Longus*, with the English translation of George Thornley, revised and augmented by John Maxwell Edmonds, Cambridge, MA-London: Harvard University Press.

Il Ciclope: un mostro tra antico e moderno

PAOLA VOLPE

Abstract

Starting from an analysis of Homer's character of Polyphemus in Homer, and in Greek literature of classical and Hellenistic periods, the article offers a translation and exegesis of a few strophes in *The Fable of Polyphemus and Galatea* by Luis de Góngora – “the fresh and popular poet” as Benedetto Croce called him – which may clarify the reception of the ancient texts in the age of Spanish baroque.

“In un dramma antico”, scrive Heiner Müller, “l'azione si mette in moto per l'arrivo di uno straniero in un paesaggio deserto di uomini: la grotta, vuota di chi la abita, compare in scena prima dell'arrivo del protagonista che, nella sua abnormità e nella sua violenza, nella sua riduzione a bestia e a puro istinto, è comico. Il Ciclope, come Filottete relegato a Lemno, è l'uomo al grado zero dell'esistenza, che conosce solo la legge della fame e del suo soddisfacimento” (cit. in Fornaro 2010: 195).

Tale è Polifemo che nella poesia omerica appare ‘essere selvatico’ solitario, dedito alla pastorizia e che può considerarsi il modello di tutti i giganti, di tutti gli esseri abnormi. Immenso come immensa può essere una cima di monte che s'innalza imperiosa al di sopra delle altre, subisce negli autori successivi ad Omero quella che Mastromarco chiama la ‘degradazione’ del mostro (Mastromarco 1998). Il vivere isolato e soprattutto il non mangiare pane connotano Polifemo come πέλωρ (“mostro”, “portento”), ovvero come colui che vive fuori da ogni contesto sociale (*Od.* 9.190-2):

καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἔσκει
ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ρίῳ ὑλήεντι
ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ὃ τε φαίνεται.

[Era un essere straordinario, mostruoso, non somigliava agli uomini che mangiano pane ma alla cima di monti altissimi, che da

tutte le altre cime si distingue.]¹

Ma egli già nell'*Odissea* mostra tratti di umanità verso gli animali (che con lui dividono l'antro oscuro e maleodorante, coperto com'è di letame) e soprattutto verso il montone, al quale rivolge parole piene di *pathos*. Sono i vv. 447-50:

κρίε πέπον, τί μοι ὄδε διὰ σπέος ἔσσυο μήλων
 ὕστατος; οὐ τι πάρος γε λελεμμένος ἔρχεται οἰῶν,
 ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρῶτος νέμει τέρην ἄνθεα ποίης
 μακρὰ βιβάζ, πρῶτος δὲ ῥοὰς ποταμῶν ἀφικάνεις.

[Mio caro montone, perché dall'antro esci ultimo dal gregge? Prima non restavi dietro alle pecore, ma per primo brucavi i teneri fiori dell'erba, avanzandoti a grandi balzi e per primo giungevi alle acque del fiume.]

Qui il montone “viene sentito come un essere umano cui fa difetto solo la capacità di comunicare, di parlare . . . A lui Polifemo attribuisce sentimenti che sono propri dell'uomo: ai vv. 451-2, al calar della sera, è preso da nostalgia di tornare alla sua stalla ‘per primo al calar della sera desideravi tornare al recinto’ e ai vv. 452-3 ‘Forse piangi l'occhio del tuo padrone che un vigliacco ha accecato con i suoi tristi compagni dopo averlo ubriacato con il vino’ Polifemo mette in relazione la lentezza con cui il montone esce dalla spelonca con un sentimento di solidarietà dell'animale, partecipe della sventura che ha colpito il padrone” (Mastromarco 1998: 18). Sembra che il montone sia un essere umano, mentre Odisseo è colui al quale – per contrasto – il Ciclope si rivolge con ferocia animalesca, anche se sarà Polifemo, seppure immenso, a subire, così da sembrare nello scontro il più debole: nella sua forza brutta egli è vinto dall'intelligenza e dall'astuzia dell'eroe greco (Perotti 2005: 56). “Il confronto <di Odisseo> con Polifemo può <così> essere letto come lo scontro con l'altro da sé, l'inumano, il mostro, il selvaggio, il primitivo, il cannibale” (Boitani 2012). Per la prima volta, forse, si prova pietà per il Ciclope, che ricorda la profezia fattagli: un giorno sarebbe stato privato della vista (*Od.* 9.507-12) ed egli ha

¹ Tutte le traduzioni dei passi citati sono di Paola Volpe tranne quelle di Alda Croce di volta in volta indicate.

sempre aspettato che arrivasse un uomo forte e bello e invece è giunto presso di lui (*Od.* 9. 515-6):

νῦν δέ μ' ἐὼν ὀλίγος τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καὶ ἄκικος
ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν, ἐπεὶ μ' ἔδαμάσσατο οἴνω.

[uno che è piccolo, da nulla e da debole mi ha privato dell'occhio dopo avermi vinto con il vino.]

Ad Omero s'ispira il *Ciclope* euripideo,² una parodia in cui l'elemento comico scaturisce “dal sorprendente contrasto tra la configurazione formalmente e contenutisticamente armonica del modello, evocata dall'imitazione, e il suo stravolgimento in futili e ridicole circostanze” (Rau 1967: 11; cf. Degani 1985: 5-33). Nel dramma satiresco euripideo è possibile sottolineare due innovazioni “l'una mirata e l'altra condizionata da una situazione non più narrata come in Omero, ma rappresentata sulla scena. L'innovazione più importante è quella relativa alla conoscenza del vino: mentre in Omero i Ciclopi coltivano la vite e producono un vino sia pure inferiore a quello che offre Odisseo, in Euripide Polifemo e i suoi fratelli non conoscono né viti né vino: ne soffrono gli schiavizzati Sileno e i Satiri, compagni di Dioniso, ed è un espediente per farli sentire più spaesati e derelitti” (Rossi 2003: 9). Dice infatti Sileno nel prologo del *Ciclope* (vv. 26-35):

ποιμνας Κύκλωπος ἀνοσίου ποιμαίνομεν.
παῖδες μὲν οὖν μοι κλιτύων ἐν ἐσχάτοις
νέμουσι μῆλα νέα νέοι πεφυκότες,
ἐγὼ δὲ πληροῦν πίστρα καὶ σαίρειν στέγας
μένων τέταγμα τάσδε, τῷδε δυσσεβεῖ
Κύκλωπι δείπνων ἀνοσίων διάκονος.
καὶ νῦν, τὰ προσταχθέντ', ἀναγκαίως ἔχει
σαίρειν σιδηρᾶ τῆδέ μ' ἀρπάγη δόμους,
ὡς τὸν τ' ἀπόντα δεσπότην Κύκλωπ' ἐμὸν
καθαροῖσιν ἄντροις μῆλά τ' ἐσδεχόμεθα.

[Adesso tocca a noi pascere le greggi di questa empia creatura, il Ciclope, e i figli miei sui più lontani clivi pascono giovani, i giova-

2 Per la datazione e il significato politico del *Ciclope* euripideo cf. Paganelli 1979.

ni armenti, invece io fui assegnato a riempire vasche, a spazzare la reggia del Ciclope, a fare da servo ai suoi empì banchetti. Ora ad esempio – sono questi i comandi – tocca ramazzare la dimora con questo ferreo rastrello che ho in mano, perché le greggi e il padrone trovino l'antro bello e ripulito.]³

Con l'arrivo improvviso del Ciclope la scena cambia, Sileno deve affilare i coltelli che serviranno a tagliare le membra degli uomini più grassi, mentre Polifemo in modo sdegnoso risponde ad Odisseo che egli ben conosce il motivo della guerra di Troia, ossia il rapimento di Elena, e che non ha rispetto alcuno degli dèi ai quali l'eroe greco pure si appella. In Euripide si intravede nella ferocia mostruosa di Polifemo un primo barlume di umanità: egli conosce la passione amorosa che ha provocato la guerra decennale. “Per una donna – che vergogna! – avete fatto vela contro la terra dei Frigi” (vv. 283-4).⁴ Il *topos* del *μιάς χάριν γυναικός*, “per una donna”, ovvero del *cunnius taeterrima belli causa*, “donna ignobilissima causa di guerra” (Hor. *Sat.* 13.104-5), “applicato alla guerra d'Ilio, trova ampio riscontro prima del nostro autore, nell'epica, nella lirica e nella tragedia: in particolare Aesch. *Ag.* 62, 448, Soph. *Aj.* 1311 s.” (Paganelli 1979: 92). Si tratta di un Polifemo che conosce la storia e che conosce la poesia eolica, e non solo, come è attestato dai vv. 323-31 che riprendono nella loro struttura il fr. 338 Voigt di Alceo:

ἄκουσον. ὅταν ἄνωθεν ὄμβρον ἐκχέη,
 ἐν τῆδε πέτρα στέγν' ἔχων σκηνώματα,
 ἢ μόσχον ὀπτὸν ἢ τι θήρειον δάκος
 δαινύμενος, εὖ τέγγων τε γαστέρ' ὑπίαν,
 ἐπεκπιῶν γάλακτος ἀμφορέα, πέπλον
 κρούω, Διὸς βρονταῖσιν εἰς ἔριν κτυπῶν.
 ὅταν δὲ βορέας χιόνα Θρηῆκιος χέη,
 δοραῖσι θηρῶν σῶμα περιβαλῶν ἐμὸν
 καὶ πῦρ ἀναίθων, χιόνος οὐδέν μοι μέλει.

3 I καθαρά ἄντρα (“antri puliti”) di v. 35 richiamano per contrasto l'antro del Ciclope ricoperto di letame del testo omerico.

4 αἰσχυρὸν στρατεύμα γ', οἵτινες μιάς χάριν / γυναικός ἐξεπλεύσατ' ἐς γαῖαν Φρυγῶν.

[Ascolta. Quando dall'alto Zeus rovescia la pioggia, io me ne sto al riparo in questa grotta, e mi mangio un vitello arrosto o qualche animale selvatico. E disteso mi innaffio bene la pancia, mi scolo un'anfora di latte, mi percuoto il peplo, gareggiando in rumori con i tuoni di Zeus. E quando il tracio Borea fa cadere la neve, io, tutto ravvolto in pelli di bestie selvatiche, accendo il fuoco e della neve non mi do cura alcuna.]

Come ancora annota Mastromarco, il Ciclope di Euripide “pur conservando, come è ovvio, elementi costitutivi comuni con il Polifemo omerico, si distacca dal modello epico per vari aspetti: conosce (e pratica) la cultura del cotto, mangia le sue greggi, conosce i vari tipi di latte, vive in un antro pulito, lascia che siano i satiri a portare le sue greggi al pascolo, pratica la caccia con il cane, ha esigenze sessuali, antepo-ponendo peraltro i rapporti omosessuali a quelli eterosessuali, conosce l'epica e la filosofia, fa sfoggio di una raffinata cultura letteraria, ha nozioni di geografia, apprende le regole simposiache” (1998: 33). E – come è stato sottolineato – non mancano nel Ciclope allusioni a fatti storici contemporanei così come ad aspetti della società del tempo.

Il Ciclope è ormai sulla strada della civilizzazione; egli, che non è ancora innamorato, lo diventerà negli *Idilli* 6 e 11 di Teocrito, nei quali perderà il carattere epico, essendo solo un uomo che corteggia una ninfa. Tale distanza dal mondo omerico si osserva già in Filosseno di Citera,⁵ del quale si ricordano due frammenti, uno tramandato da Sinesio, *ep.* 121.1ss. (p. 296 Garzya) e l'altro da Ateneo, 13.564e (Gelli 2008). Nel primo (fr. 818e) è rappresentato Odisseo che cerca di persuadere Polifemo a farlo uscire dall'antro:

γῶης γάρ εἰμι, καὶ εἰς καιρὸν ἄν
 σοι παρείην οὐκ εὐτυχοῦντι τὰ εἰς τὸν θαλάττιον ἔρωτα.
 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τοι καὶ ἐπῳδὰς οἶδα καὶ καταδέσμους καὶ
 ἐρωτικὰς κατανάγκας, αἷς οὐκ εἰκὸς ἀντισχεῖν οὐδὲ
 πρὸς βραχὺ τὴν Γαλάτειαν. μόνον ὑπόσθηθι σὺ τὴν
 θύραν ἀποκινήσαι, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν θυρεὸν τοῦτον. . . .
 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπα-

5 I frammenti di Filosseno sono stati recentemente pubblicati in Philoxenus 2014.

νήξω σοι θᾶπτον ἢ λόγος, τὴν παῖδα κατεργασάμενος.

...

καὶ δεήσεται

σου καὶ ἀντιβολήσει, σὺ δὲ ἄκκιῃ καὶ κατειρωνεύση.

...

καλὸν οὖν εἰ πάντα εὐ-

θετήσας ἐκκορήσειάς τε καὶ ἐκπλυνεῖς καὶ ἐνθυμιά-
σειας τὸ δωμάτιον·

[Sono uno stregone e al momento opportuno potrò aiutare te che sei sfortunato nel tuo amore marino. Io conosco incantesimi, legami magici, costrizioni erotiche alle quali Galatea non resisterà neppure un poco. Tu impegnati a spostare la porta o piuttosto questo masso. . . . Io ritornerò da te più veloce del pensiero, dopo che mi sarò lavorata la ragazza . . . E ti pregherà e ti supplicherà e tu fingerai indifferenza e la prenderai in giro . . . Sarebbe bello se tu mettessi tutto in ordine e pulissi la tua cameretta.]

Nel secondo (fr. 821) invece si loda Galatea “dal bel volto, dalla bella voce, germoglio d’Amore” (ὦ καλλιπρόσωπε, χαριτόφωνε, θάλλος Ἐρώτων).⁶

Ma è Teocrito a fare di Polifemo un pastore innamorato. Nell’idillio 6 Dafni si rivolge a Dameta/Polifemo e canta Galatea che scaglia mele verso il gregge per attirare l’attenzione del pastore: dal mare la ninfa “civetta” (διαθρύπτεται) e “come la lanugine secca che si stacca dal cardo quando l’inaridisce la bella stagione, fugge chi l’ama e insegue chi non l’ama” (ὡς ἀπ’ ἀκάνθας / ταῖ καπυραὶ χαῖται, τὸ καλὸν θέρος ἀνίκα φρύγει, / καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει). (Si tratta di un ribaltamento della celebre legge della ‘giusta reciprocità amorosa’, già consacrata nella letteratura fin da Saffo, fr. 1.21-4 Voigt). “A un’altra tradizione, pur essa originariamente saffica (‘la cosa più bella è ciò che si ama’ fr. 16 Voigt) potrebbe alludere in ultima istanza anche il commento di Dafni, vv. 18 sg. ‘sembrano belle per chi ama, Polifemo, anche le cose che non sono belle’” (Fantuzzi 1993: 188-9). A lui risponde Dameta/Polifemo che, prendendosi forse un po’ in giro, dice che suo intento è di farla ingelosire (34-8):

6 In Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 622C è detto “Sostiene Filosseno che ‘il Ciclope medicava il suo amore con maliose canzoni’” (τὸν Κύκλωπα μούσαις εὐφώνοις ἰᾶσθαι ᾿φησι τὸν ἔρωτα Φιλόξενοσ) (fr. 7 PMG).

καὶ γὰρ θην οὐδ' εἶδος ἔχω κακὸν ὡς με λέγοντι.
 ἧ γὰρ πρᾶν ἐς πόντον ἐσέβλεπον, . . .
 καὶ καλὰ μὲν τὰ γένεια, καλὰ δέ μευ ἅ μία κώρα,
 . . . κατεφαίνετο, τῶν δέ τ' ὀδόντων
 λευκοτέραν ἀὐγὰν Παρίας ὑπέφαινε λίθοιο.

[E certo non sono neanche brutto, come dicono, mi sono specchiato poco fa nel mare . . . e bella appariva la barba, bella la mia unica pupilla . . . e i denti nel riflesso del mare apparivano più smaglianti del marmo di Paro.]⁷

Con l'idillio 6 forma un dittico l'idillio 11, che non contiene solo la parodia del pastore e dell'amore bucolico, ma anche il messaggio all'amico Nicia, al quale offre come esempio Polifemo che guarisce o, almeno, rende meno dolorose le sue pene d'amore con il canto (vv. 13-20):

ὃ δὲ τὰν Γαλάτειαν αἰίδων
 αὐτὸς ἐπ' αἰόνος κατετάκετο φυκιοέσσας
 ἐξ' αὐῆς.
 . . .
 ἀλλὰ τὸ φάρμακον εὔρε, καθεζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ πέτρας
 ὑψηλᾶς ἐς πόντον ὄρων ἄειδε τοιαῦτα·
 ὦ λευκὰ Γαλάτεια, τί τὸν φιλέοντ' ἀποβάλλη,
 λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν, ἀπαλωτέρα ἄρνός,
 μόσχῳ γαυροτέρα, φιαρωτέρα ὄμφακος ὠμᾶς;

[Egli cantando Galatea si struggeva sul lido algoso sin dall'aurora; . . . ma trovò il rimedio e, sopra un'alta roccia, lo sguardo verso il mare, cantava così: "Bianca Galatea, perché respingi chi ti ama, tu che sei più candida del latte cagliato, più morbida di un agnello, più splendida di un vitello, più brillante dell'uva quando è acerba".]⁸

7 Cf. Verg. *ecl.* 2.25ss.

8 Nei versi qui citati sembra evidente la presenza di un'aporia. Cataudella, prendendo le mosse dal commento di Gow (1950: II), osserva che, mentre al v. 13 il canto è una manifestazione del tormento d'amore, al v. 18 proprio quel canto diventa rimedio contro l'amore. Dopo aver discusso gli interventi e le varie proposte di lettura, Cataudella al v. 13 propone di leggere, al posto di αἰίδων, αἰεὶ λαών (1953: 477-8).

Ma la ninfa sfugge perché (vv. 31-3):

οὐνεκά μοι λασία μὲν ὄφρῦς ἐπὶ παντὶ μετώπῳ
 ἔξ ὡτὸς τέταται ποτὶ θώτερον ὧς μία μακρά,
 εἷς δ' ὄφθαλμὸς ὑπεστι, πλατεῖα δὲ ρίς ἐπὶ χεῖλει.

[un irsuto sopracciglio sull'intera fronte da un orecchio all'altro si stende, unico e lungo e sotto c'è un solo occhio e largo è il mio naso sopra il labbro.]

Consapevole della sua bruttezza, il Ciclope enumera tutti i beni che ha e offre alla ninfa un antro dove sono (vv. 45-8):

ἐντὶ δάφναι τηνεῖ, ἐντὶ ῥαδιναὶ κυπάρισσοι,
 ἔστι μέλας κισσός, ἔστ' ἄμπελος ἅ γλυκύκαρπος,
 ἔστι ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ, τό μοι ἅ πολυδένδρεος Αἴτνα
 λευκᾶς ἐκ χιόνος ποτὸν ἀμβρόσιον προΐητι.

[allori e cipressi flessuosi, edera nera e la vite dai dolci frutti e dove c'è l'acqua fresca, bevanda divina che per me l'Etna selvoso fa scendere dalla candida neve.]

Un Polifemo ingenuo che mostra la sua pochezza mentale e il suo infantilismo è in Luciano (*Dialoghi degli dèi marini*), autore che sottolinea tali caratteristiche del Ciclope anche in quella esclamazione che immaginiamo sia stata detta come un lamento (ὦ πάτερ, "o padre"), così come con voce lamentevole aveva definito lo ξένος κατάρατος, "lo straniero maledetto".

Il Polifemo consapevole della sua poca avvenenza, che offre le sue ricchezze, è un Polifemo innamorato, ma non ancora geloso, perché il binomio amore e gelosia sarà presente in Ovidio (*met.* 13): l'amore ingentilisce il suo animo, ma la gelosia si manifesta con la ferocia mostruosa del Polifemo omerico, riunendo in tal modo sia la tradizione epica del gigante mangiatore di uomini sia quella elegiaca degli idilli teocritei. I diversi momenti del mito narrato da Ovidio sono sottolineati dall'uso del verbo *rapio*, che, pur con lo stesso significato, indica la prima volta la sfera fisica *Lumen . . . quod unum / fronte geris media, rapiet tibi . . . Ulixes* (vv. 772-3),⁹ e la seconda volta la sfera dell'amore, quando Polifemo irri-

⁹ "Quest'unico occhio che porti in mezzo alla fronte te lo caverà Ulisse".

dendo Telemo esclama: *O vatum stoltissime, falleris . . . / altera iam rapuit* (vv. 774-5).¹⁰ A raccontare la triste storia del suo amore per Acis¹¹ è Galatea stessa, che piange quel giovane Fauno, grande gioia di suo padre e di sua madre e ancora di più della ninfa marina. Quell'essere crudele, che disprezza l'Olimpo e i suoi numi, prova ad un tratto cosa sia il sentimento d'amore che brucia come brucia l'Etna e uccide come può uccidere la lava del vulcano che ricopre di cenere la pianura (*met.* 13. 761-8):

*cum dis contemptor Olympi
quid sit amor, sensit validaque cupidine captus
uritur oblitus pecorum antrorumque suorum.
Iamque tibi formae, iamque est tibi cura placendi,
iam rigidos pectis rastris, Polipheme, capillos,
iam libet hirsutam tibi recidere barbam
et spectare feros in aqua et componere vultus . . .*

[quel dispregiatore dell'Olimpo e delle sue divinità prova cosa sia l'amore e brucia, preso da violento desiderio, dimenticandosi delle sue greggi e delle sue caverne. E ora ti dai pensiero per il tuo aspetto, ti preoccupi di piacere, Polifemo, di pettinarti i ruvidi capelli; vuoi tagliarti l'ispida barba con un falcetto e specchiare nell'acqua il tuo aspetto truce per ricomporlo.]

Il mito di Polifemo e Galatea, così come si legge in Ovidio, ebbe molta fortuna nell'età del Rinascimento e del Barocco in Italia come in Spagna. In Italia aveva ricordato la favola di Polifemo e Galatea Boccaccio nel *De genealogia deorum* 7.17; Poliziano nelle *Stanze per la Giostra* 1.115-18; Pontano che opera nei suoi versi una mirabile sintesi tra il mondo bucolico virgiliano e la mitografia ovidiana; Sannazzaro nelle *Eclogae piscatoriae*; Bembo nelle *Rime boscherecce*; Marino in alcuni versi dell'*Adone* (canto 9) e nel gruppo di 24 sonetti della raccolta delle *Boscherecce* (1602) che Croce

¹⁰ "Stupidissimo indovino, ti sbagli . . . un'altra me l'ha già preso".

¹¹ L'introduzione di Acis nel mito è, a parere di Holland, dovuta a Callimaco, dal momento che Ovidio afferma che egli ha derivato l'amore di Acis da un poeta alessandrino. Da tale affermazione Holland deduce che quel poeta non può che essere Callimaco "dal momento che lui solo, nel periodo di Teocrito e Bione, può aver studiato questa materia (1884: 141ss.).

battezzò *Polifemeide* (Marino 1913) e in ultimo Stigliano che nelle *Stanze pastorali* (1601) così dichiara all'inizio del suo poema "In questa stanza pastorale s'introduce (non discordando dalla Favola degli antichi) il Ciclope innamorato a pregar la sua Galatea".

Un'attenzione particolare va però rivolta alla poesia di Marino, che conosce il mito di Polifemo nelle forme codificate dalle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane e dalla traduzione di Andrea dell'Anguillara in ottava rima, dedicata a Margherita di Valois duchessa di Savoia. In Marino protagonisti sono Polifemo, Galatea e Acis. Galatea ama Acis ed è riamata. Polifemo, folle d'amore per la ninfa, schiaccia con un masso il giovane Fauno, causandone la trasformazione in fiume, che sgorga nel mare dove la ninfa aveva trovato rifugio. E così i due amanti possono continuare ad amarsi, mentre il Ciclope, dopo aver a lungo riflettuto sulla sua solitudine, si uccide trasformandosi in Mongibello. Polifemo è cieco nel suo unico occhio, ma il suo accecamento, questa volta, non è fisico, perché esso è causato dall'amore.

L'uccisione di Acis ricorre pure in Pomponio Torelli, che nel 1603 a Parma pubblica una *Galatea*, ma tra il testo di Torelli e quello di Marino vi sono delle differenze che è bene sottolineare. Nel testo del Torelli è Acis stesso a profetizzare a Polifemo la cecità, in quello di Marino la profezia è invece pronunciata da Galatea. Va anche aggiunto che in Torelli "il mostro sfoga in modi parossistici la sua disperazione, mentre in Marino questa parte non compare" (Sbacchi 2002: 58). Gli atteggiamenti del Ciclope descritti da Torelli fanno da preludio alla sconfitta e alla caduta di un potente per il quale non vi è possibilità di riscatto; non così in Marino, dove a Polifemo viene concesso di manifestare i sentimenti più profondi. A Marino cioè preme dimostrare come il Ciclope sia capace di amare e come grazie a quell'amore egli diventi un uomo. "L'amore dunque è un sentimento che riesce ad espugnare il cuore di tutti, connotandosi secondo le caratteristiche di ciascuno. Il Ciclope rappresenta la forza bruta, la violenza e il suo amore è altrettanto violento distruttivo letteralmente omicida" (Sbacchi 2002: 59). Questo amore che spinge a gesti arditi imprevedibili e che – come dice Platone – è protervo e pronto a tutto (*Symp.* 203 ἴτης, "audace", "imprudente"; *Tim.* 69d ἐπιχειρητῆ παντὸς ἔρωτι, "all'amore capace di tutto") riesce a rendere ciarliero un uomo taciturno

no e spesso squassa il corpo e la voce sì da renderla lontana dagli atteggiamenti naturali e consueti (Plut. 623B-C). È per così dire la parabola di Polifemo, che per dolore d'amore piange e si lamenta per poi darsi alla più terribile collera: quel canto si muta così in un'orgia bacchica e in un grido animalesco.

In Spagna ci limitiamo a ricordare l'*Elegia* 9 di Herrera e la *Favola di Acis y Galatea* di Luis Camillo y Sotomayor. “Nella poesia spagnola del secolo d'oro tutto viene dall'Italia: la forma il metro le strofe i tipi di canzone i sonetti e anche il contenuto i temi lirici i miti i primi modelli di mistica ispirazione. Tuttavia la poesia lirica spagnola del '500 e del '600 supera per intensità per fervore e varia personalità dei poeti quella dell'Italia nello stesso periodo . . . La poesia spagnola dei secoli sedicesimo e diciassettesimo, che raggiunge quest'altezza unica, è, comunque, tutta di origine italiana” (Alonso 1973: 24-5). Il mito di Polifemo e Galatea rappresenta i due poli di questa età: da un lato l'armonia e lo splendore (Galatea), dall'altro l'oscurità di un antro, che è l'immagine plastica della nostalgia per la perdita di un'età dorata.

Il mistero della grotta imperscrutabile e il dolore dell'amante respinto e malinconico sono i temi della *Fabula de Polifemo y Galatea* di Louis de Góngora (nato a Cordoba l'11 luglio del 1561 e lì morto il 23 maggio del 1627), che Croce considerò poeta “fresco e popolare”.¹² “Talia, culta sì, aunque bucólica”¹³ (v. 2) ha ispirato questi versi che egli dedica al conte di Niebla. Al proemio di fattura classica e in ottave che potremmo definire tassiane, formate da endecasillabi a rima alternata,¹⁴ segue una prima fase descrittiva che definisce il luogo dell'azione e i personaggi, poi gli amori di Aci e Galatea, la morte degli amanti, la furia del Ciclope (cf. Jammes 1967: 565). La Sicilia fa da sfondo alla vicenda ed è raffigurata con il suo mare spumeggiante che lambisce il promontorio del Lilibeo dove è la “caverna profonda”, il “cavo malinconico”

12 Su Góngora uomo e poeta cf. B. Croce 2015: 402; A. Croce 1946: 54-65.

13 Verg. *ecl.* 6.1-2 *Prima Syracusio dignata est ludere versu / nostra nec erubuit silvas habitare Thalia* (“La nostra Talia per prima si degnò di cantare nel verso siracusano, e non si vergognò di abitare nelle selve”).

14 Tasso infatti aveva conferito all'ottava “una forma specifica di ‘armonica disarticolazione’ sovvertendo la sintassi nelle misure brevi (la quartina), per poi ricompirla nel rispetto della partitura metrica” (Cabani 2005: 181).

di Polifemo “orrore di quella terra”.¹⁵ Gongora affida la descrizione del luogo (la Sicilia) e della caverna di Polifemo al blu del mare, alla sua schiuma che bagna il Lilibeo, alla fucina di Vulcano e alla tomba delle ossa di Tifeo. “The alternately metallic and crystalline imagery and aural sensation are immediately subsumed in the ‘telurica obscuridad bovéda y tumba’ . . .” (Ansell 2011: 560). È la grotta del Ciclope un ornamento fosco di una natura ridente e luminosa, un letto circondato da nubi inquietanti, un ‘grembo oscuro’ intorno al quale volano tristemente gementi gli uccelli dalle ‘ali notturne’.¹⁶ Tutto è oscuro, nero come neri sono i capelli che paurosamente ondeggiavano al vento, lurido come lurida è la barba che, come torrente impetuoso, ricopre il petto e che invano possono attraversare le dita della mano.¹⁷ È Polifemo il *ferus filius* (“figlio feroce”) di Nettuno, grande come un monte, “cui il pino più valente come bastone gli obbediva così leggero e al grave peso giunco così sottile che un giorno era diritto, un altro ricurvo” (ottava 7, vv. 5-8, trad. A. Croce).¹⁸ Ma quella del Ciclope è una Sicilia rigogliosa e fertile, ricca di greggi e di frutta in ogni stagione come Góngora ricorda nell’ottava 11:

Erizo es el zurrón, de la castaña,
y (entre el membrillo o verde o datilado)
de la manzana hipócrita, que engaña,
a lo pálido no, a lo arrebolado,
y, de la encina (honor de la montaña,
que pabellón al siglo fue dorado),

15 Cf. *Od.* 9.182-6; *Theoc.* 11.44-5; *Verg. Aen.* 3.616-19; *Ov. met.* 13. 810-2.

16 Cf. *Stat. Theb.* 3.510-2 *Monstra volant dirae strident in nube volucres / nocturnaeque gemunt stringes et feralia bubo / damna canens* (“volano mostri, orribili uccelli stridono tra le nuvole, gemono le notturne strigi e il gufo che predice catastrofi”).

17 Cf. *Ov. met.* 13.765-6 . . . *Iam rigidos pectis rastris, Polypheme, capillos, / iam libet hirsutam tibi falce recidere barbam* (“E ora, Polifemo, ti preoccupi di pettinarti i ruvidi capelli; vuoi tagliarti l’ispida barba con un falchetto”).

18 “a quien el pino más valiente, / bastón, le obedecía, tan ligero, / y al grave peso junco tan delgado, / que un día era bastón y otro cayado”. “La poesia di Góngora si abbandona alla libera fantasia e si traduce in immagini intense che sono l’elemento più evidente come nelle metafore” (A. Croce 1945: 74).

el tributo, alimento, aunque grosero,
del mejor mundo, del candor primero.

[Il paniere è riccio della castagna e tra le cotogne, o verdi o color di dattero, della mela ipocrita che inganna, non col pallore, con l'incarnato della quercia, onore della montagna, che padiglione fu al secolo dorato, del tributo alimento, benché grossolano, del miglior mondo, del candore primitivo.]¹⁹

Alla descrizione inquietante del Ciclope segue quella di Galatea radiosa nel suo splendore e nel suo viso candido: in lei Venere ha riunito ogni grazia, sì che in lei possa racchiudersi la bellezza del cigno di Era e del pavone di Venere.²⁰ Su di lei cade una pioggia di fiori, di gelsomini bianchi e rose purpuree:²¹ lo splendore dunque del bianco e il rosso dell'amore (ottava 14):

Purpúreas rosas sobre Galatea
la Alba entre lilios cándidos deshoja:

19 Traduzione di A. Croce. L'ottava è uno degli esempi più evidenti del poetare gongoriano ed è "pietra di paragone di tutti i commentari del Seicento" (Reyes 1927: 252). Qui "si ha una illazione di significato: il paniere fa da riccio alla castagna; ma il paniere diventa poi riccio anche della mela e della ghianda" (A. Croce 1945: 66). Ed è una Sicilia dai molti colori e dai molti contrasti: oscurità/luce; terra/mare; nero/verde-azzurro ed in ultimo mostruosità/cortesìa (cf. Ferri Coll 2006: 149). In una lettera a Benedetto Croce Ramon Menendez Pial ringraziava Alda Croce per lo studio sulla poesia gongoriana "asistiendo por completo a su actitud de mantener las dos epocas en la vida poética del autor", cit. in Tessitore 2011: 429.

20 Góngora qui inverte gli uccelli e risolve in questo modo la rivalità tra le due dee, perché Galatea "como obiecto universal de desio, es el principio de la concordia en la vida humana . . . Galatea es el pavón de Venere y el cisne de Juno, porque triunfa de la disarmonía de la naturaleza; es la belleza y el poder juntos" (Góngora 1983: 100). Cf. Poggi 2019: 187-206. La studiosa confronta il testo di Góngora con il *Polifemo* di Stigliani.

21 Per la "pioggia dei fiori" oltre al passo dantesco (*Purg.* 30.28-32) sono da ricordare Verg. *Aen.* 6.883 *manibus date lilia plenis* ("date gigli a piene mani"), *georg.* 2.323ss., 3.242ss.; Ov. *am.* 1.2.39-40; *Stat. silv.* 1.2.22-3 *Tu modo fronte rosas, violis modo lilia mixta / excipis et dominae niveis a vultibus obstas* ("Tu ora ricevi rose sulla tua fronte, ora gigli mescolati con viole, e proteggi il candido volto della tua signora"). Sono soltanto alcuni esempi, ma è certo che essi indicano nella pioggia di fiori il valore di consacrazione divina ed insieme quello amoroso e fecondante. Cf. Fenzi 1991: 462-9.

duda el Amor cuál más su color sea,
 o púrpura nevada, o nieve roja.
 De su frente la perla es eritrea,
 émula vana. El ciego dios se enoja,
 y, condenado su esplendor, la deja
 pender en oro al nácar de su oreja.

[Purpuree rose sopra Galatea l'Alba tra gigli candidi disfoglia; dubita Amore quale più il suo colore sia, se porpora nivea o neve rossa. Della sua fronte è la perla eritrea emula vana: il cieco dio s'adira e, condannato il suo splendore, la lascia imprigionare in oro dalla conchiglia del suo orecchio.]²²

Rosse sono anche le labbra della ninfa pronta a ricevere il bacio di Fauno.²³ Galatea è l'unica dea dell'isola ed è la dea di quanti mietono le ricche spighe, di quanti tosano la bianca lana, di quanti chiedono i mosti purpurei in grandi damigiane (ottava 19). Non ha templi né altari, ma sacro è ogni luogo dove ella posa il suo piede leggero: è lì che il mandriano offre i suoi piccoli vitelli, l'agricoltore le sue primizie e l'ortolano – la terra qui non è avara – la Cornucopia (ottava 20).²⁴ Tutta la gioventù del luogo arde d'amore tralasciando il proprio lavoro e l'indolenza prende gli animali che lentamente arano i campi e lo stesso cane, non più guardiano, lascia che il lupo entri nel recinto. È la descrizione del *locus amoenus* del quale la ninfa fuggitiva è padrona: bagna nelle acque del ruscello le sue membra bianche come gelsomini e si abbandona al sonno cullata dal cinguettio dell'usignolo.²⁵ Ecco apparire Acis, in una caldissima giornata estiva “latiendo il Can del cielo estaba” (ottava 24).²⁶ Il caldo del Sole si metaforizza nel caldo dell'amore e

22 Traduzione di A. Croce, la quale per altro pone in evidenza la capacità del poeta spagnolo di “riflettere sulle cose, scomporle e ricomporle . . . giocare con esse” (1945: 73).

23 “Aci e Galatea sono istintivi e muti, confusi con la natura, accomunati ad essa, e muto è anche il loro terrore e dopo la morte di Aci il dolore di Galatea. Il solo che abbia la parola è Polifemo per intonare un canto che era un tema letterario” (A. Croce 1945: 84).

24 Cf. Ov. *fast.* 5.115-28; Hor. *ep.* 1.12.1-3, 28-9.

25 Cf. Ov. *met.* 1.107-8.

26 Cf. Man. *Astr.* 5.207-8 *exoritur Canis latratque canicula flammis / et rapit igne suo, geminatque incendia Solis* (“Si leva il Cane e la Canicola latra

della passione. Acis ha la chioma impolverata “umide scintille se non ardente rugiada sudando” (“húmidas centellas, si no ardientes aljófares, sudando”) e, vedendo il “dolce tramonto di due begli occhi chiusi nel dolce sonno” (“dulce Occidente viendo al sueño blando / su boca dio, y sus ojos quanto pudo”) le baciò la bocca e volse lo sguardo avidamente al “cristallo sonoro”, “sonoro cristal” (il ruscello) e “al cristallo silenzioso”, “al cristal mudo” (Galatea). Poi il giovane accaldato deve rinfrescarsi dal fuoco dell’amore e della passione (che è il fuoco eterno della vita) e si bagna là dove vi sono due mirti che, imbiancati dalla schiuma del mare, sembrano due verdi aironi. Il rumore del ruscello increspato dal vento sveglia la vergine sopita ed ella corre verso quelle rive verdi calpestando i candidi gigli e ancora più fuggirebbe se non sentisse serpeggiare nelle vene un gelido brivido.²⁷ La scena serena del Fauno e dei doni da lui offerti è preludio di quell’unione nell’ombrosa alcova che Favonio ha preparato per loro, per i due amanti – lei esitante ma rapita, ignara del nome, ma non dei tratti del giovane che l’ha ormai conquistata (ottava 32, 5-7):

Al pie – no tanto ya, del temor, grave –
fía su intento; y, tímida, en la umbría
cama de campo y campo de batalla,
fingiendo sueño al cauto garzón halla.

[Al piede non più reso lento dal timore affida tremante il suo desiderio e timida s’imbatte nel fanciullo scaltro, immerso nel sonno menzognero sdraiato all’ombra in un letto di fiori e di battaglia d’amore.]

“Del quasi tramontato sole aspira ai confusi raggi la sua chioma, fiori sembra la sua barba, i cui colori, siccome dorme la luce, negano i fiori” (ottava 35).²⁸ Vede il corpo sdraiato e sospesa su un

fiamme e cattura nel suo fuoco, e raddoppia l’incendio del sole”).

27 Cf. Ov. *am.* 3.15, 37-8 *perque meos artus frigida gutta fluit* (“attraverso le membra mi scorre una gelida goccia”); Verg. *Aen.* 3.175 *tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor* (“allora un gelido sudore sboccava da tutto il corpo”).

28 “Del casi tramontato sol aspira / a los confusos rayos, su cabello; / flores su bozo es, cuyas colores, / como duerme la luz, niegan las flores”. “I capelli <di Acis> sono raggi, ma i raggi confusi, indistinti, oscuri del sole al tramonto; e la barba nascente, fiori, ma fiori senza colore (perché, se gli occhi

piede si tende verso di lui (“librada en un pie toda sobre el piede”²⁹) mentre Amore ‘inchioda’ il cuore di entrambi (ottave 33-4) infondendo in loro il più dolce dei veleni. E giacciono là, dove c’è una cavità rocciosa ricoperta di foglie ombreggianti e nascosta dall’edera che con le sue foglie s’arrampica sugli alberi,³⁰ mentre il mirto dolcemente li avvolge e le rauche colombe tubano³¹ e mentre sul talamo piovono nere viole e bianchi gelsomini (ottava 42):

No a las palomas concedió Cupido
 juntar de sus dos picos los rubíes,
 cuando al clavel el joven atrevido
 las dos hojas le chupa carmesíes.
 Cuantas produce Pafo, engendra Gnido,
 negras violas, blancos alhelíes,
 negras violas, blancos alhelíes,
 llueven sobre el que Amor quiere que sea
 tálamo de Acis ya y de Galatea.

[Cupido ancora non permetteva ai colombi di unire i loro becchi color rubino quando il giovane ardito succhia al garofano³² le labbra rosse come petali. Quante viole nere e bianchi gelsomini Pafo produce e Cnido offre, piovono là dove adesso Amore voleva fosse talamo di Acis e Galatea.]³³

sono chiusi, cioè la luce dorme, quei fiori negano le loro tinte” (A. Croce 1945: 69).

29 Cf. Ov., *met.* 8.200-2 *Postquam manus ultima coepto / imposita est, geminas opifex libravit in alas / ipse suum corpus motaque pependit in aura* (“dopo che all’opera fu data l’ultima mano, l’artefice librò se stesso sulle due ali e rimase sospeso nell’aria muovendosi”). Cf. Marino, *Adone* 3.86.

30 Cf. Cat. 61 (*In nuptias Iuliae et Manilii*), v. 35 *ut tenax hederà huc et huc arborem implicat errans* (“come l’edera caparbia e mutevole circonda il tronco dell’albero di qua e di là”); Ov. *met.* 13.786, *ars* 2.623 *in nemore atque antris, non sub love, iuncta voluptas* (“il piacere si univa nel bosco e nelle grotte, non all’aperto”).

31 Verg. *ecl.* 1.57-8 . . . *nec tamen interea raucae . . . palumbes / . . . gemere* (“ma tuttavia tuoi colombi dal grido roco nel frattempo tuberanno”).

32 Il garofano è uno dei fiori più ricorrenti nella poesia barocca.

33 Per le nere viole che indicano il pallore della sofferenza cf. Hor. *carm.* 3.10 *pallor amantium* (“pallore degli amanti”) e Verg. *ecl.* 10.9. Cf. Folena 1949.

È da segnalare l'intenso cromatismo di questa e di altre descrizioni gongoriane "che sono bellissime, piene di metafore nuove e, talvolta, sorprendenti" (Alvar-Mainet-Navarro 2000: 311; cf. anche Ferri Coll 2006: 145ss.) Il sole alto all'orizzonte ha fatto da cornice all'incontro dei giovani amanti, ma la voce di Polifemo, improvvisa, rompe il silenzio della natura complice e i sospiri d'amore. Plasticamente il cambio, per così dire, della scena è affidato all'immagine del carro del Sole che s'immerge "lavando le sue ruote" ("sus ruedas lava") là dove "il greco aveva eretto le sue colonne" ("las columnas Etón que erigió el griego"). La voce del Ciclope ("Le grotte intanto e le rupi scoscese, là dove il suono dell'aspra zampogna giunge, il tuono del canto fulminò veloce. A dirlo, Pieridi, sia la vostra voce!" (ottava 45, 7-8)³⁴, il sole che tramonta oltre le colonne d'Ercole segnano la fine della favola d'amore. "O bella Galatea – canta Polifemo – più soave dei garofani che l'Aurora spezzò, più bianca dell'uccello³⁵ che sull'acqua vive e nell'acqua muore, pari in splendore al pavone che, superbo, indora di tanti occhi il manto azzurro di quante stelle il celestiale zaffiro . . ." (ottava 46, 1-7).³⁶ Ma la ninfa è sorda ad ogni invito "Sorda figlia del mare, le tue orecchie sono ai miei lamenti più sorde delle rocce al vento" (ottava 48, 1-2).³⁷ Eppure egli è un pastore, *dives pecoris* ("ricco

34 "Las cavernas en tanto, los ribazos / que ha prevenido la zampoña ruda, / el trueno de la voz fulminó luego; / ¡referidlo, Piérides, os ruego!". Cf. Theoc. 10.24; Verg. *Aen.* 9.525-7.

35 Theoc. 11.20 λευκότερα πακτᾶς ("più candida del latte cagliato"); Verg. *ecl.* 7.38 *candidior cycnis* ("più bianca dei cigni"); Ov. *met.* 13.796 *mollior et cycni plumis* ("più morbida anche di una piuma di cigno").

36 "¡Oh bella Galatea, más süave / que los claveles que troncó la aurora; / blanca más que las plumas de aquel ave / que dulce muere y en las aguas mora; / igual en pompa al pájaro que, grave / su manto azul de tantos ojos dora / cuantas el celestial zafiro estrellas! . . .". Ritorna qui il tema cigno/pavone.

37 "Sorda hija del mar, cuyas orejas / a mis gemidos son rocas al viento". Ov. *met.* 13.799-802 . . . *durior annosa quercu, fallacior undis / lentior et salicis virgis et vitibus albis, / his immobilior scopulis, violentior amne, / laureato pavone superbior, acrior igni, / asperior tribulis* . . . (" . . . più dura di una quercia antica, più ingannevole delle onde, più sguscianti dei rami del salice e della vitalba, più inamovibile di questi scogli, più irruente di un fiume, più superba di un pavone che si gonfia, più feroce del fuoco, più aspra dei rovi . . .").

di pecore”) avrebbe detto Virgilio,³⁸ le valli sono tutte popolate dai suoi armenti e dalle mammelle delle femmine sgorga il latte in abbondanza,³⁹ ma latte e lacrime corrono insieme perché per numero “i miei mali sono pari ai miei beni” (“en número a mis bienes son mis males”). Trasudano nettare le sue querce ombrose e l’ape vola di fiore in fiore riempiendo i favi numerosi.⁴⁰ All’aspetto fisico, alla ricchezza immensa, alla sua discendenza divina (“Sono figlio di Nettuno, dio del mare <e> . . . il re di questo profondo abisso del mare <aspetta di abbracciarti> come nuora sul trono di cristallo . . .” (ottava 51, 1-4)⁴¹ il Ciclope aggiunge la sua possanza fisica (ottava 52):

Sentado, a la alta palma no perdona
 su dulce fruto mi robusta mano;
 en pie, sombra capaz es mi persona
 de innumerables cabras el verano.
 ¿Qué mucho, si de nubes se corona
 por igualarme la montaña en vano,
 y en los cielos, desde esta roca, puedo
 escribir mis desdichas con el dedo?

[Pur seduto la mano possente non lascia all’alta palma il dolce frutto, e in piedi con la mia persona offro nell’estate ardente vasta ombra ad innumerevoli capre. Quale meraviglia se invano la montagna, per uguagliarmi, si circonda di nubi e se posso anche in cielo da questa altura scrivere con il dito le mie sventure?]⁴²

Così cantava Polifemo, amante respinto, mentre la collera riempiva il suo cuore: fu un attimo e le pietre ruppero per sempre l’alcova squarciando l’edera che fino ad allora aveva protetto gli amanti. Acis e Galatea, sciolti i loro intimi abbracci, corrono verso il mare con piedi alati, ma il gigante, vedendo la ninfa andare verso le on-

38 Verg. *ecl.* 2.20.

39 Cf. Ov. *met.* 13.821-4.

40 Cf. Verg. *georg.* 4.10-11.

41 “Del Júpiter soy hijo, de las ondas, / aunque pastor; si tu desdén no espera / a que el monarca de esas grutas hondas, / en trono de cristal te abra- ce nuera”. Cf. Ov. *met.* 13.854-5 *adde quod in vestro genitor meus aequore reg- nat: / hunc tibi do socerum* (“Aggiungi che mio padre regna nel vostro mare; te lo porto come suocero”).

42 Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.619-20.

de e il Fauno smuovere antichi faggi, “con violenza infinita staccava dal gran monte la cima più grande che rovinò sul giovane” (ottava 62, 1-2).⁴³ Usciva sangue dalle sue ferite, ma *intra / temporis exiguum rubor evanescere coepit / fitque color primo turbati fluminis imbre / purgaturque mora . . . Acis erat: sed sic quoque erat tamen Acis in amnem / versus; et antiquum tenuerunt flumina nomen* (Ov. *met.* 13.887-97).⁴⁴ “Le sue ombre furono dolorosamente schiacciate dalla roccia fatale e il suo sangue bagnò le radici degli alberi vicini. Le bianche ossa, ora argentea corrente, sfiorando i fiori e inargentando la spiaggia giunsero fino a Doris che pietosamente pianse, lo chiamò genero e consacrò il ruscello” (ottava 63).⁴⁵ È qui evidente la pietà del poeta che “si esprime nell’ingentilire trasfigurandola la fine crudele di Acis schiacciato da un macigno. La trasformazione in fiume, che è nel mito, diviene necessaria: la morte non è più morte ma metamorfosi e quel fiume è acclamato e accolto genero, da Doride” (A. Croce 1945: 85).⁴⁶ La ‘degradazione’ (dovuta alla passione amorosa) del mostro si conclude anche nel poeta spagnolo con un atto feroce: egli che aveva esaltato la bellezza di Galatea, che aveva in ogni modo catturato l’attenzione della ninfa, malinconico, respinto (*exclusus amator*, “amante cacciato”) dà sfogo alla sua gelosia, ma non per questo potrà più essere considerato il mostro omofago ed antropofago dei

43 “Con violencia desgajó infinita, / la mayor punta de la excelsa roca”.

44 “In un breve lasso di tempo il rosso comincia a sparire, e diviene dapprima il colore di un fiume intorbidito dalla prima pioggia e quindi col tempo si schiarisce . . . Era Aci; benché trasformato in fiume era Aci, e le acque di quel fiume conservarono il suo nome”.

45 “Sus miembros lastimosamente opresos / del escollo fatal fueron apenas, / que los pies de los árboles más gruesos / calzó el líquido aljófara de sus venas. / Corriente plata al fin sus blancos huesos, / lamiendo flores y argentando arenas, / a Doris llega, que, con llanto pío, / yerno lo saludó, lo aclamó río”.

46 La fonte di Góngora è evidentemente Ovidio, ma è indubbio che il poeta spagnolo dia maggiore risalto alla coppia degli amanti rispetto al testo latino. È anche verosimile che egli si sia ispirato all’*ekphrasis* di Filostrato Maggiore (II-III sec. d.C.). In *Im.* 2.18 il retore descrive un dipinto nel quale un abominevole montanaro canta mentre Galatea gioca su un mare placido guidando un carro tirato da quattro delfini. Cf. Pucci 2010: 73ss. Ma si conserva anche un quadro di Nicolas Pussin alla Galleria Nazionale di Dublino, nel quale è dipinto Polifemo che suona mentre Aci e Galatea, protetti dal velo degli Amorini, si abbracciano.

poemi omerici. Egli, nonostante le sue ricchezze, conosce la sconfitta in amore, quell'amore che egli aveva cantato nell'*Idillio* 11 di Teocrito. Accanto al mondo bucolico cantato dal poeta alessandrino c'è in Góngora "una segreta passione <ed> è la passione ciò che rende burrascosi e contrastanti i paesaggi, ciò che scoppia tra l'amore e l'odio del Ciclope, è la passione dell'esuberante paesaggio che fa da cornice agli amori di Aci e Galatea." (Alonso 1973: 223).

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Alonso, Dámaso (1973), "Il debito di Góngora verso la poesia italiana", in *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema «Premarinismo e pregonorismo»* (Roma, 19-20 aprile 1971), Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 9-31.
- Alvar, Carlos, José-Carlos Mainet e Rosa Navarro (2000), *Storia della letteratura spagnola*, I, *Il Medioevo e l'età dell'oro*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Anzell, Matthew (2011), "Ciclope: Góngora's Polifemo and the Poetics of Disfiguration", *Hispanic Review* 79 (4), autumn 2011: 547-72.
- Boitani, Piero (2012), "Prefazione" in Omero, *Odissea*, a cura di Giulia Capo, traduzione di Dora Marinari, Roma: La Lepre Edizioni (edizione in formato elettronico).
- Cabani, Maria Cristina (2005), *L'occhio di Polifemo. Studi su Pulci, Tasso e Marino*, Pisa: ETS.
- Cataudella, Quintino (1953), "Un'aporia del Ciclope. Teocrito XI, 13 sg.", *Revue des études grecques* 66, fasc. 311-13: 473-8.
- Croce, Alda, (1945) "La poesia di Góngora", *Quaderni della Critica* 1 (1): 53-90.
— (1946), "La poesia di Góngora", *Quaderni della Critica* 2 (5): 54-73.
- Croce, Benedetto (2015), *Poeti e scrittori d'Italia I. Dallo Stil novo al Barocco*, a cura di Giuseppe Galasso, Milano: Biblioteca Adelphi.
- Degani, Enzo (1985), *Poesia parodica greca*, Bologna: CLUEB.
- Fantuzzi, Marco (1993), "Teocrito e la poesia bucolica", in Giuseppe Cambiano, Luciano Canfora e Diego Lanza (eds), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. 1, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo*, tomo 2, *L'ellenismo*, Roma: Salerno Editore, 145-95.
- Fenzi, Enrico (1991), "R.V.F. CXXVI, 'Chiare fresche et dolci acque'", *Italianistica. Rivista di letteratura italiana* 20 (3): 455-86.
- Ferri Coll, José María (2006), *Los tumultos del alma. De la expresión melancólica en la poesía española del Siglo de oro*, Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnànim.
- Folena, Gianfranco (1949), "Il pallore della viola", *Lingua nostra* 10: 75-87.

- Fornaro, Sotera (2010), "Officina Filottete. In margine al 'Filottete' di Heiner Müller", *Dionysus ex machina* 1: 186-200.
- Gelli, Emiliano (2008), "Euripide, Filosseno e il *Ciclope* di Antifane", *Prometheus* 34: 245-56.
- De Góngora, Luis (1983), *Fabula de Polifemo y Galatea*, edición de Alexander A. Parker, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Gow, Andrew Sydenham Farrar (ed.) (1950), *Theocritus*, edited with a translation and commentary by A.S.F. Gow, 2 voll., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, George Richard (1884), "De Polyphemo et Galatea", *Leipziger Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 7: 139-312.
- Jammes, Robert (1967), *Etudes sur l'oeuvre poétique de don Louis de Góngora y Argote*, Bordeaux: Institute d'Études Ibériques et Ibéro-américaines.
- Mastromarco, Giuseppe (1998), "La degradazione del mostro. La maschera del Ciclope nella commedia e nel dramma satiresco del quinto secolo a.C.", in Anna Maria Belardinelli, Olimpia Imperio, Giuseppe Mastromarco, Matteo Pellegrino e Piero Totaro (eds), *Tessere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*, Bari, Adriatica Editrice, 9-42.
- Marino, Giambattista (1913), *Poesie varie* a cura di Benedetto Croce, Bari: Laterza.
- Paganelli, Leonardo (1979), *Echi storico-politici nel Ciclope euripideo*, Padova: Antenore.
- Perotti, Pier Angelo (2005), "Polifemo in Omero, Euripide, Luciano", *Minerva* 18: 39-70.
- Philoxenus Cytherius (2014), *Testimonia et fragmenta*, collegit et edidit Adelaide Fongoni, Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore.
- Poggi, Giulia (2009), *Gli occhi del pavone. Quindici studi su Góngora*, Firenze: Alinea Editrice.
- Pucci, Giuseppe (ed.) (2010), *La Pinacoteca di Filostrato Maggiore* a cura di G. Pucci, trad. di Giovanni Lombardo, Palermo: Aesthetica.
- Rau, Peter (1967), *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, München: Verlag Ch. Beck.
- Reyes, Alfonso (1927), *Cuestiones Gongorinas*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Rossi, Luigi Enrico (2003), "Introduzione" a Euripide, *Ciclope*, a cura di Michele Napolitano, Venezia, Marsilio.
- Sbacchi, Diego (2002), "Polifemo: varianti del mito da Omero a Marino", *Quaderni d'italianistica* 23 (1): 49-64.
- Tessitore, Fulvio (2011), "Le lettere di Ramon Menendez Pidal a Benedetto Croce", *Annali dell'Istituto italiano per gli studi storici* 26: 409-34.

Finding Room for Satyrs at the Theatrical Table, from Ancient to Modern Times

ERIC NICHOLSON

Abstract

Although the ancient Athenian satyr-play, in its one fully surviving exemplar of Euripides's *Kyklops*, was the originating model for late Italian Renaissance pastoral tragicomedy, its obligatory chorus of singing and dancing satyrs was suppressed, and these same defining characters most often reduced to a single outsider figure representing a violent threat rather than a vital force for human communities. My essay asks how and why this reduction and exclusion came to be the norm. Connecting an appraisal of *Kyklops* to its cultural as well as performance contexts, I follow the lead of classical scholars – Seaford, Lissarrague, Konstan, *et al.* – who accentuate the playful, ambiguous, and ‘anthropological’ qualities of the Dionysiac theatrical satyr.

I then chart several important several important figurations of the satyr in Italian pastoral drama, from Giralaldi Cinthio's *Egle* through Tasso's *Aminta* to Valeria Miani's *Amorosa speranza*, not only to reconsider the outcast and scapegoat status of the character, but also to argue that his ludic energies and primordial vigour get channelled into his laughable, less threatening, and indeed feminizing humiliations at the hands of wittily resourceful and self-defending nymphs. While the satyr's absence from the concluding nuptial celebrations of pastoral drama may attest to his embodiment of “dirt” (to apply Mary Douglas's reading of cultural conceptions of disorder), his susceptibility to quick domination and transformation may also suggest that his playful, fluid, and almost child-like spirit persists through late Renaissance pastoral plays, especially ones written by women. This final point gains support and demonstration through live theatrical interpretation.

To open with a somewhat satirical question: why are satyrs not invited to the nuptial celebrations that so often conclude early modern pastoral tragicomedies? It is somewhat surprising that they do not appear on the guest list, since their hybrid form and classical roots make them figures that are essential, indeed foundational, to late Renaissance pastoral drama. With their mixture of the an-

imal and human, satyrs are benders and transformers of *genus*, and thus they serve as embodiments of the bending and transforming of *genre* pursued by late sixteenth- to early seventeenth-century Italian and European playwrights. ‘Stars of the show’ as the speaking, singing, and dancing chorus-members in the ancient Greek satyr-plays which provided a model for the ‘third genre’ of pastoral tragicomedy, they tend to become marginalised, denigrated, and/or outcast in the very plays that they had helped to inspire. While the dramaturgical agenda of resolving tensions through the eventual achievement of heterosexual matrimony, performed for Christian patrons and audiences, can provide one explanation for the suppression and even ‘editing out’ of the ‘primitive’ ‘wild-man’ satyr,¹ other aesthetic as well as ideological motives come into play. This short essay aims to clarify some of these motives, while arguing that Renaissance pastoral’s banishment and exclusion of the satyr is not as definitive or intractable as it would appear.

As befits their ontological status, satyrs cannot be entirely repressed and put down, all the more so when almost 2,000 years later they leap off the pages of the one fully surviving satyr-play, Euripides’s *Cyclops*, and in to the scripts and stagings of sixteenth-century Ferrarese and later Italian and European pastoral dramas. In the ancient Athenian, pre-Christian world of Euripides, they are shown to be free-wheeling, fun-loving fertility spirits, dedicated devotees of Dionysus, who unabashedly and even expertly release the energies of dance, acrobatics, and theatrical performance.² As humans they speak and sing, but especially as animals they run, spring, somersault, spin, and twist: this non-verbal, kinetic impulse needs to be emphasised, if satyrs and their usage are to be understood. This emphasis is also appropriate for a volume in honour of Guido Avezzi, whose multi-faceted work has illuminated not only rhetorical and historical aspects of Greek dramatic texts, but also their physical and performative

1 For a useful explanation of how the “wild-man” figure of the Christian Middle Ages inherited and supplanted the pagan satyr figure, modifying the latter’s reappearance in Renaissance pastoral drama, see Pieri 1983: 133-40.

2 On ancient Greek satyrs and their representation in the visual and performing arts, see especially the work of Lissarrague 1990a, 1990b and 1993. A fundamental study of satyr-drama remains Rossi 1972.

qualities. Professor Avezzù teaches us to maintain awareness and discover specific inflections of *context*, for example when he suggestively calls the satyr of satyr-plays “the hero of the *polis*” (2003: 45-52). In this contextual regard, valuable insights regarding theatrical ‘citizen’-satyrs can be gained from observation of their gestures, poses, grimaces, and interactions in ancient Greek statuary and vase-decorations. The *Cyclops*, the *Ichneutae* (Trackers) of Sophocles, and other fragmentary satyr-plays feature important moments of discovery, even prodigious discovery, when almost like children the satyrs express astonishment (*thambos*) at the divinely imbued entities that they find.³ Likewise the satyrs of contemporary statuettes and vase-paintings, despite their most often having mature male bodies and bearded faces, communicate infantile surprise and excitement through their outstretched arms, open hands, and wide-staring eyes: they are captured in a state of bedazzlement, or *aposkophein*, often conveyed by their frontal presentation.⁴ Their gestures and facial expressions suggest how they also can serve as models for the potential wonder and amazement that audience members could and perhaps should feel when watching plays in the theatre.

Indeed, one can postulate that souvenir-representations of theatrical performance appear in some ancient Greek domestic artworks. Surviving bronze statuette-ornaments of the sixth-fifth century BCE show satyrs and their balding, potbellied leader

3 On these and other related points see Seaford: 1984. Seaford stresses the paradoxical and ambiguous qualities of satyrs, who are at once “worthless hedonists”, but also bearers of “more than human wisdom” (6-7). Also see Seaford 1976: 216, for his explanation of how the satyrs experience *heuremata* (‘discoveries’) as *terata* (‘prodigies’).

4 Here it is worth quoting at length the eloquent comments of François Lissarrague: “It is important to emphasize the essential role of the specific gesture of *aposkophein*, which signifies bedazzlement, as well as the frequent frontal presentation of satyrs. Everything takes place as if the satyrs were discovering the human world, as if they were being used to explore culture in two ways: through their behavior, which is more or less close to the human model to which they are trying to conform, and through their relationships with the world outside – especially in satyric drama – where they are like naifs who discover what the spectator knows all too well. As a result, their response suggests a renewal of the world and of culture” (1993: 219).

Silenus in a variety of tumbling and acrobatic positions, including balanced on one hand.⁵ The tour de force red-figure *psykter* (vase for cooling wine) painted by Douris ca. 485 BCE features a 'leader satyr', dressed à la Hermes the Messenger, presiding over four groups of fully naked satyrs, drinking, revelling and cavorting in spectacular ways. One pair, for example, seem to treat a curving-handled *kantharos* (wine-cup) as a swimming pool, one of them poising his foot above it while the other – revealingly shown *en face* – readies himself for a dive into it. The adjacent trio of satyrs executes a particularly impressive routine: two standing satyrs, one holding a *kantharos* and the other a *oinochoe* (small carafe), flank a crouching satyr who supports himself on his fingertips, all the while balancing his *kantharos* on his erect penis as his companion pours wine into the precariously perched vessel.⁶ This sense of acrobatic poise and movement would have been accentuated by the effect of the satyrs performing 'their antics on the very surface of the wine' as the ice-filled *psykter* bobbed up, down, and round and round inside the wide-mouthed *krater* mixing bowl.⁷ Appropriately, then, virtuosic theatricality abounds in Douris' painting of Dionysiac satyrs. Recent scholarship has recognised overtly theatrical elements in red-figure vase production, with satyrs and their plays often taking centre stage in these scenes. As early as the 1880s, Carl Robert identified the Hermes-style satyr of the Douris *psykter* as a kind of Coryphaeos, linking him with a similar figure on the famous "Pronomos Vase"

5 A remarkable showcase display at the Musée du Louvre, Paris, Departement des Antiquités Grecs, preserves and vividly presents more than a dozen such figurines.

6 Excavated in Cerveteri, Italy, the vase was sold in 1868 to the British Museum, London. See http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?assetId=34652001&objectId=461894&partId=1 (Accessed 20 October 2018).

7 For this highly salient point, see Osborne 1998: 164. Osborne also pertinently notes that almost all the satyrs on this vase have tied-up penises, arguing that this ligaturing "seems to be adopted as a visual symbol of urbanity and sexual continence" (165). This portrayal confirms the fact that satyrs were not inevitably understood as incarnations of sexual license and phallic violence.

in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples.⁸ Meanwhile, the “Pronomos Vase” itself, which depicts satyric performers in close proximity to the enthroned Dionysus and Ariadne, and also shows a dancer-actor ‘warming up’ in an ithyphallic kilt, has become the focus of numerous studies and even an entire book dedicated to links between ancient Greek theatre and vase-painting.⁹

At the same time, the possible allusions to actual satyr plays in some of these surviving pictorial images are not the primary concern here; what matters is the prominence of satyrs in the consciousness of ancient Greek theatregoers. Euripides could rely on his audiences’ enthusiasm for and thorough familiarity with satyrs and their antics when he wrote his play inspired by the Polyphemos episode from Homer’s *Odyssey*. As befits Euripides’s as well as Dionysus’s affinity for irony and surprises, the Chorus of Satyrs and their leader Silenus do not first appear as their true selves – that is, as celebrants of Bacchus, juggling Nature and Culture as surely as they do their *kylix* wine-bowls – but as captives of a one-eyed, godless barbarian pastoralist, a monster who is unfamiliar with grapes and wine but brutally includes human flesh in his diet.¹⁰ With negative-stressing anaphora, the enslaved satyrs communicate the extremity of their suffering in their opening epode/lament:

No Bacchus here! Not here the dance,
 or the women whirling the *thyrsos*,
 or the timbrels shaken,
 where the springs rill up!
 Not here the gleam of wine,
 and no more at Nysa with nymphs
 crying *Iacchos! Iacchos!*
Where is Aphrodite?...
 she that I used to fly after
 along with the bare-footed Bacchae!

8 See British Museum site, cit.

9 See Taplin and Wyles 2010.

10 It is important to note here how Euripides departs from the Homeric original (where Polyphemos does know about viticulture): on this and other key points of the Euripidean adaptation, see Konstan 1990.

Dear lord Bacchus, where do you run,
 tossing your auburn hair?
 For I, your servant, am a wretched slave,
 tricked out in dirty goatskin
 to serve a one-eyed Cyclops.
 (63-81)¹¹

Thus the satyrs enter, ‘tricked out’ in slaves’ costumes. They metatheatrically call attention to how they are playing a role they do not want to play: a troupe of sub-shepherds, of the flocks belonging to the gruesome Uber-shepherd Polyphemos. If these energetic dancers and tumblers need not fear being eaten alive by their cruel overlord, who comically opines to the Coryphaeus that “I’d soon be dead if I had you / jumping through your capers in my belly” (220-1), they are tragically deprived of their true master Dionysus, lord of the dance and leader of their ecstatic *thiasos* rites. Instead of joyously releasing their natural, playful energies in attendance on their divine patron, they are enslaved by a profane *tyrannos*, who declares that “There’s no Bacchus here, / no bronze clackers or rattling castanets!” (204-5), and whose only god is his own belly. In a satirical spin on the sophistic positions of Kallikles and Thrasymakhos, Euripides has Polyphemos proclaim that the only things that matter to him are wealth, power, and self-satisfaction: when Odysseus pleads to him to honor the code of ‘xenos’, the giant retorts, “Money’s the wise man’s religion, little man. The rest is mere bluff and purple patches” (316-7). As Guido Avezù astutely observes, the Kyklops is not an authentic ‘primitive’, but a greedy, self-centred individual who, “fully aware of the laws that men have given themselves, deliberately rejects every social norm, and makes wealth his supreme value”.¹²

The play dramatises the satyrs’ eventual liberation from their enslavement, after the scheming, duplicitous Odysseus – his persuasive rhetoric marking him as more of a fifth-centu-

¹¹ All quotations are from Euripides 1956.

¹² The Italian original reads: “pienamente consapevole delle leggi che gli uomini si sono dati, [il Ciclope] respinge intenzionalmente ogni norma e si dà come valore supremo le ricchezze” (Avezù 2003: 242). Also see Konstan 1990: 215, and Paganelli 1979.

ry Athenian orator than a Bronze Age hero – manages to get Polyphemos deliriously drunk, allowing him to gouge out the giant's single eye and escape. As elsewhere in this play, Euripides also somewhat surprisingly adheres closely to the Homeric version of the tale, deploying the famous “Nobody” joke-name trick, and having Odysseus represent civilized customs vs Polyphemos's barbaric savagery. Yet the fidelity to basic plot structure and characterisation is in itself something of a ruse, as the script makes a series of anachronistic manoeuvres, not only associating Polyphemos with opportunistic fifth-century sophists and Odysseus – here the son of cheating Sisyphus, and not the noble Laertes – with ethically dubious defenders of Athenian imperialism, but also confronting the Athenian audience with ambivalent reflections of their own ethnographic curiosities, and the potential contiguity between their local Selves and distant Others.¹³

The crucial change, however, is the introduction of Silenus and the Chorus of Satyrs, who disrupt the Civilised Odysseus-Barbarian Polyphemos binary, and through their hybrid, disorderly, adolescent and parodic characteristics as well as their non-heroic attitudes entail a repositioning and reevaluation of epic and tragic tropes from a liminal, ambiguous perspective. In convincing ways, Pierre Voelke and Carol Dougherty have argued that the world of ancient Greek satyrs and their drama is a border-world, neither completely foreign nor completely familiar, often set at the edges of civilisation, and often in flux and in transit.¹⁴ And as François Lissarrague has appositely put it, the “presence of satyrs within the myth [of the rediscovery of wine, and the culture of drinking it] subverts tragedy by shattering its cohesiveness”, and therefore, appropriately, “they appear as blatant meddlers, creators of disorder, fashioning before the audience's eyes a negative anthropology, an anthropology of laughter” (Lissarrague 1990b: 236). A fine example of this significant bathos occurs when Odysseus, partially echoing lines from Book 9 of *The Odyssey*, recounts to the satyrs his tearful witnessing of the Kyklops's devouring of his shipmates, and then his offer of Maron's ‘heavenly’ wine to the

13 On these points, see Euripides 1956, 5-8; and Dougherty 1999.

14 See Voelke 1992, and Dougherty 1999: 326-9.

belching ogre, which allowed him to slip out of the cave. He thus is able to propose to the oppressed sub-shepherds a valorous deed of liberation and revenge:

- ODYSSEUS . . . Now, if you agree,
 I'd like to save myself and you as well.
 So tell me, yes or no, whether you want
 to escape this monster and live with the nymphs
 in the halls of Bacchus. Your father [Silenus] in there
 agrees, but he's weak and loves his liquor.
 He's stuck to the cup as though it were glue,
 And can't fly. But you are young, so follow me
 and save yourselves; find again your old friend,
 Dionysus, so different from this Cyclops!
- COR. OF SATYRS My good friend, if only we might see that day
 when we escape at last this godless Cyclops!
 (*Showing his phallus.*)
 his poor hose has been a bachelor
 A long time now. . . .
 (427-40)

For a moment Odysseus's exhortation to the downtrodden satyrs to free themselves from their oppressor and reunite with their beloved Dionysus seems to lift the Coryphaeus into the tone and spirit of epic, only to yield abruptly to the phallic, carnivalesque gag about sexual need and privation. This moment foreshadows the even more bathetic excuses the satyrs will make, such as spraining their ankles while standing still, to refrain from helping Odysseus and his men to thrust the sharpened tree-trunk into Polyphemos's eye: their cowardly, self-protective retreat is all the more ludicrous for its contradiction of their previously made offer to "help hold the pole", and their boast that "I could shoulder a hundred wagon-loads / so long as Cyclops died a wretched death!" (473-4). The satyrs, on-stage and thus potentially voicing the audience's wishes, do act as cheerleaders for Odysseus and his men, who enact the blinding off-stage. Perhaps this is the way that most ordinary mortals would behave in such a situation, and in fact the satyrs' prudent keeping of distance from the wounded, raging Kyklops enables them to survive. They thus make good their

promise to escape with Odysseus, and attain their happy ending through setting sail towards an expected reunion with Bacchus.

In keeping with a play named for the round-eyed *Kyklops*, the ultimately freed satyrs come full circle, since they themselves, led by their Falstaffian father Silenus, had set sail towards Sicily to free their beloved master Dionysus, after they had found out that he had been kidnapped by Tyrrhenian pirates. It is as if their reverent devotion has finally been rewarded by the elusive god of wine, theatre, and ambiguities himself, who though absent as an embodied character is nonetheless present throughout the play, in his manifestation as wine, especially the strong delicious irresistible vintage that will intoxicate Polyphemos, and consequently enable the freeing of the gods' long-suffering followers. Again Richard S. Seaford offers a persuasive reading, of how this "playful tragedy" recapitulates the ritual pattern of initiation into the mysteries of Dionysus through confinement, suffering, release, and ultimate affirmation of the celebratory *thiasos*.¹⁵ This Dionysian triumph thus reaffirms the satyric qualities of the dithyrambic origins of Greek drama, and refutes the notion that the post-trilogy satyr-play mainly served as a kind of comic relief. Extending Seaford's analysis, one could perceive how Aristotle's assertion that tragedy derived from satyric drama is reaffirmed as well, along with Nietzsche's view that the "satyr chorus of the dithyramb is the saving deed of Greek art" (Nietzsche 1967: 60). In fact it is Nietzsche's interpretation of the satyr figure that informs my own reading of the ambivalent permutations of this character in Italian and European pastoral drama. I concur (at least partially) with Nietzsche in arguing that the Greek "satyr was something sublime and divine", and that he "was the archetype of man, the embodiment of his highest and most intense emotions", "the offspring of a longing for the primitive and natural" (1967: 61). Yet instead of decrying a 'mawkish', sentimentalising displacement of the satyr into the 'idyllic shepherd', I propose an alternative appraisal of the marginal, outcast satyr characters of early modern pastoral as a lingering and not quite completely suppressed vari-

15 See Seaford 1984: 7-9, where he aptly compares and contrasts this Dionysiac schema to its use in Euripides's *Bacchae*.

ant of their ancient theatrical predecessors. I also propose that several pastoral plays by Italian women pursue this variation with special vigour, acumen, and self-referential implications.

As students of Italian pastoral tragicomedy know, it was Euripides's *Cyclops* that enabled the new genre to emerge out of the first thorough dramatic experiment in devising a modern version of the 'third' type of classical Greek play. The experiment was Giovan Battista Giraldi Cinthio's *Egle*, the "satira" first performed at Ferrara in 1545, and published with a prefatory "lettera" in 1554. True to its Euripidean model, *Egle* does bring a group of lusty satyrs out of a cave and on to the stage, where the title character – who is Silenus's lover – helps the satyrs with a scheme to seize their beloved nymphs before their rivals, the heavenly gods themselves, can do so. The nymphs, however, flee the satyrs' advances, and are transformed (off-stage) into trees, flowers, rivers, and in one case, a reed: this is Syrinx, the nymph beloved by the minor deity Pan, who then turns her into his pan-pipe.¹⁶

Giraldi starts the gradual suppression of the satyrs' Dionysiac energies, for example editing out their bawdy complaint about their under-used phalloi, and submitting their comical-tragical-satirical and indeed pastoral hybridity to a process of decorum-making. Still, he does retain more of the sexual frankness of Euripides than his Ferraran successors would: if the aged Silenus no longer plays a ridiculous 'Ganymede'-lover to the lascivious Cyclops, Giraldi's script does have the character Silvano remark that the fleeing nymphs look like Venus from the front, and Ganymede from behind (Giraldi 1985: 115). In this regard Giraldi applies his insight, explained in his "Lettera sopra il comporre le Satire atte alla scena", that frolicking and agitated mobility befits the chorus of a satyr-play, "satyrs being naturally none other than goats, with whom they have many similarities in their leaps and their vigorous movements" ("essendo naturalmente I satiri non al-

16 For this description, and other invaluable material on *Egle* and early Ferrarese pastoral drama, I am gratefully indebted to the outstanding study by Sampson 2006. On Satyr characters and their uses in the theatre of sixteenth-century Ferrara, see Garraffo 1985: 185-201. I have also benefitted from Chiabò and Doglio 1991, especially the essays by Umberto Albini (1991) and Riccardo Bruscaagli (1991).

trimento che le capre, colle quali essi hanno molto simiglianza sui salti e sui movimenti gagliardi”; Giraldi 1985: 160; translations are mine). All in all, Giraldi retains the animalesque qualities of the Greek Satyr Chorus, and avoids anachronistically identifying their lust as sin, because – as he recognises in his “Lettera” – instinctive libido is an integral part of their Bacchic nature. Moreover, he sustains the view of tragedy’s emergence from satyr-plays, for “these fables [satyr-plays] were born from Bacchic sports and games” (“sono nate queste favole da’ giuochi di Bacco”), and therefore he avers “that the satyrs, who were Bacchus’s familiars and companions, first inspired that sort of play suited to their nature, which was entirely libidinous and lascivious” (“I satiri, ch’erano a Bacco famigliari e compagni, prima a quella sorte di favola si dessero che alla loro natura si confacesse, la quale era tutta libidine e lascivia”; Giraldi 1985: 148). Their amoral disorderliness thus persists, even as they are frustrated in their erotic designs. Giraldi’s refinement does not involve the creation of a shepherd’s idyll, but rather pursues, albeit somewhat clumsily, a sincere and thoughtful project of altering the all-male scenario of *The Cyclops*: as Giraldi explains, “from that *Cyclops* I have so far distanced myself that instead of Ulysses and his companions I have introduced a band of nymphs, with their purity” (“Dal qual *Ciclope* mi sono nondimeno in tanto allungato che, in vece di Ulisse e de’ suoi compagni io vi ho introdotte le ninfe colla purità loro”; Giraldi 1985: 162-3). The revisionist playwright thus allows the Satyrs – supported by their leaders Silenus and an amoral god Pan – to express their unbridled sexual energies, but he makes sure that they do not achieve their desire, because of the superior, transformative power of Nature that changes the nymphs into trees. Moreover, Giraldi modulates their aggressive threat by including “Little Satyrs”, who ingenuously believe that their desired nymphs have shown them “immense courtesy” and “so much love” (Giraldi 1985: 103). In this attempted modern satyr-play, then, the would-be trickster satyrs are given strongly serio-comic voices, and though thwarted in their design, they make a lasting centre-stage theatrical impression.

Almost ten years later, it was the Ferraran Agostino Beccari who would diminish the satyrs’ role significantly, and at this point it is worth asking: is this a main reason why later Italian theo-

rist-historians of Pastoral would identify Beccari's *Il Sacrificio* (first performed 1554, and published in 1555), rather than Giraldi's *Egle*, as the first exemplar of the genre? No longer is there an entire Chorus of Satyrs, but instead a single solitary one, now relegated to the status of the truly marginalised figure, and often designed to incarnate the vice of lust. Beccari's Satyr is tricked and frustrated, as he unsuccessfully attempts to take the nymph Stellinia by force, and ends up exposed to mockery, as she manages to tie him to a tree (Beccari 1555: 4.7). While he does free himself from his bonds after Stellinia slips away, and tries a second time to rape her, he is prevented by the arrival of her lover Turico. The scene of his harshly comical punishment, iconographically deriving from the classical topos of Apollo's tying up and flaying of Marsyas, evidently impressed later readers and authors. It recurs with significant alterations in Isabella Andreini's pastoral drama *Mirtilla* (1588), where the nymph Filli – played by Andreini herself – pulls off a thorough sequence of deception, titillation, and humiliation of her desperately amorous satyr-assailant. This scene has attracted a good deal of recent critical attention, since Andreini adds the triumphantly self-liberating as well as self-celebrating metatheatrical demonstration of her own desirability but also inviolability as the Nymph-Innamorata figure, who though lovesick for the disdainful Uranio is able to outwit, mock, and escape from the ineptly aggressive and foolishly narcissistic Satyr.

Even more tellingly, the actress-playwright feminizes and symbolically castrates her tied-up assailant, grasping and twisting his useless horns, pulling hairs out of his heavy beard, and pinching his “mammelle morbide” (“soft breasts”), before she pretends to give him a fragrant thyme breath freshener, which he then learns too late is a ball of repulsive aloes. She thus forces the Satyr to reenact the bitter-tasting practical joke of demeaning humiliation played on Boccaccio's Calandrino and Machiavelli's Nicia, making him a fully comical public laughingstock. As Françoise Decroisette incisively notes, Andreini conveys an optimistic vision of ingenious female agency here, in a way that sixteen years later (1604) Valeria Miani would extend in more ferocious terms.¹⁷

17 See Decroisette 2002, especially 161-7 and 177-82. Also see Ray 1998,

In this Paduan author's pastoral play *Amorosa speranza* ('Amorous Hope'), the Satyr – suggestively named Eliodoro, profaner of the Temple – is shown no mercy by the nymph Tirenia: after she first succeeds in sending him to the top of a tree to retrieve her shot arrow, leaving him there to be rescued by the female satyr Artemia, she finds herself assaulted by him a second time, and then manages to tie him to a tree. She goes even farther than Andreini's Filli in figuratively castrating and feminizing the Satyr, as she removes not only his entire beard but both of his horns. Where the Satyr of *Mirtilla* would be found, untied, and re-educated into culinary preferences by the gluttonous shepherd Gorgo, Eliodoro loses his very identity, so much so that the ox-driver Bassano doesn't even recognise him. Even more than the other Satyrs of contemporary Italian pastoral, these characters yield to female power.

What exactly is being 'edited out', however, in this process of the suppression of the Satyr? Simply the moral, sexual threat of an emblem of lust? Or is an almost gratuitous scapegoating being practiced, for the sake of the final comic resolution? In Battista Guarini's *Pastor fido* (1590), the Satyr appears as a would-be lover, but eventual dupe of the trickster/'bad girl' Corisca. In this regard, his in- or non-humanity is underlined, since Corisca eventually repents, and converts to virtue, pleading forgiveness from her lover Amarilli; in contrast, the rude and ungainly Satyr, humiliated and painfully falling to the ground as he pulls off Corisca's blonde wig, remains unredeemed, and excluded from the social re-groupings of the play (Guarini 1999: 2.6.965-1007).

To employ Mary Douglas's insight into cultural concepts and constructs of hygiene vs pollution, do early modern pastoral satyrs represent too much "dirt", that is, disorder and exceptionality (Douglas 1966: 35-40)? In the primarily elite genre of Italian pastoral, they also can represent the threat of poverty. The most famous Ferrarese poet and playwright of the late Renaissance, Torquato Tasso, reveals through the voice of the Satyr the inconvenient truth made available by the pastoral 'mode', but often suppressed by the Italian pastoral tragicomic 'genre': "Non sono io brutto, no, né tu mi sprezzì / perché sì fatto io sia, ma solamente /

perché povero sono; ahì, ché le ville / seguon l'eseempio de le gran cittadi; / e veramente il secol d'oro è questo, / poiché sol vince l'oro e regna l'oro" ("I am not ugly, no, nor do you disdain me / because I'm made the way I am, but only / because I'm poor. Alas, that rustic villages/ should follow the example of great cities! / And truly this is the golden age, / since gold alone conquers, and gold alone reigns"; Tasso 2015: 119.776-81). At this point, the Satyr overtly serves as the Satirist, all the more so because he is recycling a witty critique from Ovid's *Ars amatoria* (Ovid 1957: 93.277-8). A startling intertextual citation, perhaps, but once again Tasso has managed to revive the element of surprise so crucial to the ancient Greek portrayal of satyrs. His subaltern, aggressive Satyr in fact takes Silvia by surprise off-stage, strips her naked and ties her to a tree with her own flowing hair, only to be prevented from accomplishing his planned assault by the arrival of Aminta, the sexually timid shepherd in love with Silvia. The rescued nymph flees from Aminta, though she will return to help revive him after he attempts suicide; the Satyr, on the other hand, is never seen or heard from again in this exceptionally structured but also exceptionally influential pastoral play.

Further questions arise, then: what are the most urgent threats incarnated in the satyr-figure? Is it primitive violence alone, or is it rather violence's potential interdependence with economic deprivation, and social marginalisation? To what extent is the Satyr the convenient but also necessary scapegoat, banished not only for his violation of the poetic, idealising courtship values of the refined nymphs and shepherds, but also for his structurally over-determined embodiment of 'mongrel tragicomedy', and its impure, dirty origins? How might we today confront the complexities of the pastoral genre's moves of appropriation (in all senses, from the aesthetic to the economic), and of its agenda of exclusion vs. inclusion, precisely by acknowledging and seeking to re-integrate its actual originators, the Satyrs? Could the Satyr-figure's pre-civilized, instinctually playful, and naturally sublime but simultaneously bathetic energies be recuperated and re-evaluated through an experimental, outdoor theatrical interpretation?

Inspired by the scenes of nymphs emasculating and comically humiliating satyrs in Andreini's *Mirtilla* and Miani's

Amorosa speranza, as well as by the imaginative kind of modernising adaptation seen in Tony Harrison's smartly raucous version of Sophocles' fragmentary *Ichneutae*, entitled *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus* (performed at Delphi, 1988), this experimental approach was put into practice at New York University, Florence, for the premiere English-language production of the pastoral drama *Clorilli* by Leonora Bernardi of Lucca, dated to ca. 1591. Given its title by the editors of the forthcoming edition of the play, Virginia Cox and Lisa Sampson (the latter of whom rediscovered the untitled script in the Biblioteca Marciana, Venice), and translated by Anna Wainwright, *Clorilli* was performed before a live audience in the gardens of Villa La Pietra, Florence, in May of 2018. Early on in the rehearsal process, the productions set designer, Cameron Anderson, proposed that the play's Satyr character be played by the same actress who played the character of the playwright herself. This proposal met with unanimous approval by the director, cast, and production team, and thus the professional actress Elia Nichols opened the performance as Bernardi, welcoming the audience in a formal, brocaded Renaissance dress while she delivered the prologue. A half hour later, she reappeared in the shaggy woollen outfit – complete with high-contrast make-up, long fake beard, large curving ram's horns, and a half litre-sized cheap beer tin in hand – of Ruscone the Satyr, making ridiculously goat-like movements but also posturing like a strutting, swaggering, young 'macho' would-be seducer. Support for this interpretation came from the original script itself, with its post-Tassian lines including Ruscone's lovesick naming of Clorilli as his "goddess", and boasting of his "venerable and strong features, so fitting for a semi-god". Taking a cue from this Satyr's final complaint against "deceitful Clorilli", Ms Nichols as the potentially violent Ruscone was teased, tricked, and easily defeated by Clorilli, even before the arrival of Clorilli's long-lost brother Fillinio, who delivered the coup de grace to the limping Satyr's backside. All the while, she made it clear that she in some ways was still Bernardi in this cross-gendered performance. The transformative and tragicomic sequence was made complete, then, by the return of Leonora Bernardi in her original costume at the end of the performance, inviting the audience to witness the final harmonious group dance in celebration

of the play's double weddings. The Satyr character thus was able to express his/her sublimely natural energies, and to recuperate his/her place at the festive table of a celebratory theatrical group, not exactly the Chorus of an ancient Attic drama, but nonetheless an updating of a Dionysiac *thiasos*. Significantly, women were the ones who enabled this recuperation to happen.

Works Cited

- Albini, Umberto (1991), "Il dramma satiresco greco", in M. Chiabò and F. Doglio (eds), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento*, Roma: Nuova Coletti, 15-27.
- Andreini, Isabella (2017), *Mirtilla, A Pastoral: a bilingual edition*, trans. by Julia Kisacky and ed. by Valeria Finucci, Toronto: Iter Press.
- Avezzi, Guido (2003), *Il mito sulla scena: la tragedia ad Atene*, Venezia: Marsilio.
- Beccari, Agostino (1555) *Il sacrificio*, Ferrara: Francesco di Rossi da Valenza.
- Bruscagli, Riccardo (1991), "Ancora sulle pastorali ferraresi del cinquecento: la parte del Lollo", in M. Chiabò and F. Doglio (eds) (1991), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento*, Roma: Nuova Coletti, 29-43.
- Chiabò, M. and F. Doglio (eds) (1991), *Sviluppi nella drammaturgia pastorale nell'Europa del Cinque-Seicento*, Roma: Nuova Coletti, 1991.
- Decroisette, Françoise (2002), "Satyres au féminin dans la pastorale italienne de la fin du XVI^e siècle", in Giuditta Isotti Rosowsky (ed.), *La campagna in città: letteratura e ideologia nel rinascimento*, Firenze: Franco Cesati, 149-82.
- Dougherty, Carol (1999), "The Double Vision of Euripides' 'Cyclops': An Ethnographic 'Odyssey' on the Satyr Stage", *Comparative Drama* 33 (3): 313-38.
- Douglas, Mary (1966), *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London: Routledge.
- Euripides (1956), *The Cyclops*, trans. and ed. by William Arrowsmith, in *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Euripides II*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Euripides (1984), *Cyclops of Euripides*, ed. by Richard S. Seaford, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garraffo, Ornella (1985), "Il satiro nella pastorale ferrarese del Cinquecento", *Italianistica* 14 (2): 185-201.

- Guarini, Battista (1999), *Il pastor fido*, ed. by Elisabetta Selmi, Venezia: Marsilio.
- Giraldi Cinzio, Giambattista (1985), *Egle; Lettera sopra il comporre le satire atte alla scena; Favola pastorale*, ed. by Carla Molinari, Bologna: Commissione Per i Testi di Lingua.
- Harrison, Tony (1990), *The Trackers of Oxyrhynchus: the Delphi Text 1988*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Konstan, David (1990), "An Anthropology of Euripides' *Kyklops*", in John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 207-27.
- Lissarrague, François (1990a), "The Sexual Life of Satyrs", in David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 53-81
- (1990b), "Why Satyrs Are Good to Represent", in John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, Princeton: Princeton University, 228-36.
- (1993), "On the Wildness of Satyrs", in Thomas H. Carpenter and Christopher A. Faraone (eds), *Masks of Dionysus*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 207-20.
- Miani (Negri), Valeria (1604), *Amorosa speranza, favola pastorale*, Venezia: Francesco Bolzetta.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1967), *The Birth of Tragedy*, trans. by Walter Kaufmann, New York: Random House.
- Osborne, Robin (1998), *Archaic and Classical Greek Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ovid (1957), *The Art of Love*, trans. by Rolfe Humfries, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Paganelli, Leonardo (1979), *Echi storico-politici nel Ciclope euripideo*, Padova: Antenore.
- Pieri, Marzia (1983), *La scena boschereccia nel Rinascimento italiano*, Padova: Liviana.
- Ray, Meredith (1998), "La castità conquistata: The Function of the Satyr in Pastoral Drama", *Romance Languages Annual* 9: 312-21.
- Rossi, Luigi Enrico (1972), "Il dramma satiresco attico: forma, fortuna, e funzione di un genere letterario antico", *Dialoghi d'Archeologia* 6: 248-302.
- Sampson, Lisa (2006), *Pastoral Drama in Early Modern Italy: the Making of a New Genre*, Oxford: Legenda.
- Seaford, Richard S. (1976), "The Origins of Satyric Drama", *Maia* 28: 209-21.

- (1984), “Introduction”, in *Cyclops of Euripides*, ed. by Richard S. Seaford, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-72.
- Taplin, Oliver and Rosie Wyles (eds) (2010), *The Pronomos Vase and Its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tasso, Torquato (2015), *Aminta*, ed. by Marco Corradini, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Tylus, Jane (1992), “Colonizing Peasants: the Rape of the Sabines and the Renaissance Pastoral”, *Renaissance Drama* 23: 113-38.
- Voelke, Pierre (1992), “L’espace dans le drama satyrique”, in Claude Calame (ed.), *Figures Grecques de l’intermédiaire*, Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, 33-58.
- Winkler, John J. and Froma I. Zeitlin (eds) (1990), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Oedipus Tyrant? Tyranny and Good Kingship in Alexander Neville's Translation of Seneca's *Oedipus*

FRANCESCO DALL'OLIO

Abstract

This paper examines Alexander Neville's representation of Oedipus as a tyrant (a traditional feature of the character since Sophocles' tragedy) in his 1563 translation of Seneca's *Oedipus*, and the impact it has on its political message. The first two sections describe how Neville's changes create a different political landscape by making the Chorus the primary moral authority of the play and by enhancing Oedipus' intimate sense of guilt for the suffering he causes to the kingdom. Then, in the third section the article examines how Neville foregrounds Oedipus' potentially tyrannical character by showing his desire to hang on to power and behave unjustly towards Creon, although this means leaving Thebes vulnerable to plague. The article situates this analysis within the broader context of Elizabethan debate on tyranny and of contemporary dramas on the same subject.

1. Introduction

Alexander Neville's *Oedipus* is one of the most studied amongst the translations of the ten Senecan tragedies, published between 1559 and 1567 and then collected by Thomas Newton in the single 1581 volume of *Seneca. His Tenne Tragedies*. Friederick Kiefer (1978) and Jessica Winston (2008: 47-53) consider this play together with Jasper Heywood's translation of *Troades* as the most representative examples of how English Renaissance sensibility influenced early modern translative approaches to Seneca. Kiefer underlined Neville's emphasis on such topics as the precariousness of power and just retribution, which are only marginally present in Seneca. Following Kiefer,

Winston highlighted the political relevance of such choices, meant to encourage those in power “to practice humility and compassion by showing that those in position of authority cannot escape fortune’s reach” (53). In the following pages, I will pursue this line of interpretation by focusing on one main aspect of Neville’s translation: how Oedipus’ tyranny is affected by the translative approach the author adopted and the effects of the new vernacular context upon the story. I will therefore argue, following Woodbridge’s proposal to view Seneca’s translations as a sort of “resistance project” directed against tyranny (2010: 138), that Neville’s re-interpretation of the Senecan play is politically-oriented. Woodbridge contends that all the translations of Seneca’s tragedies should be considered as dealing with such a topic, either by having a tyrannical character (Atreus in *Thyestes*, Clytemnestra in *Agamemnon*), or by describing the oppression subjects suffer by the arbitrary power of men and gods alike (the Greek army in *Troades*, and Iuno in *Hercules furens*, respectively; 149-52). Among them, *Oedipus* stands out as the “rare positive political exemplum” of a “king who pulls back from tyranny” (135).

Woodbridge’s interpretation has the merit of being the first to consider this aspect of the relationship between Neville’s translation and the literary tradition he received. In Sophocles’ tragedy, after hearing Tiresias’s revelation of the true story of his birth and actions, Oedipus shows signs of suspicious, angry and fearful behaviour, leading him to accuse the prophet and Creon of conspiring together against him. The way he acts in this scene displays a set of psychological traits that the cultural tradition of Attic tragedy associated with a tyrannical personality.¹ Seneca rewrote this episode in a way consonant to the political culture of his time, making Oedipus more similar to “a Tacitean portrait of a Julio-Claudian emperor than . . . [to] Sophocles’ protagonist” (Boyle 1997: 97). By rewriting Oedipus’ tyranny in a way more consistent with Renaissance political thinking, Neville was establishing himself as part of a well-defined literary tradition, notwithstanding his claim to have “in Sense

¹ Lanza offers a brief but accurate analysis of the ‘tyrannical’ behaviour of Oedipus (1977: 141-8). Some scholars have interpreted Oedipus as an altogether tyrannical character, but as Paduano has argued (1994: 94-100, and more recently 2012: 54-62) this interpretation is hardly convincing.

lytell altered" (a.vii^v) the Senecan tragedy.² For this reason, it is interesting to examine how this complex process took place and how Neville conveyed an ethical and political message around a very delicate topic at the time as that of tyranny.³

In the first two sections of this article, I will discuss how Neville dealt with the political issue. In particular, I will show how his approach was to emphasise, on the one hand, the people's suffering because of the plague, and on the other hand, Oedipus' characterization as a prudent, responsible and caring king. Then, in the third section, I will focus on the episode of his transformation into a 'tyrant', and its meaning in relation to the rest of the play. Thus, I will show how Oedipus' tyranny helps convey the moral and political message of Neville's translation, in contrast to the early phases of the tragedy, when Oedipus instead proves to be a good king.

2. A More Involved Chorus

As Kiefer (1978) and Winston (2008) have shown, the deepest and most extensive changes in Neville's translation occur in the choral songs. Of the five choral odes in Seneca's tragedy, only two (the

² Which was nothing exceptional, at a time when, as Morini 1995: 17-24 reminds us, there was no established theoretical thinking about translations, and the old Medieval custom of widely changing the original text (if secular) to give voice to the translator's agenda was still practiced.

³ Many factors contributed to making tyranny a delicate topic in English literature between the late 1550s and the early 1560s. Henry VIII's arbitrary rule had created a rift between the crown and the Humanist-educated intellectual elite, that prompted the latter to abandon their traditional role as advisors and become covert critics of the tyrannical king (cf. Walker 2005). Mary's reign exasperated this situation and pushed renowned Protestants exiles to develop a 'resistance theory' centred around the right of people to rebel against a legitimate but abusive (i.e. tyrannical) king (cf. Woodbridge 2010: 138-49). Elizabeth's ascent was relatively smooth, but the new queen found herself confronted with subjects who, even when not spurned on to rebel by political or religious reasons, did not intend to submit to her power and tried to influence her by presenting her with 'images' of good kings, following the will of God and/or her people (cf. Hill 1992; Walker 1997: 196-221; Dall'Olio 2017: 476-8, 489-96). Speaking of tyranny during this period meant dealing with a very thorny and multifaceted issue.

first and the last one) retain at least something of the original, albeit with significant differences. Of the other three, the first one (the ode to Bacchus at the end of Act 2)⁴ is omitted, and the other two are rewritten in ways that make them entirely unconnected to the original play.⁵ These changes were not made randomly; on the contrary, as Kiefer contended, the choral odes are exemplary of Neville's translation practice as well as of his interest in the vulnerability of power to Fortune's blows and in the faith in divine justice to punish the sins of everyone, especially those in power (Kiefer 1978: 378, 382-5). In my opinion, these changes also contributed to involving the Chorus more in the dramatic action, stressing their role as representatives of the community and in this way foregrounding the people's suffering and opinions on the crisis in Thebes.

This enhancement of the Chorus' role is already evident in the first ode. Both the original Senecan piece and the translated version open with the Theban citizens entering on stage, lamenting the plague fallen upon the city. In both versions, the citizens also invoke a god (Bacchus in Seneca, an unnamed God in Neville) to come to their aid. However, in Seneca the prayer becomes almost immediately a poetic description of the lands Bacchus travelled together with his faithful Theban soldiers:⁶

Occidis, Cadmi generosa proles,
 urbe cum tota. viduas colonis
 respicis terras, miseranda Thebe.
 carpitur leto tuus ille, Bacche,
 miles, extremos comes usque ad Indos,
 ausus Eois equitare campis
 figes et mundo tua signa primo.
 cinnami silvis Arabas beatos
 vidi et versas equitis sagittas,

4 No doubt this ode seemed to Neville, as also to some modern scholars, as an unnecessary stop in the dramatic action. However, cf. Mastronarde 1970: 306-10 on its relevance for the imagery of Seneca's tragedy.

5 Cf. Kiefer 1978: 374-80, Winston 2008: 49-50.

6 All Latin and English quotations from Seneca's *Oedipus* are from Seneca 2011.

terga fallacis metuenda Parthi.
 litus intravit Pelagi Rubentis;
 promit hinc ortus aperitque lucem
 Phoebus et flamma propiore nudos
 inficit Indos.

(110-23)

[“High-born breed of Cadmus, you fall / With all the city. You watch lands / Widowed of tillers, piteous Thebes. / Death crops your soldiers, Bacchus, / Your comrades to furthest India, / Who boldly rode on Eastern plains / And fixed your standards at earth’s rim. / They saw rich Arabs in cinnamon / Groves, archer-riders in retreat, / The false Parthian’s ominous back. / They entered the Red Ocean’s shore, / Where Phoebus rises and unlocks / The light, and blackens the naked / Indian with close flame.”]

Neville replaced the description with a prayer to the god, so that the Chorus can know the cause of the pestilence. The ‘digressive’ moments of the Senecan ode are thus substituted with a more apparently caring attitude on the part of the Chorus, who therefore gain a prominent role as the voice of the subjects:⁷

More then thrice renowned stock of auncient Cadmus race.
 O mighty Thebes Citie great, O hevvy ruthfull Case.
 Loe now you lye all desolate, with Plagues devoured quight.
 O fowle and fearfull fates (alas) what causeth all this wo?
 O God whence springs this Pestylence? that us tormenteth so?
 (A.vi^{r-v})

In the remaining lines, Neville preserves the entire Senecan description of the devastated city, but he adds two more passages to emphasize the citizens’ anguish in witnessing its ruin. In the first one, they ask to the god that the plague should be aimed at punishing the guilty (“Powre downe on them diseases fowle, that

⁷ As Winston 2008, I will refer to the in-quarto version of 1563. It should be recalled that, at the time of its publication, with Elizabeth just ascended to the throne, the debate on tyranny and good kingship was still affected by the resistance literature that developed against Mary, and that prompted many writers to deal with the subject of tyranny in the hope of influencing the new queen.

them deserved have", A.vi^v), so that at least it may provide justice in the country,⁸ while in the second they reiterate their prayer that suffering will be put to an end (A.viiiⁱ). These insertions have a considerable effect on the beginning of the play. In the previous scene, Oedipus expressed his own personal anguish due to the plague destroying his kingdom, and, as will be seen, his fear of being responsible for his own potential role in it. Now, in the first choral ode, the Theban community echoes him, by asking what the cause of this plague is, what the plague should be, and by praying to the god that at least this common ruin may have some aspects of justice associated with it. As a result, their suffering appears as equally relevant to the play as that of the king, which establishes the Chorus as another, 'unofficial' protagonist.

The Chorus' deep concern about the fate of the kingdom sets the pattern for the next two odes (the third and the fourth in Seneca), where they reformulate what Neville presented, in the Preface to the translation, as the moral of the play: "a very expresse and lively Image of the inconstant change of fickle Fortune in the person of a Prince of passing fame and Renowne . . . by meere misfortune, nay rather by the deepe hidden secret Iudgments of God pyteouslye plunged in most extreame myseries" (a.v-vi). However, the two odes' focus upon this theme marks a total departure from Seneca. In the original text, the third ode begins with the Chorus passionately denying Oedipus' guilt ("Non tu tantis causa periculis" ["No! You did not cause this crisis"], 3.709) and then goes on with a long description of the Labdacids' curse, while the fourth ode opens with the Chorus wishing to fly away from present misery and then continues with the story of Icarus' flight, whose moral is "Quidquid excessit modum / pendet instabili loco" ("All that exceeds the mean / Stands poised upon the brink", 4.909-10). Nothing of this remains in Neville's translation, where the second ode (immediately following Creon's report of Laius' response declaring Oedipus guilty) presents his story as the proof that the life of princes is "a state ene fytt for men on whom Fortune wolde wreke her wyll" (D.ii^r), while the second one laments the definitive fall of Oedipus by the hand of Fortune, now that there is no doubt about his guilt ("A wofull thy-

8 Cf. Kiefer 1978: 379-80; Winston 2008: 51.

ng to see: / A Princely lyfe to myselfe state, converted for to bee", D.viii^v). In both cases, Neville discards the mythical landscapes and the poetic image present in Seneca to privilege a more explicit reaction by the Chorus to what happens on stage, rendered in the moralistic terms of the Christian and medieval tradition about Fortune's fickleness.⁹ It is worth noting that both odes stand in stark contrast with Oedipus' tyrannical behaviour in Act 3, when he rejects the oracle's response and tries to charge Creon and Tiresias with treason. Differently from the king, the Chorus accepts the response and its consequences, and the following events in the play will prove Oedipus wrong and the citizens right.

Neville's additions to the fourth and last Choral song (the fifth in Seneca) confirm the Chorus' active role. In this case, the translator faithfully reproduces the topics of the original Choral piece: man has to yield to fate's fixed course, and sometimes fear of what is to come paradoxically accelerates its occurrence. This last point is then developed by Neville in a longer *coda*, where the Chorus, as Keifer pointed out (1978: 374-5), laments not the inevitability of fate, but the human sense of instability, and therefore invites every man to be advised:

Wherefore set pevysh feare asyde,
and worthy courage beare.
And thou that Subiect art to Death
Regarde thy latter daye.
Thinke no man blest before his ende
Aduyse the well and staye.
Be sure his lyfe, and death, and all,
be quight exempt from mysery:
Ere thou do once presume to saye:
this man is blest and happy.
(E.iv^v)

This brings back to mind Oedipus' tyrannical behaviour in Act 3,

9 Cf. Kiefer 1978: 374-6; Winston 2008: 50. It is also worth noting that Neville moves to this ode the Chorus' expression of solidarity towards the king, present in the previous ode, but with a different meaning: "O Oedipus thy fatall fall, thy dredfull mischiefs right. . . . what hart may them reioyce / At thy dystresse? I can no more: my teares do stop my voice" (E.i^r).

against which the Chorus express the ultimate moral that power does not grant happiness, and men have to learn humility and acceptance of their fate (Winston 2008: 50-1).

3. The King and His People

It has been pointed out several times that one of the main differences between Seneca's tragedy and its Sophoclean model is that in Seneca Oedipus is presented from the beginning as internally plagued by fear and anxiety over his guilt, thus eliminating the positive connotations of his kingship present in Sophocles.¹⁰ The search for the truth leading to the terrible discovery of Oedipus' true parentage in the Greek tragedy is thus replaced, as Anthony Boyle noticed (1997: 91), by a desperate longing for innocence, and a more pessimistic analysis of the contradictory nature of power and law. In Neville's translation, this aspect is maintained, but is developed in a way that emphasizes its most directly 'political' consequences. Neville intensifies Oedipus' sense of inner justice and responsibility towards his subjects, elaborating on an aspect of his character that in Seneca is alluded to but never becomes central. In this way, Oedipus' kingship recovers some of the positive qualities it lacks in Seneca, thus creating a background against which the tyranny displayed in Act 3 will emerge as even stronger.

This strategy is apparent from the beginning of the play, in the monologue which marks Oedipus' entrance in Act 1. In Seneca, he expresses his fear that his being untouched by the plague may be the sign that a greater, more terrible evil will befall him (Paduano 2012: 82):

Iam iam aliquid in nos fata moliri parant.
 nam quid rear quod ista Cadmeae lues
 infesta genti strage tam late edita
 mihi parcit uni? cui reservamur malo?
 inter ruinas urbis et semper novis
 deflenda lacrimis funera ac populi struem

¹⁰ Cf. Mastronarde 1970: 315; Palmieri 1983: 183; Caviglia 1986: 261-5; Boyle 1997: 92; Paduano 2012: 80-1.

incolumis asto – scilicet Phoebi reus.
 sperare poteris sceleribus tantis dari
 regnum salubre? fecimus caelum nocens
 (1.29-36)

[Now, now fate fashions something for me. / What else can I think
 when this plague that fouls / Cadmus' folk, dealing universal death,
 / Sparing me alone? For what evil am I kept? / Amid the city's
 ruin, the endless funerals, / The unceasing sobs, the slaughter of
 men, / I stand untouched – truly damned by Phoebus. / Could one
 expect sin like mine to receive / A healthy realm? I've made the
 air guilty.]

Neville rewrites this passage so as to present Oedipus as anguished at the thought that his subjects may be suffering because of him:

For what should I suppose the cause? A Plague that is so generally
 And Cadmus' country wholly spoils and spreads itself thorough all?
 Should us amongst so huge a heap of plaged Bodies spare?
 And we alone amongst the rest reserved to mischiefs are?
 O heavy hap. And byde we still alone the spoyle to see?
 Of Cities great, of men, of beasts, by plague that wasted be?
 And thou amongst so many yls, a happy life to lead,
 Couldst once persuade thy selfe (O wretch) without all fear or dread.
 Of Phoebus' secret Judgements to, and that in kinges estate,
 Thou, thou, infected hast the ayre, in such a filthy rate.
 (A.ii^r)

In this passage, Oedipus' original fear of what fate might have in store for him is replaced by his own self-blame for having thought that he could live "a happy life" while the city is suffering. This detail recalls a previous passage in this same monologue, when he acknowledges the true, harsh reality of a prince's life:

Doth any man in Princely throne reioyce? O brittle Joye
 How many ills? how faire a face? and yet how much annoy
 In the doth lurke, and hidden lies? what heapes of endless stryfe?
 They iudge amys, who dream who Prince to have the happy lyfe.
 For as the mountains huge and high, the blustering windes withstand,
 And craggy Rocks, the belching fluds do dash and beate from land.

Though that the seas in quiet are and nought at all do some:
 So kingdoms great submytted lye, to fortunes doulfull Dome.
 (A.i^v)

In this passage too, Neville rewrites the original Senecan passage on the negativity of the *regnum* as only a superficial benefit:

Quisquamne regno gaudet? o fallax bonum,
 quantum malorum fronte quam blanda tegis!
 ut alta ventos semper excipiunt iuga
 rupemque saxis vasta dirimentem freta
 quamvis quieti verberant fluctus maris,
 imperia sic excelsa Fortuna obiacent.
 (1.6-11)

[What joy lies in kingship? O treacherous prize, / What evils you
 hide with that smiling face. / As soaring ridges always catch the
 gales / And craggy rocks on which vast ocean splits / Are lashed
 by waves of the most tranquil sea, / Exalted power is Fortune's
 plaything.]

The difference between the two passages is a telling example of Neville's reinterpretation of the play. In Seneca, Oedipus laments that the *regnum* causes unhappiness and is subjected to Fortune's blows, a recurrent theme in his theatre and particularly prominent in this play.¹¹ For him the plague is a proof that the *regnum* is battered by Fortune and this is how the gods punish him for his crimes. For that reason, in a subsequent passage, while declaring that he never sought a kingdom, he will claim: "caelum deosque testor – in regnum incidi" ("heaven witness! – [I] stumbled on a kingdom", 1.14). Neville, instead, lays the emphasis on Oedipus' personal pain due to his own cares as a king, which he did not have when he was a vagabond and exile (Kiefer 1978: 378). For him the plague is a disgrace that hits him personally, since, as a prince, he has to see his own people perish while he does not suffer, and this is precisely what makes his life wretched. After all, he cries that "a kingdom is befauln on me" (A.i^v), thus strengthening his own passivity in front of destiny.

¹¹ Cf. Boyle 1997: 97; Paduano 2012: 81.

Therefore, it is no surprise that, while in both texts Oedipus intends to discharge himself from the accusation of ambition, only in Neville's does his cry for innocence sound really desperate. Oedipus declares that kingship is a condition that he was afflicted with against his will, doing away with all traces of willingness and hints of guilt still perceivable in Seneca with regard to his acceptance of kingly power: Oedipus stumbled on a kingdom and did not refuse it (Paduano 2012: 81). This is not the case in Neville, where Oedipus' protestations of innocence strengthen his painful sense of responsibility: he never intended to cause suffering to the Theban people in order to satisfy his own personal ambition. At the outset, he is undoubtedly good and caring, justly concerned with the future of his country, and even willing to exile himself, if this could help take away the plague.

It is interesting that the two main themes of Oedipus' monologue in Act 1 will be reprised and expanded by the Chorus: the preoccupation for the safety of the kingdom is immediately picked up in the first choral ode, while the negative view of kingship, as we saw above, provides the argument of the second and third odes. As a result, the relationship between the king and his people is strengthened, reinforcing the impression of Oedipus as a good king. This sets the pattern for the rest of the play, where Oedipus' personal responsibility to respond to the political crisis and save the kingdom becomes a main aspect of the political message of the tragedy. In fact, Neville underlines in plenty of ways the fact that it is only as a result of his protagonist's will that Thebes can be restored to health.

On the one hand, Neville cuts off all the passages which in Seneca's text allude to the Labdacids' family curse, or equips the play with a larger mythical landscape. We saw this already in the first section above with regard to the Choral odes, but there is another place in the tragedy where this intention becomes evident: Creon's retelling of Laius' necromancy in Act 3. In the original text, Laius' appearance is preceded by that of his ancestors, everyone named in a way reminding the audience of the family history:

primus emergit solo,
dextra ferocem cornibus taurum premens,

Zethus, manaque sustinet laeva chelyn
 qui saxa dulci traxit Amphion sono,
 interque natos Tantalus tandem suos
 tuto superba fert caput fastu grave
 et numerat umbras. peior hac genetrix adest
 furibunda Agave, tota quam sequitur manus
 partita regem. sequitur et Bacchas lacer
 Pentheus tenetque saevus etiamnunc minas.
 (3.609-18)

[First to rise from the ground / Is Zethus – his right hand grips a wild bull / By the horns; then – a lyre in his left hand – / Amphion, whose sweet music moved the rocks. / The Tantalid with her children, safe at last / In pride, bears her stony head with disdain / And counts her ghosts. A worse mother appears, / Frenzied Agave, leading the whole troop / Who dismembered the king. Torn Pentheus / Trails the Bacchae and still his wild threats rage.]

In Seneca, these references define Oedipus' guilt as a result of the family curse of the Labdacids, thus placing part of the blame for his crimes on a tradition of familiar horror and decay (Mastrorarde 1970: 311-2). This aspect is completely lost in Neville's text, where the mythical characters are reduced to names only:

Both Tantalus and Zetus to, and pale Amphion Ghost:
 And Agave, and after her, ten thousand sprights do post.
 Than Pentheus and more and more, in lyke estate ensue:
 Tyll out at length coms Laius: with fowle and griesly hue.
 (C.vi^r)

The omission of the mythical references to the family curse deprives Oedipus' actions of their mythical resonances, leaving him to cope with his own personal guilt.¹² No curse can be invoked to partially justify his parricide and incest: Oedipus is alone in front

¹² Winston remarks that in this way Neville "reduces the particularity of the story, shaping Oedipus into a generally representative man who suffers the vicissitudes of fortunes and operations of justice" (2008: 49). While this is substantially true, I believe that the changes also serve to highlight and enlarge Oedipus' personal responsibility.

of his sins.

On the other hand, Neville keeps underlining the effort Oedipus puts into his search for Laius' murderer, a task which Oedipus sees as a way to exercise his royal power as a defender of the Theban community. When Creon comes back from Delphi with the oracle's response about the need to find out Laius' murderer, Oedipus is indignant and amazed at the thought that any man could kill a king: "Durst eny man on yearth attempt, / that noble prince to slaye?" (B.iii'). In the original Latin text, Oedipus just asked who the murderer was: "Et quis peremptor incluti regis fuit?" ("And who was the renowned king's assassin?", 2.221). The emphasis Neville lays on the extraordinariness of the murder of a king suggests that Oedipus-the-king cares more about the administration of justice than his counterpart in Seneca's tragedy, also considering that king-killing was a more delicate question to deal with in Neville's time.¹³ Likewise, the consequent curse on Laius' unknown murderer too is more violent and expands the idea present in the original that the murderer must be excluded from human society:

Let him no health, no comfort have, but al to crusht with cares,

¹³ Killing a tyrannical (i.e. legitimate but abusive) king was a matter of furious debate in the 1560s. Resistance writers such as John Ponet, Christopher Goodman and John Knox advocated in their works the people's duty in doing so, as a form of punishment sanctioned by God. This theory was to be taken up again later (albeit in a much less religious tone) by Scottish humanist and scholar George Buchanan. In his *De Iure Regni Apud Scotos Dialogus* (published in 1579 but written a few months after Mary Stuart's deposition in 1567) he argued that the power of kings derived by popular will, and therefore a king whose behaviour was not in accord with the law could be justly killed (cf. Mason and Smith in Buchanan 2004: xxvii-xxix, xlvi-xlviiii). To contrast such theories, official Tudor ideology went on to assert, in texts such *An Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* (1571), that the people had no right to rebel even against a bad king, since this would have been an act of revolt against the order of Nature as established by God's will (cf. Dall'Olio 2017: 476-7). However, this did not entirely settle the issue: on the contrary, as Mack's and Miola's analyses of Shakespeare's plays show (cf. Mack 1973; Miola 1985), the theme of 'killing the king/tyrant' kept haunting the Elizabethan imaginary, time and again prompting political and cultural debate.

Consume his wretched yeres in grief and though the Death him spares
 A while. Yet mischiefs all at once, at lengthe upon him light.
 With all the evils under sonne, that uglye Monster smight.
 In exile let him lyve a slave, the rated course of life.
 In Shame, in Care, in penurye, in Daunger and in strife.
 Let no man on him pitie take, let all men him revile.
 (B.v^t)

In Seneca's text, this part of the curse was contained in just two verses: "hunc non quieta tecta, non fidi lares, / non hospitalis exulem tellus ferat" ("[He] is to find refuge in no quiet home, / No faithful hearth, no friendly land – an exile", 2.257-8), while greater relevance was given to the ethical part of the punishment, with a special emphasis on the culprit committing family crimes, such as parricide and incest, as part of his damnation. The shift in the emphasis from one aspect of the curse to another witnesses Neville's different inflection of Oedipus's story, making the political aspect of the regicide much more important than the moral one: the king's murderer has committed an impious crime polluting the city, therefore he has to be excluded by the community he tainted as a fitting punishment. While it remains true that, as in Seneca, Oedipus projects on the unknown murderer an image of himself-as-the-murderer, devising the punishment that he fears that could be inflicted to himself (Caviglia 1986: 261), Neville's re-writing emphasizes the social aspect of Oedipus' curse, thus reinforcing the idea that Oedipus is a righteous king bent on doing the right thing.

The same preoccupation with the right punishment will crop up again at the end of the tragedy, when Oedipus, in blinding himself, will show the same care about justice and retribution. This aspect is present in Seneca too, as Gottfried Mader has shown,¹⁴ but Neville points up its political and social relevance. In Seneca, his self-blinding is presented as an intentional act through which Oedipus accepts and declares in its full extent his own wretched nature, thus finally imposing his own will on the fate

¹⁴ Mader 1995: 307-9. Cf. also Palmieri 1983: 157-8: she was the first to insist on Oedipus' choice of excluding himself from every community, the dead and the living, as the rationale behind the choice of blinding himself.

forcing him to be parricide and incestuous (Mader 1995: 316-8). In Neville the recurrence of “revenge” and “vengeance” in Oedipus’ final speech (absent in the Latin text) adds an ethic nuance: the king is obsessed by the thought of punishing himself with a penalty fitting his crimes, thus restoring justice and order (Kiefer 1978: 379-80). Oedipus goes out at the end of Act 4 with a “revenging mynd” (D.viii^v), and invokes the gods to receive “vengeance due” (E.i^r) for the crimes he committed. In the following speech, the Nuntius tells the Chorus that Oedipus decided not to kill himself, because that would not “make / A meete amends outright” for his crimes (E.iii^r). Oedipus even wishes he could live a hundred times so that he could “vengeaunce take / Upon this wretched pate” (ibid.) again and again. In this way, Oedipus proves that he is still a rightful king, as he applies to himself the same punishment he was to mete out for the unknown murderer. His self-blinding both makes him an object of horror for every man and is the explicit mark of his own exclusion from society. Oedipus’ final words sanction the justice of it:

Now spare you Gods, spare now, my Countrey prest to fall.
 I have done that you did commaund: Your wraths revenged bee.
 This wretched looke, this mangled face, is fittest now for thee.
 (E.iv^v)

In Seneca, this same passage ended with a somehow proud affirmation of Oedipus’ own ingenuity: “*Inventa thalamis digna nox tandem meis*” (“Now I’ve found night fit for my marriage bed”, 5.977). Self-blinding appeared to be a way of finally proving to himself and everybody that he had accepted his fate. In Neville, instead, Oedipus shows satisfaction because his punishment is fit for the revenge of the gods, and therefore it is an act of both personal and social justice.

4. Oedipus the Tyrant?

It is against the backdrop of the Chorus as the moral authority of

the play, and of Oedipus as a king genuinely devoted to administering justice, that the following discussion of Oedipus' tyranny in Act 3 is set. We may start by pointing out that, in Neville's text, Oedipus's tyranny is more explicitly declared than in the original. In Seneca, he behaves like a tyrant, when he accuses Creon of conspiring against him and has him imprisoned for no other reason than his fear of losing his throne, but he is never defined as such.¹⁵ In Neville's translation, instead, Act 3 ends with Creon openly saying that Oedipus behaved like a tyrant towards him: "Who so the Tyrant playes and gyltles men with force doth smight / He dredeth them that hym do dred" (D.i^v).¹⁶ Thus, Neville makes explicit what Seneca only alluded to, making Oedipus descent into tyranny faster.

The impression of a quicker descent is reinforced by Neville's decision to cut the ominous signs present in the first part of Act 3, when Oedipus orders a reluctant Creon to reveal Laius' ghost's response. In Seneca, Oedipus' insistence on having it becomes suspicious, as he, in a fit of rage,¹⁷ denies Creon the "muta libertas" ("the right of silence", 3.525) that his brother-in-law presents as the fundamental right to be granted by a king. Scenes like this are typical of Senecan tragedies (Boyle in Seneca 2011: 237), where tyrants are often shown to be afraid of the silence of their subjects, which they see as a sign of a possible threat against their power, as Oedipus himself says: "Saepe vel lingua magis / regi atque regno muta libertas obest" ("The right of silence / Harms king and kingdom – often more than speech", 3.524-5).¹⁸ The denial of the right of silence thus becomes as an assertion of absolute power: refusing Creon his right to a fundamental *libertas* as that of holding his peace, Oedipus claims absolute submission.

This feature is absent from Neville's text, where Creon sim-

15 Cf. Mader 1993; Boyle 1997: 97; Paduano 2012: 80.

16 In the original text, the idea is the same, but the word 'tyrant' is not mentioned: "Qui sceptris duro saevus imperio regit / timet timentis" ("The savage who kings it with merciless power / Fears those who fear", 3.705-6).

17 A typical psychological feature of the tyrant in Seneca's tragedies: cf. Boyle in Seneca 2011: 236.

18 Cf. Mader 1993: 114 on this sentence as a perfect example of 'tyrant-logic'.

ply asks “leve to hould my peas” (C.iii’), as the lesser one “of all the pardons Princes graunt” (ibid.). This different word choice gives a very different meaning to Creon’s request. He is not asking Oedipus to respect a fundamental right of every subject, but permission to act as he thinks best, even if his duty towards king and country requires that he reports the response of Laius’ ghost. Creon thus implicitly recognises that Oedipus’ request is legitimate, even if he threatens him with punishment; he is justified because since what is at stake is the fate of the kingdom and his request only confirms that he continues to be a careful and good prince, as proved by his answer to Creon: “As though the Silence hurts not more, oftimes than words ill spent” (ibid.). Neville here eliminates the political references of the original (where silence was a threat to power), giving Oedipus’ answer a generalizing tone, more appropriate to a wise and caring king. Even Oedipus’ wrath, in this context, may be viewed as an appropriate emotional response to Creon’s silence, which endangers the city by concealing what could ensure the salvation of Thebes.

By contrast, after Creon’s speech Neville accelerates the process through which Oedipus comes to accuse Creon and Tiresias of conspiracy. In Seneca, before accusing Creon Oedipus is caught by fear that the response may be truthful and reminds himself, in an aside, of what may instead prove that it is not. Only after having weighed the evidence, does he come to the conclusion that he is the victim of a plot:

Et ossa et artus gelidus inuasit tremor.
 quidquid timebam facere fecisse arguor.
 tori iugalis abnuit Merope nefas
 sociata Polybo; sospes absoluit manus
 Polybus meas. uterque defendit parens
 caedem stuprumque. quis locus culpae est super ?
 multo ante Thebae Laium amissum gemunt,
 Boeota gressu quam meo tetigi loca.
 falsusne senior an deus Thebis gravis?
 iam iam tenemus callidi socios doli.
 (3.658-68)

[An icy shiver knifes my bones and limbs. / All I feared to do, I’m

accused of having done. / But Merope's partnership with Polybus /
 Refutes any impious marriage; Polybus lives, / Clearing my hands
 of guilt. Both parents disprove / Murder and incest. Where can
 my guilt lie? / Thebes lamented the loss of Laius / Long before I
 stepped on Boeotian soil. / Does the old priest lie – or a god hate
 Thebes? / Now, now I've got them and their devious plot.]

On the contrary, Neville has Oedipus immediately accuse Creon of treason, and all the actions that in Seneca's play were evidences he brought to quiet his own fear, become arguments to show Creon the failure of his plot. Oedipus goes as far as challenging him to "lay what [he] can unto [his] charge", as nothing will prove him guilty:

That, that I alwayes feard, alas upon me now is layde:
 But slender props thei are (God wot) wherby your Treason is sayde.
 Meropa my Mother deare, shall me from this defende.
 And Polibus shall purge me quight, from Actions that all tend
 To muder, or to incest vile, they both shall me excuse.
 In suche a case no means at all of tryall I refuse.
 Laye what you can unto my charge, no fault in me remayns.
 The Thebanes long or I cam here, of Laius death complayns.
 My mother yet alive, my father styll in lyke estate.
 No, no, this is som doliysh drift, of yon false Prophet parte.
 (C.vii^v)

The king, who at the beginning of the play seemed ready to give up his power for the good of the people, rapidly becomes a power-hungry tyrant once his power is threatened. Neville's changes to the text emphasize this sudden transformation by omitting all transition between the two phases of Oedipus' psychological characterization.

In addition, Neville also takes care of presenting Creon as a positive character by putting in his mouth the moral about the wretchedness of the life of princes endorsed by Oedipus at the beginning of Act 1 (1.6-11, see above), and repeated by the Chorus after this scene in the second and third choral odes of the play (see above). This is evident in the way Neville re-elaborates Creon's original first response to the charge of treason: "si me fides sacrata cognati laris / non contineret in meo certum statu, / tamen ipsa me for-

tuna terret nimis” (“If sworn loyalty to my family’s house / Did not keep me firmly in my own place, / Such fortune . . . Would stop me”, 3.672-4). In his translation, the English author expands this sentence through Creon’s insistence that “yll fortune . . . / Whose guyse it is on Princes heads, houghe heapes of Cares to throwe” (C.viii), will deter him from any such attempts. Moreover, Neville also dilates the following passage (3.687-93) when Creon states that he does not need to aim for power, since he already enjoys all the advantages of his position. Neville has Creon explicitly say that his life is blessed because it is “from Pryncely Cares exempt” (D.i^r), and therefore this is enough to dissuade him from seeking more power. Creon thus emerges as a proper, faithful servant of the state, respectful of his position in society and lacking ambition. He also appears to share the same view of the Chorus on the life of princes, a view that Oedipus, after having supported it in his monologue at the beginning of the play, now seemingly opposes when confronted with the concrete possibility of losing his power.

In my opinion, here lies the key to understand Neville’s peculiar treatment of Oedipus’ tyranny: this is the first and only time, in the whole play, when Oedipus does not act for the good of his people, but for his own, personal sake. After starting as a good sovereign aware of the duties of a ruler, bent on doing the right thing, Oedipus suddenly reveals himself as hanging on to power, whatever the consequences. This perspective is clear in the way Neville modifies Creon’s answers to Oedipus’ question: “dost thou me exhorte thou slave my kingdom for to leave?” (C.vii^v).¹⁹ In Seneca, Creon simply stresses that Oedipus has no other choice: “Suadeam hoc illis ego, / in utrumque quis est liber etiamnunc status. / tibi iam necesse est ferre fortunam tuam” (“I’d advise this / To men who are free to choose what to do. / Necessity now makes you bear your fortune”, 3.679-81). In Neville, Creon says the same thing, but adds that, in any other case, he would ‘not’ endorse such a proposal:

Think you I wold them so perswade whiche freely myght possess

19 “Hortaris etiam, sponte deponam ut mea / tam gravia regna?” (“Are you really asking me to lay down / Freely this heavy crown?”, 3.678-9). It is worth noting that, here too, Neville intensifies Oedipus’ wrath and arrogance, by making him insult Creon.

him),²⁰ still it highlights an inconsistency in Oedipus' behaviour, that shows a very different side of him, leading him to be the loser at the end of the tragedy. By contrast, the Chorus emerge as the real authority of the play, not only because their suffering is functional to the dramatic action at the beginning of the play, but also because, in the following odes, they show themselves to have a better understanding and a wider moral horizon than the king, who is entirely absorbed by the painful process of self-knowledge and unwilling to listen to anybody. In the loss of this connection between the king and the Chorus, the representatives of the kingdom, there resides the rationale of Neville's reinterpretation of Oedipus' tyranny. When in the last Act Oedipus renounces the throne and punishes himself with self-blinding, he will go back to being a good king: fully aware of his guilt, he will choose to accept his fate and will behave accordingly, thus saving Thebes.

Therefore, the play invites us to identify Oedipus alternatively as a good king or as a tyrant depending on whether he behaves in the interest of the people or of himself. This distinction between tyranny and kingship was not an innocent one in the 1560s when tyranny was a frequent topic in drama (Bevington 1968: 141-68). Neville's *Oedipus* followed Thomas Preston's *Cambises* (printed 1569, but commonly thought to have been written around 1560) by only three years, the first Elizabethan tragedy to explicitly deal with a traditional tyrant figure represented as an unstable and assertive king who refuses to take counsels and carries on ruling according to his desires.²¹ Slightly earlier, figures of tyrannical kings deposed by their own subjects for not respecting the law nor ruling for the people's sake had made their way into the anthology *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1559), on whose frontispiece it was written that the stories contained in it would show the reader "howe frayle and unstable worldly prosperitie is founde, even of those, whom Fortune seemeth most highly to favour".²² Thus it invited to consider those stories as moral examples

20 Cf. Caviglia 1983: 269; Paduano 2012: 80.

21 On Preston's *Cambises* in its political context, see the fundamental study of Hill 1992; cf. also Dall'Olio 2017: 491-2.

22 See Winston 2004 on *The Mirror* and its political meanings.

through which one could learn humility in front of fickle Fortune – the same purpose Neville wanted to achieve with his translation. One year after *Oedipus'* print, Richard Edwards' *Damon and Pythias* was to stage the figure of a fearful tyrant, obsessed with his own security and deaf to all counsel. All these plays, written either by young Protestant intellectuals educated during the Marian persecution, or by older authors who had lived at the Marian court,²³ had one thing in common: tyrant figures presented as stubborn and self-absorbed kings whose wilful rule oppressed their subjects, eventually leading most of them to a gruesome and pitiful end. By offering them as negative examples of kingship, their authors gave, by contrast, indications about what a good king should be like: he who reigned according to the law, defended justice and respected the freedom of the people and their well-being.

Neville rewrote *Oedipus'* tyranny along these lines, providing yet another example of a literary work that “fostered a kind of political awareness” (Winston 2008: 51). In this tragedy, *Oedipus'* tyranny offered the perfect negative example not to be followed: the king's desperate effort to retain his power and prove his innocence demonstrates a man refusing to relinquish his power, too consumed by his personal involvement in the situation to make the right decision. Thus, through textual manipulation and the reinvention of the Chorus's role, Neville's *Oedipus* recasts the story as a mirror for magistrates, suggesting that the only way for a king to be a good ruler is to pursue the good of the country and accept with humbleness and submission what an unpredictable future holds for him, always putting the people's sake, and the law, before personal advantage.

Conclusion

Neville dedicated his work to Nicholas Wotton, an important figure of Tudor diplomacy between the 1540s and the 1560s, thus

²³ This is the case for Richard Edwards: see Ros King's introduction in Edwards 2001.

making of it “a subtle form of admonition, encouraging a powerful and influential person to practice humility and compassion by showing that those in positions of authority cannot escape fortune’s reach” (Winston 2008: 53). Within this context, Neville’s re-interpretation of Oedipus’ tyranny occupies a very important role, one that so far has not received much attention. In contrast with both the Chorus’ moralistic view of the life of princes as subjected to Fortune’s instability, and Oedipus’ behaviour at the beginning and at the end of the play as a truly righteous king, Oedipus’ transformation into a tyrant marks the moment, at the play’s centre, when the sovereign becomes an example of Fortune’s reversal. Driven by fear and insecurity, Oedipus refuses to accept that the only way to save the kingdom from the plague is to renounce power, and instead charges Creon with treason, denouncing his will to pursue safety for his own power by any means. As a result, he becomes an example of arrogance and pride, a king who deems his own power more important than the good of his subjects. This justifies his fall, on an ethical plane, as an example of divine punishment, while at the same time reinforcing the ultimate moral of the play about Fortune’s fickleness and the need for a governor to learn humility. That was a strong message in the Elizabethan age, one that his readers would have easily grasped as being deeply political.

Works Cited

- Baldwin, William (1559), *A Myroure for Magistrates, Wherein may be seen by example of other, with howe grevous plages vices are punished and howe frayle and unstable worldly prosperitie is founde, even of those, whom Fortune seemeth most highly to favour*, London: Thomas Marsh.
- Bevington, David (1968), *Tudor Drama and Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boyle, Anthony James (1997), *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Buchanan, George (2004), *A Dialogue of the Law of Kingship among the Scots*, ed. by Roger Mason and Martin Smith, Aldershot/Burlington: Ashgate.

- Caviglia, Franco (1986), "L'*Oedipus* di Seneca", in Bruno Gentili, Roberto Pretagostini (eds), *Edipo: il teatro greco e la cultura europea*, Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 255-74.
- Dall'Olio, Francesco (2017), "Xenophon and Plato in Elizabethan Culture: The Tyrant's Fear Before *Macbeth*", *Comparative Drama* 51 (4): 476-505.
- Edwards, Richard (2001), *The Works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England*, ed. by Ros King, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Hill, Eugene D. (1992), "The First Elizabethan Tragedy: A Contextual Reading of *Cambises*", *Studies in Philology* 89: 404-33.
- Kiefer, Frederick (1978), "Seneca Speaks in English: What the Elizabethan Translators Wrought", *Comparative Literature Drama Studies* 15: 372-87.
- Lanza, Diego (1977), *Il tiranno e il suo pubblico*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Mack, Maynard (1973), *Killing the King: Three Studies in Shakespeare's Tragic Structure*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Mader, Gottfried (1993), "Tyrant and Tyranny in Act III of Seneca's *Oedipus*", *Grazer Beiträge: Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft* 19: 103-28.
- (1995), "Nec Sepultis Mixtus et Vivis Tamen / Exemptus: Rationale and Aesthetics of the 'Fitting Punishment' in Seneca's *Oedipus*", *Hermes* 123 (3): 303-19.
- Mastrorarde, Donald (1970), "Seneca's *Oedipus*: The Drama in the World", *Transactions and Proceedings of American Philological Association* 101: 291-315.
- Miola, Robert S. (1985), "*Julius Caesar* and the Tyrannicide Debate", *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.2: 271-89.
- Morini, Massimiliano (1995), *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- Neville, Alexander (1563), *The Lamentable Tragedy of Oedipus the Sonne of Laius King of Thebes out of Seneca*, London: Thomas Colwell.
- Paduano, Guido (1994), *Lunga storia di Edipo Re: Freud, Sofocle e il teatro occidentale*, Torino: Einaudi.
- (2012), *Edipo: storia di un mito*, Roma: Carocci.
- Palmieri, Nicoletta (1983), "Sulla struttura drammatica dell'*Edipo* di Seneca", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Siena* 4: 115-64.
- Seneca, Lucius Anneus (2011), *Oedipus*, ed. with introduction, translation and commentary by Anthony James Boyle, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Walker, Greg (1997), *The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2005), *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Winston, Jessica (2004), “A Mirror for Magistrates and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England”, *Studies in Philology* 101: 381-400.
- (2008), “Seneca in Early Elizabethan England”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 59 (1): 29-59.
- Woodbridge, Linda (2010), *English Revenge Drama: Money, Resistance, Equality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Euripidean Ambiguities in *Titus Andronicus*: the Case of Hecuba

SILVIA BIGLIAZZI

Abstract

It has been remarked that the funeral scene in *Titus Andronicus* 1.1 may be compared to Seneca's *Troades*, a play which, with Erasmus' Latin translation of Euripides' *Hecuba* (1506) and Golding's rendition of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1567), contributed to passing down the story of Hecuba to early modern England. Like *Titus*, Seneca's *Troades* includes human sacrifice (of Astyanax and Polyxena), but compared to that (Latinized) Greek myth, human sacrifice in *Titus*' Rome bears deeper consequences symbolically and dramatically. *Titus*' opening scene reveals a precise intent to connote from the outset the course of the action as a clear response to a crisis of funeral rituals endowed with political connotations within the context of Rome's war with the Goths and the relation between Rome and the barbarians. The Hecuba imagery in 1.1.138-44 legitimizes Tamora's revenge against the Romans, and implicitly likens them to the traitorous and cruel Greeks in the narrative of the destruction of Troy. Tamora-as-Hecuba dismembers and resignifies the Trojan legacy assumed by the play, embodying a story of suffering and fierce revenge which turns that same Trojan myth against Rome within the *translatio imperii* tradition. This article examines the function of Hecuba in *Titus Andronicus*, exploring the many ways in which the Euripidean subtext might have affected the complex shaping of revenge in this possibly co-authored play, following the representation of the crisis of communal rites and Roman *pietas* as figures of contemporary forms of 'wild' and 'excessive' justice.

1. Patterning

We know that *Titus Andronicus* reflects no recorded historical events. As Jonathan Bate put it, the "best way of thinking about the origins of *Titus Andronicus* is not so much in terms of 'sources', as of patterns, that is, of "a series of *precedents* in the dramatic repertoire of the period", such as Kyd and Marlowe, and of models "in Shakespeare's reading of the classics" (Shakespeare 2018: 89). Bate singled out "Aeneas, Hecuba, Virginius, Coriolanus

and Seneca's *Hippolytus*", but gave obvious prominence to "the two exemplary classical stories of rape" (ibid.): that of Philomela, which Shakespeare could find in *Metamorphoses* (book 6), and that of Lucrece, available in both Livius' *Ab urbe condita* (1.57-60) and Ovid's *Fasti* (2.721-812), and which was also to become the subject of his *Rape of Lucrece* (1594).¹ Open reference to Ovid in 4.1.51-8 marks perhaps the "most literary moment" (ibid.) in the play, but Shakespeare's recourse to patterning also suggests other models drawn from ancient drama, rather than poetry or historical writings. Tanya Pollard has recently discussed how the possible impact of Euripides' *Hecuba* upon *Hamlet* within that play's "intertextual web" may point to "Shakespeare's engagement with theatrical performance" precisely in terms of patterning (2012: 1077; see also 2017: 117ff.).² With regard to *Titus Andronicus*, I am increasingly inclined to think that a similar theatrical patterning also invests Shakespeare's allusions to Hecuba as a figure for avenging characters in the play in ways that seem to suggest awareness of that Greek theatrical precedent, alongside the Ovidian source and Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *The Trojan Women*.³ I am also inclined to

1 ". . . Lucrece was praised in *Le Roman de la Rose* and included by Chaucer in his *Legends of Good Women* (fifth tale), which Shakespeare certainly knew. . . . Chaucer referred to 'Ovyd and Titus Lyvius', and these authorities were used by the English poet. It has been proved by Egwig and Baldwin that he probably used an edition of Ovid's *Fasti* with Latin annotations by Paulus Marsus of which there were many reprints from 1508 onwards. . . . The dramatist seems to have had before him a copy of Titus Livy's *History of Rome* (chapters LVII-LX)"; a "fairly close version" of it was also available in William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* (1566): Bullough 1964: 179. On the relation between Philomela and Lucrece in *The Rape of Lucrece* see Newman 1994.

2 More precisely, Pollard has contended that "Euripides's play offered Shakespeare not only the generic conventions he exploits in *Hamlet* — a pre-existing crime, ghost, delay, deceit, and violence — but also a dramatic model for engaging audiences with tragic affect. In particular, it offered him a tradition of emotionally affecting tragedy that was female-centered, rooted in lament, and culminating in triumphant action: a tradition that he translated, in subtle and complex ways, into a new model of tragedy" (2012: 1077).

3 Penelope Meyers Usher has very recently argued that Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* might also be considered among possible influences on the play either via Peele, as the author of a translation of *Iphigenia*, or in

believe that Euripides' play provides a dramatic subtext conceptually and dramaturgically. Pollard has claimed that "the play's references to Hecuba mark the start of Shakespeare's reflections on her ability to inspire grief and rage in audiences" (2017: 100). Also, *Titus* "complicates the *Spanish Tragedy's* heroic model of revenge by challenging audiences' abilities to identify comfortably with any of the play's wronged revengers" (ibid.). Beforehand, Emrys Jones had convincingly contended that Euripides' *Hecuba* shows affinity with the dramatic structure of *Titus*, which consists of "two movements of feeling, the first dominated by passionate suffering, the second by purposeful revenge" (1977: 97). What Jones especially emphasized was the way suffering becomes so intensified and intolerable that the insane grief it causes needs the abrupt "relief of aggressive action" (98) – a pattern that can also be found in *Hecuba*. "The moment of change", he remarked, "during which Hecuba and Titus make the decisive move from passivity to activity, is dramatized in each case by a short interval of silent self-communing and withdrawing" (100) – before both of them turn to savage revenge.

In the following pages I will argue that the Greek Hecuba not only suggests dramatic solutions,⁴ but also enhances the crisis of rituals dramatized in *Titus* from its outset in ways that the Ovidian one does not. I have discussed elsewhere how political and civic rites in this play undergo a process of degeneration conveyed through images of mutilation of the body politic that go

the light of an "open and fluid" conception "of early modern intertextuality" (2018: n.p.) – on which, in the same volume, see Drakakis 2018: n.p. While not providing new evidence and somewhat overstating the topic of sacrifice (which the play explicitly relates only to the killing of Alarbus), Meyers Usher offers some interesting suggestions, especially regarding the two supplication scenes (1.1 and 3.1). Jones 1977 (esp. 114-15) more convincingly identifies textual echoes of *Iphigenia* in *Julius Caesar* (4.2.30-52, 4.3), stating that "[t]here is no other scene like it in classical drama, Greek or Roman" (110). See also Daniell in Shakespeare 1998: 93.

4 In this respect Jones has pointed out that differently from Ovid, Euripides could provide a "structure . . . that could be imitated and adapted to a modern theatre. The structure of Ovid's episode, on the other hand, is one proper to narrative poetry, not drama" (1977: 103).

along with acts of physical mutilation on stage (Bigliazzi 2018). This process is linked to figures of lopping, hewing, devouring and rituals of homophagy as the outcome of the collapse of civic ceremonies, both political and funerary, leading to Rome's regress to tribal forms of *sparagmos*. Shakespeare and his contemporaries were well aware of the symbolic ritualism inscribed in classical stories of dismemberment that could be found in both Ovid and Seneca.⁵ This rituality is used in this play with different purposes, including the dramatization of the mangling of the very idea of Romanity through that of piety, or *pietas*, in which the essence of Romanity itself was claimed to be grounded (*ibid.*). I will argue that this process focused on the collapse of civil bonds and Roman *pietas* into its opposite, symbolically hinted at by the 'pity/pit' binary as a disquieting potential inscribed in the thematic and dramatic texture of the play,⁶ is triggered by savage ceremonies leading up to wild justice. This process is closely linked with the use of the Hecuba story in ways that distance it from its Latin version and more traditional images of female mourning. This is not at odds with Tassi's claim that the enactment of "a new ruthless revenge cycle" is connected with the Philomela "master narrative" Shakespeare found in Ovid (2011a: 100, 102). Tassi has convincingly observed that the image of "handwashing" evoked by Aaron in 2.2. ("Philomel must lose her tongue today" and Tamora's sons will "wash their hands in . . . blood", 43, 45) "suggests Greek rituals of pollution and purification; a virgin is sacrificed, but it is a shameful, dire deed, unhallowed in spirit" (*ibid.*), uncomparable with the sacrifices of Iphigenia or Polyxena; it is a brutal, per-

5 Famous instances of *sparagmos* well-known to the Elizabethans are contained in Ovid's narration of the stories of Acteon (referred to in *Titus* 2.2.63) and Pentheus in book three of *Metamorphoses*, in Seneca's *Phaedra* (quoted in *Titus* 1.1.635 and 4.1.81-2, and alluded to in 5.3.69-71). Cf. Shakespeare 2018: 29; Miola 1992: 14-18; see 30 on Senecan and Renaissance dramas including the killing of children; on cannibalism in early modern culture cf. Noble 2003.

6 It first emerges in the insistent reference to 'pity' and 'pitilessness' in rituals of sacrifice in Act 1, establishing a metonymic chain that links the monument of the Andronici and the 'pit' in the forest; on this see Bigliazzi 2018.

verted 'sacrifice' that will drive Titus to be revenged "worse than Progne" (5.2.195). My contention is that the ethically ambivalent story of Procne's revenge⁷ combines with that of Hecuba in ways that highlight a likewise ambiguous aspect of the Queen of Troy in *Titus* closer to Euripides' version than to Ovid's. In other words, Euripides' Hecuba seems to be the missing link in the construction of a revenge story openly revolving on Ovid's narrative of Philomela and Procne and, less prominently, on Ovid's Hecuba. This is especially interesting if we consider that, as Enterline remarked, "in the schools, Ovid was taught as one of the most 'copious' of authors and his Hecuba (*Metamorphoses* 13) provided an exemplary model for how to use copia to create great emotion" (2004: 25). The possibly Euripidean subtext for Hecuba suggests other, more problematic possibilities inspired by ancient myth, and at the same time opens new perspectives on the shaping of early modern revenge tragedy at a time when "[r]evenge was not yet fully identified with extralegal retaliation, nor was judicial punishment yet fully differentiated from extrajudicial vengeance, but involved a violently lopsided process of trying to get even" (Callaghan and Kyle 2007: 54). My discussion is premised on the consideration that the problematization of justice and revenge in *Titus* is inscribed in a cultural and political context where there was "contiguity between 'wilde justice' and 'justice'", as it "reveals itself plainly enough in actual cases of physical mutilation and in the drama of the period, most especially in revenge tragedy".⁸ As Callaghan and Kyle have further elucidated, it was in the "context of the attempts by the Tudor and Stuart state to gain a mo-

7 Ovid's ambivalent position surfaces in his depiction of Procne's preying on Itys as a ferocious "Tyger" butchering "a little Calf that suckes upon a Hynde" (6.806). Not coincidentally, perhaps, Tamora too will be called a "ravishing tiger" (5.3.194). The moral ambiguity of the story's ending is symbolically underlined by the stain of blood on the feathers of the sparrow and the nightingale as the indelible mark of their crime: "And of their murder from their breasts not yet the token goth, / For even still yet are stained with blood the fethers of them both" (847-8). All references to Golding's translation are to Ovid 1904.

8 Callaghan and Kyle 2007: 40; for a fuller discussion of the relation between revenge drama and the judiciary system see *ibid.*

nopoly over retaliation for injuries and of the ideological struggle to differentiate the state's frequently bloody operations from those of 'wilde justice' that revenge drama becomes one of the most popular genres on the early modern stage" (40). In this respect, Euripides' ambiguous treatment of Hecuba's revenge most likely contributed to the way *Titus* offered a challenging early attempt to question ideas of revenge in drama.

2. Shakespeare's Hecubas

Shakespeare was evidently very interested in Hecuba if references throughout his work score up to fifteen allusions by name and one mention by the title of 'queen of Troy' (Pollard 2012, 2015, 2017). Apart from *Titus* and *Hamlet*, relevant examples include *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594), *Coriolanus* (1608-9) and *Cymbeline* (1610-1611). None of them focuses on Hecuba as a figure of suffering, but as a figure of revenge.⁹ For *Lucrece*, *Volumnia* and *Innogen* Hecuba clearly embodies immediate, aggressive response "to wrongdoers" (Pollard 2012: 1075), showing little affinity with the Senecan model of the bereaved, suffering mother.¹⁰ When *Lucrece* famously beholds the painting of the fall of Troy and finds "despairing Hecuba" (1447), she "shapes her sorrow to the beldame's woes" (1458), complaining that the painter "did her wrong, / To give her so much grief and not a tongue" (1462-3); thus, she lends her her own voice, imaginatively avenging her "with [her] knife" by furiously "scratch[ing] out the angry eyes / Of all the Greeks that are thine enemies" (1469-70).¹¹ In *Coriolanus*, *Volumnia*

9 These references have often been pointed out. See for example Westney 1984; Tassi 2011a and 2011b; Kenward 2011; Pollard 2012, 2015 and 2017.

10 Seneca's *Troades* has been invoked with regard to Hecuba's curse on the Greeks (cf. Westney 1984: 455). In this regard, Westney has noted that perhaps the clearest mention of Hecuba's curse is contained in Sandy's commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, whose publication in 1617, however, excludes it as a source of Shakespeare's. All the same, Westney remarks, "Sandy probably reflected the work of other commentators in recording a detail about Hecuba that might have been current in the sixteenth century" (1984: 455).

11 All quotations from Shakespeare are from Shakespeare 1989, except for those from *Titus Andronicus*, which are from Shakespeare 2018.

denies importance to motherly love and contrasts Hecuba's breast-feeding image, as a figure of maternal affection (*Iliad* 22), with that of Hector's bleeding forehead as the visible sign of heroic honour – here an incitement for her daughter-in-law to be proud of Coriolanus' fighting against Aufidius (“. . . the breasts of Hecuba, / When she did suckle Hector, looked not lovelier / Than Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood / At Grecian sword, contemning. . . .”, *Coriolanus* 1.3.42-3).¹² Finally, in *Cymbeline* Innogen's mistaking Cloten's beheaded corpse lying next to her for that of Posthumous (a trunk vaguely reminiscent of Priam, *Aeneid* 2.558-9) pushes her to raise an invective, not a lament, in which there resounds Hecuba's vindictive rage: “Pisanio, / All curses madded Hecuba gave the Greeks, / And mine to boot, be darted on thee” (4.2.314-15).

In *Titus*, the mention of Hecuba likewise reflects an engagement with revenge, yet in a more substantial way, raising radical questions on the nature of ‘justice’ at the level of both the individual and the family when the community loses its grasp on ‘just rule’. The occasion is that of funeral rites. Once the mourning of the dead in Rome regresses to a tribal ceremony involving the sacrifice of the enemy, civility collapses into barbarity and savagery spreads among the Romans and the Goths alike. Radical binarisms are effaced and ethically ambivalent figures of unruly family revenge mirror each other on either side, while Hecuba becomes the ambiguous model of

12 “. . . Hecuba then fell upon her knees, / Stript nak'd her bosom, show'd her breasts, and bad him rev'ence them, / And pity, if ever she had quieted his exclaim, / He would cease hers, and take the town, not tempting the rude field / When all had left it: ‘Think,’ said she, ‘I gave thee life to yield / My life recomfort; thy rich wife shall have no rites of thee, / Nor do thee rites: our tears shall pay thy corse no obsequy, / Being ravish'd from us, Grecian dogs nourish'd with what I nurs'd’” (*Iliad* 22.68-75). The quotation is from Chapman's *Iliad* (Homer 2000), but it should be noticed that Chapman's complete edition “with Book 22 was not printed until 1610, suggesting that Shakespeare knew his Homer from sources other than Chapman's translation” (Kenward 2011: 163). As Peyré has recently remarked, “Early on in his career, when composing *Titus Andronicus* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, long before Chapman's *Seaven Books* were published, Shakespeare already showed sustained interest in the Troy story, which he probably alluded to from Virgil and Ovid, from Caxton, or from what had become common knowledge” (2017: 37).

their ‘wild justice’. As Jones remarked, “Tamora [in Act 1] is to Titus what Titus is later to be to her. Later – indeed for most of the play – it will be his turn to play Hecuba” (1977: 104-5).

Hecuba is openly evoked twice, in 1.1.139-41 with regard to Tamora, and in 4.1.19-21 with reference to Lavinia. As Pollard noticed, “it is striking that [Hecuba] appears in sections now widely attributed to George Peele [i.e., 1.1 and 4.1], with whom Shakespeare collaborated on the play” (2015: n.p.).¹³ If Peele had a hand in the composition, the hypothesis of a Euripidean patterning would be reinforced, although if Jones’ suggestion that Shakespeare reworked a passage of Euripides’ *Iphigenia* in *Julius Caesar* is correct (see note 3 above), Peele’s intervention would not be necessary to justify allusions to *Hecuba* in *Titus*. In any case, Peele not only translated “one of Euripides’ Iphigenia plays” and was credited as a “privileged ventriloquist for Euripides” (Pollard 2017: 101-2),¹⁴ but he also wrote an epyllion entitled *The Tale of Troy* (printed in 1589) where, somewhat unusually among his contemporaries, he depicted Hecuba as clearly mad with grief for her loss of Priam and Troy:

My pen, forbear to write of Hecuba,
That made the sun his glistening chariot stay,
And raining tears his golden face to hide,
For ruth of that did after her betide;
Sith this thrice-wretched lady lived the last,
Till Fortune’s spite and malice all was past
And worn, with sorrows, wexen fell and mad:
(460-6)¹⁵

¹³ The collaborative view has long been supported, most authoritatively by Vickers (2002: 148-243). Contrary positions include Bate in Shakespeare 1995, where we read that “the play’s structural unity suggests a single authorial hand” and “computer analysis . . . suggests what literary judgements confirms: that the whole of *Titus* is by a single hand” (82, 83; on Bate see Vickers 2002: 208-10). However, in his recent revised edition of the play (Shakespeare 2018: 121ff.), Bate reconsiders the collaborative hypothesis.

¹⁴ “William Gager claimed that, ‘If Euripides lived, he would consider himself indebted to [Peele] – and Hecuba lingered in his imagination as he moved out of the university realm and into London’s commercial literary world” (Pollard 2017: 102).

¹⁵ This is the text of the second edition (1604) as printed in Peele 1888:

For the moment, it should be recalled that these two allusions frame a third indirect reference related to Titus in 3.1.264, concerning his reaction to his discovery of the horrific loss of his two sons. If we compare these three occurrences, we notice that Hecuba is not the “exemplary model” traditionally used to arouse compassion, as taught in schools, nor is she connected with a totally positive moral action. On the contrary, she evokes ambivalent avenging instincts bringing about wild chaos within a city morphed into “a wilderness of tigers” (3.1.54).

The first occurrence appears in Demetrius’ advice to his mother soon after her appeal for mercy to an unmovable Titus: Alarbus will be sacrificed and Demetrius incites Tamora to take revenge on Titus as the Queen of Troy did upon the Thracian king:

DEMETRIUS Oppose not Scythia to ambitious Rome.
 Alarbus goes to rest and we survive
 To tremble under Titus’ threatening look.
 Then, madam, stand resolved, but hope withal
 The self-same gods that armed the queen of Troy
 With opportunity of sharp revenge
 Upon the Thracian tyrant in his tent
 May favour Tamora, the queen of Goths
 (When Goths were Goths and Tamora was queen),
 To quit the bloody wrongs upon her foes.
 (1.1.135-44)

It has been contended, most significantly by Emrys Jones, that this reference with the peculiar mention of Polymestor’s tent, although hardly conclusive, could have been inspired by the Latin translation of Euripides (presumably Erasmus’ widely circulating 1506 one), because Ovid contains no such detail (1977: 104). More sceptical about the Euripidean source, Jonathan Bate has instead suggested that Shakespeare might have been prompted to write about a tent by the memory of “thentent” (“th’entent”) in Golding’s translation of *Metamorphoses*:

The cursed murderer, and desyrde his presence too thentent
 Too shew too him a masse of gold (so made shee her pretence),

263. The 1589 first edition has only a few lexical variants.

Which for her lyttle Polydore was hid not farre from thence.
(13.660-62)

This hypothesis dates back to 1903, when Robert Root wrote that it is “not inconceivable that [the reading “thent ent” as printed in the revised 1575 edition] should be misread ‘the tent,’ a substitution which would make good enough sense” (70). I am not so sure that it would make such good sense; soon afterwards the narrator says that the gold was not hid in ‘a tent’ but in “a secret place” (665; “in secreta venit”, 555) where Polymestor is talked into entering in order to find the promised gold – a detail that would dissuade anyone from misreading ‘the intent’ as ‘the tent’: why should ‘the tent’ be then called “a secret place” four lines later? Besides, “then-tent” is not an infrequent phrase in Golding’s translation (printed as “thinent”, it occurs about a hundred lines before, at 557: “Now too thintent I freely may depart”; spelt as “thentent” it reappears in 14.155: “But to thentent through ignorance thou erre not . . .”). Root also suggested that “[i]t is not impossible that the story of Jael and Sisera might have influenced the author’s memory” (ibid.).¹⁶ But why should one think about a Biblical model of female revenge in a tent when Hecuba is openly mentioned here?

In whatever form it was consulted, whether in Erasmus’ translation or by way of a text based on it, Euripides’ *Hecuba* seems to be the alluded subtext in this point, suggesting both a camp as a location and a tent as a secluded place:¹⁷

HEC. Serues uelim has, quas extuli pecunias.
POLY. Ubi nempe? An intra amictum, an abditas habes?
HEC. Spoliorum aceruo his delitent *tentoriis*.
POLY. Ubi? Nam hic Pelasgum nautica *tabernacula*.
HEC. Sunt propria captis foeminis *tentoria*.
POLY. Tutan satis sunt, intus atque absunt uiri?
HEC. *Intus* Pelasgum nemo, nos solae sumus.
Sed *intro* propera, . . .
(1012-19; emphasis mine)

16 Reference is to Judges 4:21; see also 5: 24-26.

17 The Latin text is that of Erasmus 1506, and the English translation is by Edward Philip Coleridge, in Euripides 1938a. Subsequent quotations are from these editions.

[HEC. I wish to keep safe the treasure I brought from Troy. // POLY. Where can it be? inside your dress, or have you hidden it? // HEC. It is safe among a heap of spoils within these *tents*. // POLY. Where? This is the station built by the Achaeans to surround their fleet (lit. “These are the *tents* of the Achaeans near their fleet”). // HEC. The captive women have *huts* (lit. “*tents*”) of their own. // POLY. It is safe to enter? are there no men about? // HEC. There are no Achaeans *within*; we women are alone. *Enter then the tent* . . . (emphasis mine)]

Can we perhaps perceive a connection between the mentioned tent and Tamora’s following preying upon her victim(s) within a wild forest where “never shines the sun” (2.2.96)? Can we agree with Jones’ suggestion that, if not “a slip on Shakespeare’s part”, this change of “tent from Hecuba’s to Polymestor’s” could have been calculated precisely “in order to invent a new parallel between Hecuba and Tamora” (1977: 104)?¹⁸ Jones further contended that “Just as Hecuba, says Demetrius, revenged herself upon Polymestor in his tent, so Tamora will revenge herself upon the ‘barbarous’ Roman in his home city” (ibid.). Perhaps the two options are not mutually exclusive and their combination may explain the wild image of Tamora after her Roman preys resembling beastly Hecuba hunting after the Thracian prey. In either case, the detail of the tent (as an equivalent either of the forest or of Rome, or of both), could only be suggested by the Euripidean text (or by any other text derived from it).

It may be anticipated here that Polymestor too is a barbarian for the Greeks, like Hecuba, in fact a traditionally much wilder one, as the Thracians were renowned for their ferocity (Mossman 1995: 185-6). Not coincidentally Tereus was the Thracian king who raped and mangled Philomela. Thus, casting Titus as the barbarous Roman from the point of view of the ‘barbarian’ mobilizes perspectivism as a major dramatic component. The audience are called on to share in both the Romans’ and the Goths’ suffering and to feel their avenging impulses before distancing from their

¹⁸ Interestingly, Theobald emended “his” to “her”. This misreading has apparently proved tenacious: Brodersen 2018 wrongly locates Hecuba’s violence on Polymestor in ‘his’ tent.

brutality. There is no third party on stage to offer impartial judgement. In Euripides, there is a third party instead, Agamemnon, and for him both Hecuba and Polymestor are barbarians, although with a difference.¹⁹ I will return to the implications of this parallel at a later stage.

For the moment, let us consider the second indirect allusion to Hecuba, which significantly occurs at the climax of Titus' inflicted pain, when, in 3.1, instead of seeing his two sons freed in exchange for his severed hand, he receives his hand back together with their two heads. Titus is struck dumb, and when Marcus shows surprise at his silence, he bursts into an anticlimactic grotesque laughter that reverses tragedy into gruesome comedy:

MARCUS . . . Why art thou still?
 TITUS Ha, ha, ha!
 MARCUS Why dost thou laugh? It fits not with this hour.
 TITUS Why? I have not another tear to shed.
 Besides, this sorrow is an enemy
 And would usurp upon my watery eyes
 And make them blind with tributary tears.
 (3.1.264-70)

If Shakespeare, as Bate suggests, has in mind Ovid ("The Trojan Ladies shrieked out. But shee [Hecuba] was dumb for sorrow. / The anguish of her hart forclosde as well her speech as eeke / Her teares devowring them within", 13.645-7), it is in order to expand Hecuba's silence and elaborate on the idea of the interruption of lament due to excess of grief. What follows is not mourning but a ritualistic vow to redress wrongdoing (3.1.271-80). Significantly, it is precisely at this point that Titus responds to Tamora's sworn revenge with an identical vow of private justice: "You heavy people, circle me about, / That I may turn me to each one of you / And swear unto my soul to right your wrongs [*They make a vow*] / The

19 Interestingly, this differentiation between various degrees of barbarity, as opposed to the Greeks, is typical of *Hecuba*. In Euripides' *Trojan Women* there is no such contrast, and Andromache goes so far as to call the Greeks barbarous for plotting to kill Astyanax: "O you Hellenes, cunning to devise new forms of cruelty [βάρβαρα κακά, lit. 'of barbaric evils'], / why slay this child who never wronged any?" (764-5, trans. Coleridge in Euripides 1938b).

vow is made . . .” (3.1.277-79). There follows their grotesque procession as they leave the stage, Titus and Marcus bearing the head of the two sons, Lavinia holding Titus’ own hand in her mouth, while Lucius is sent away from “proud Rome” (3.1.291) to join the Goths and raise an army “to be revenged on Rome” (301). Thus, the figure of Hecuba punctuates the two moments when both Tamora and Titus progress from mourning to savage private justice.

The last, explicit reference to Hecuba occurs in 4.1, when the boy shows fear of an apparently maddened Lavinia following him everywhere (4.1.2), and compares her to maddened Hecuba:

My lord, I know not, I, nor can I guess,
 Unless some fit or frenzy do possess her.
 For I have heard my grandsire say full oft
 Extremity of griefs would make men mad,
 And I have read that Hecuba of Troy
 Ran mad for sorrow. That made me to fear,
 Although, my lord, I know my noble aunt
 Loves me as dear as e’er my mother did,
 And would not but in fury fright my youth,
 Which made me down to throw my books and fly,
 Causeless perhaps. . . .
 (4.1.16-26)

It has been observed that in neither Euripides nor Ovid Hecuba is depicted as “maddened”, as in both her revenge is lucidly contrived and executed (see e.g. Westney 1984: 444). We have already noted that Peele in his epyllion on Troy described Hecuba as “wexen mad” (albeit for Priam’s death), which might further suggest his hand (or his influence) in this point. However, it remains unclear from where this idea was derived, although apparently Hecuba was often “referred to [as mad] in English literature before Shakespeare” (Westney 1984: 445). And yet, Westney (*ibid.*) recalls that the only other reference to her madness before *Titus* was Marlowe’s line on “the frantic Queen” in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (2.1.244; perf. 1587-1593; pr. 1594), and, before then, Cooper’s mention of the Queen in *Thesaurus* (1565), where she was said to have “finally waxed madde, and did byte and stryke all men that mette, wherefore she was called dogge, and at the laste was hyr selfe kyllled with stones by

the Greekes” (J4r). In his turn, Bate suggested a comparison with *Ironside* [4.2] 1477-80, where Hecuba is said to have run “mad for sorrow” because unable to lament for excess of grief (“To dam my eyes were but to drown my heart / like *Hecuba*, the woeful Queen of Troy, / who having no avoidance for her grief, / ran mad for sorrow ’cause she could not weep”).²⁰

If we look at Golding’s translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 13 we only find an angry and furious Hecuba, not a mad one (“And therewithall shee armd her selfe and furnisht her with ire: / Wherethrough as soone as that her hart was fully set on fyre, . . . / Now having meynt her teares with wrath) / . . . And beeing sore inflaamd with wrath, caught hold uppon him”, 652-70). Her gouging Polymestor’s eyes is a brutal act of violence carefully planned and lucidly carried out before she is transformed into a dog:

. . . [Hecuba] digitos in perfida lumina condit
 expellitque genis oculos (facit ira valentem)
 immergitque manus, foedataque sanguine sonti
 non lumen (neque enim superest), loca luminis haurit.
 (Ovid 2000: 13.561-4)

[Hecuba] Did in the traytors face bestowe her nayles, and scratched out
 His eyes, her anger gave her hart and made her strong and stout.
 Shee thrust her fingars in as farre as could bee, and did bore
 Not now his eyes (for why his eyes were pulled out before)
 But bothe the places of the eyes berayd with wicked blood.
 (Ovid 1904: 13.673-7)

In Seneca’s *Agamemnon* Cassandra alludes to her metamorphosis into “a bedlam bitch”, an expression which, compared to the original “circa ruinas rabida latrauit suas” (708; “around the ruined walls madly she raked”, Seneca 1968), incorporates a hint at her mental insanity. However, the original refers her madness to a previous time, when she ran desperate around her palace in Troy

²⁰ For other textual similarities between *Ironside* and *Titus Andronicus*, see Sams 1985: *passim*, esp. 27-40. Also notice the resonance of l. 470 (“ran mad for sorrow ’cause she could not weep”) with the above-quoted lines of Ovid 13.645-7 (referred to *Titus* 3.1.264-70) on the breaking of lament caused by grief.

– a detail that Peele retained in his epyllion, and instead Studley erroneously related to Polydorus' death:

tot illa regum mater et regimen Phrygum
 fecunda in ignes Hecuba fatorum nouas
 experta leges induit uultus feros:
 circa ruinas rabida latrauit suas,
 Troiae superstes, Hectori, Priamo, sibi.
 (Seneca 1968: 705-9)

That *Hecuba* the mother of so many a princely wyght,
 Whose fruitfull Wombe did breede the brand, of fyer blasing bryght:
 Who also bare the swinge in *Troy*, by practise now doth learne,
 New lawes and guise of desteny in bondage to discerne.
 On her shee takath heart of grace with lookes so sterne and wylde,
 And barketh as a bedlem bitch about her strangled chylde
 Deare *Polidor*, the remnaunt left, and onely hope of *Troy*,
Hector, and *Priam* to reuenge, and to restore her ioy.
 (Seneca 1581: 153^v)

If we turn to Euripides, her lament for Polydorus is qualified as Dionysian (νόμον / βακχεῖον, 685-6; “cantonem maenadum”, 18^a), which, as Mossman claims, “could at least suggest dangerous loss of rational control, meaning ‘frenzied’ or ‘inspired’, as it does when Hecuba uses it of Cassandra at 676” (1995: 167-8).²¹ And yet, Mossman also justly remarks that “[v]ehemence is a characteristic of laments” (168).

Whatever may have suggested mad sorrow here (if not

²¹ References to the lines of the Greek text are to Battezzato 2018, who has recently noticed that the Dionysian lament is a prelude to the avenging plan. It is formally a lament, but it is narrative in content, as Hecuba relates how Polydorus was entrusted to Polymestor: “sung and recited sections create an alternation between the delivery of information and highly emotional reactions. This scene is unusual in that visual contact with the body of Polydorus becomes a substitute for a verbal announcement of his death. Hecuba addresses her dead son in a lament, asking *him* questions about his death; the servant fills in the details, answering the questions directed to Polydorus. Hecuba’s dialogue with her son’s body mixes formulas of lament (685n.) and questions which it would be normal to ask of a messenger” (2018: 164, comment on 684-721).

precise lexical occurrences, perhaps the fury of her own bestial revenge), Lavinia, like Tamora, “imitates Hecuba in converting grief to anger and revenge, escalating the passionate action that animates the play” (Pollard 2015: n.p.). What the boy perceives is the potential for her avenging fury which scares him into thinking that she might destroy him, as Hecuba had done with Polymestor’s sons. If this is implied in his fear, Ovid was not the direct source, as no mention of the killing of children is made in *Metamorphoses*; yet Euripides’ *Hecuba* could have been.

3. What Justice?

But why could Euripides’ fingerprint be relevant for a better understanding of the play? The answer is that, compared to Ovid’s treatment of Hecuba, Euripides is much more ambiguous, and ambiguity is a fundamental feature of *Titus*’ treatment of justice in Rome. There is no doubt that Polymestor is a “cursed murderer” in Ovid and that Hecuba’s fate and final metamorphosis into a dog turns her into the real victim. Ovid is unequivocal in stating that the Trojans, the Greeks and the gods are all moved to compassion for her terrible fate:

illius Troasque suos hostesque Pelasgos,
illius fortuna deos quoque moverat omnes,
sic omnes, ut et ipsa Iovis coniunxque sororque
eventus Hecubam meruisse negaverit illos.

(Ovid 2000: 572-5)

. . . Her fortune moved not
Her Trojans only, but the Greekes her foes to ruthe: her lot
Did move even all the Goddes to ruthe: and so effectually,
That *Hecub* too deserve such end even Juno did denye.

(Ovid 1904: 685-8)

In this respect Euripides is more problematic. As Christian Billing has convincingly argued, in line with gender-political criticism on Greek female weeping for the dead (Foley 1993; Loraux 1998; Alexiou 2002), *Hecuba* exemplifies how “the formal conventions of Greek tragedy augment the power of female lament because such rhetorical expression acts, in many ways, as a sub-

stitute for violent action” (Billing 2007: 50). It is a surrogate of vengeance channelling female violence into a rite approved by the community, if not excessively disorderly.²² The transition from complaint to supplication coincides with Hecuba’s gesture of turning towards Agamemnon, who has repeatedly invited her to, and to explain what has happened and whose body it is she is weeping for. Turning her face towards him, she ceases chanting as a maenad (νόμον / βακχῆϊον) and suddenly transforms into a shrewd orator capable of handling a whole gamut of rhetorical tools and even connecting them, at some point, with a rhetoric of the body, as if her limbs were endowed with voice, and her own voice were multiplied in them (835-40; see Avezzù forthcoming). The shift from self-referential lament to the transitive *actio* of oration aiming at *peithô*, or emotional persuasion, is abrupt and accurately studied, as if a new Hecuba turning her face towards her ‘master’ prepared herself to master him. That is why she is very attentive to Agamemnon’s feedback, as a crafty orator in an assembly or court of justice. It is no surprise that her performance proves successful, at least in so far as Agamemnon, very cautiously, lets her proceed with her vengeance without interfering:

AGA. Ita fiet: at si nauigare copiis
 Licuisset hoc tibi haud queam largirier:
 Sed quia ferentes nunc negat ventos deus:
 Manendum: et opperiendum erit nobis quoad
 Detur secundus cursus atque commodus.
 Bene vertat autem: quippe pariter omnium
 Et publicitus et singulorum proprie
 Refert malis male evuenire: bonis bene.
 (23^{r-v})

[AGAMEMNON So shall it be; yet had the host been able to sail, I could not have granted thee this boon; but, as it is, since the god sends forth no favouring breeze, we needs must abide, seeing, as

22 On sixth-century BC limitations of “everything disorderly and excessive in women’s festivals, processions (*exodoi*) and funeral rites” (Plutarch, *Solon* 21.5)³, see Foley 1993: 103; on parallels with practices of lamentation in early modern England see Goodland 2003 and 2005; see also Bigliuzzi forthcoming.

we do, that sailing cannot be. Good luck to thee! for this is the interest alike of citizen and state, that the wrong-doer be punished and the good man prosper. (898-904)]

Nonetheless, the question itself of vengeance is not uncontroversial. As Mossman has argued, here it could be justifiable on the basis of “Athenian law concerning the murder of slaves”, as “it was the duty of the relatives of a murdered slave to urge his master to obtain vengeance by taking legal action” (1995: 183). But the ‘master’ refuses, letting her “resort to self-help (861ff.)”, a fact which in Athens would have produced unpredictable reactions on the part of the citizens (*ibid.*). On the other hand, Hecuba has no fellow citizens as the “community has vanished”, and therefore she is not “bound to refrain from vengeance” for their sake (184). Thus, her action is both legitimate for the evident wrong received, and ‘legitimized’ by Agamemnon, albeit “self-help” “has the effect of stressing the terrible state of flux in the aftermath of the destruction of Troy”, when there is no longer a polis and therefore no stable rule (*ibid.*).

And yet, although sanctioned by the chief of the Greeks, Hecuba’s action is not exempt from moral ambiguity. Her hint at the Lemnian women at 886-7 – infamous for killing all men on the island of Lemnos as a consequence of their husbands’ taking Thracian concubines – in response to Agamemnon’s scepticism about female capacity to take revenge on their own, lets ideas of ferocity sneak into the scene as a prefiguration of her own savageness in blinding Polymestor (child-killing was not unusual in vengeance). The audience expect to hear about his murder, instead they hear him being tortured first, and then see him horrendously mutilated. What Euripides deploys is Hecuba’s animal wildness suddenly subverting the moral meaning of her ‘legitimized’ revenge.²³ In this respect, the use of the offstage is dramatically very

23 It has often been contended that the play presents two ‘tragedies’, one revolving around the death of Polyxena, sacrificed according to Greek customs, and the other around that of Polydorus, barbarously murdered for greed. In Nussbaum’s view, however, the two parts appear closely linked once we “focus on the question of good character and its stability”, as this allows us to “see that the first episode sets forth a view on this issue [related to the respect and/or violation of *nomos*] which the second episode will give us reason to ques-

effective: the audience hear Polymestor's cry, then Hecuba's gloat on what she has done while introducing his entrance onstage as a presenter and director of a piece of theatre of cruelty:

HE. Mox hunc videbis prodeuntem ex aedibus
 Caecum atque caecis lubricantem passibus.
 Pariter duorum liberum cadauera:
 Quos ipsa cum fortissimis Iliadibus
 Ferro peremi. Iamque persoluit mihi
 Poenas. sed (ut vides) foras mouet pedem.
 Verum hinc prosul concessero: ac vitauero
 Ira aestuantem Thraca: et indomitum virum.
 (27^r)

[HECUBA A moment, and you shall see him before the tent, blind, advancing with blind random step; and the bodies of his two children whom I with my brave women of Troy killed; he has paid me the penalty; here he comes from the tent, as you see. I will withdraw out of his path and stand aside from the hot fury of the Thracian, my deadly foe. (1049-55)]

Polymestor's appearance is not a silent spectacle of horror; he moves and speaks, describing himself on all fours while he crawls in the attempt to "gorge on [the women's] flesh and bones" (1071), and make for himself "a wild beasts' meal, inflicting mutilation" (1072), in fear that they may mangle his children as a "feast of blood for dogs" (1077-8). He is reduced to a horrifyingly mauled body, "a signifier of the female attack that has left him blind and heirless" (Billing 2007: 54), replacing the pitiful, mangled carcass of Polydorus, brought off stage at 904. In a crescendo of atrocity pivoting on aural effects coming from the offstage,

tion. At the same time it reveals to us, in the person of Polyxena, features of nobility on account of which it cannot possibly be as stable as Hecuba thinks, features whose violent removal will be the source of Hecuba's degeneration in the play's second half" (2001: 406). For Nussbaum's discussion of Hecuba's savage reaction to Polymestor's violation of the *nomoi* of hospitality and friendship, see chap. 13, "The Betrayal of Convention: a Reading of Euripides' *Hecuba*". A critique of Nussbaum's interpretation of *nomos* as a human construct can be found in Mossman 1995: 182. A recent summary of Nussbaum's position within a broader reception of the play is in Brodersen 2018.

before being shown onstage, Hecuba appears to belong to a ferocious female community responding to the rapacity of yet another barbarian like her with wild justice, in a dispute arbitrated by a Greek. Agamemnon makes their 'otherness' explicit during the trial, when he urges Polymestor to "banish that savage spirit from your heart and plead your cause" (1129-30; βάρβαρον; "barbarism"), and only ratifies an action carried out by another barbarian, in which he has refused to become involved and on which, so to speak, he has turned a blind eye. And yet his verdict is not immune to critique. Dionysus' own prophecy of retribution voiced by Polymestor invests both Agamemnon, whose violent end is predicted,²⁴ and Hecuba. However we interpret the dog imagery related to the women in the tent (1070-80) and to Hecuba's final announced metamorphosis, ambiguously hinting at bestiality, domesticity, but also at immortality, that final curse is not silenced. As Mossman remarked, "initial support of Hecuba is qualified by the blinding, restored by the subsequent *agōn*, and finally thrown into confusion by the last scene" (1995: 203).

4. Wild Justice

Let us now turn to *Titus* and its connections with Euripides' play. We noticed that in *Hecuba* there are two main dramatic changes, from lament to supplication and from 'legitimate' justice to ferocious, albeit legitimized, justice. In *Titus* this latter shift occurs very early in the play. As often remarked, 1.1 stages the political rite of power on three different levels: up above, with the "*Tribunes and Senators aloft*"; down below (or possibly in the discovery space), with the funeral rite of interment; and on the main stage, with the two brothers' entrance from opposite sides and their rivalry over Lavinia. The sacrifice of the barbarian Alarbus, the eldest and noblest son of Tamora, takes place offstage, while Titus' sacrifice of his youngest son Mutius occurs onstage. In this complex stage business symbolically exploiting the resources of

²⁴ This brings full circle the irony implied in the previous mention of the Lemnian women.

the multiple stage, the funeral ceremony has a central function. It regards Titus' loss of his sons 'sacrificed' offstage for the cause of Rome against the "barbarous Goths" (1.1.28) and now about to undergo the rite of interment in the monument of the Andronici. Before Titus speaks like a new Priam, whom he resembles as the father of twenty-five valiant sons, half the number of the Trojan king's (1.1.82-84), Q1 contains a dubious passage on Roman sacrificial rites, indicated by Bate within braces:

MARCUS . . . {and at this day
To the monument of the Andronici
Done sacrifice of expiation,
And slain the noblest prisoner of the Goths}.
(1.1.35-8)

These lines are in glaring contradiction with the follow-up of the action, since Alarbus has not yet been slain. Perhaps for this reason they are not in Q2. Bate does not omit them in his edition, arguing that "'At this day' could mean 'on the day corresponding to this': i.e., on each of Titus' five returns to Rome, his first action was to slay a prisoner". This would suggest "an anticipation of the slaying of Alarbus, not an inconsistency with it" (Shakespeare 2018: 98).²⁵ If this were correct, Q1 would hint at human sacrifice as a custom, contrary to Rome's priding itself in not allowing it (135n127). On the other hand, Bate also notes that the slaying of Alarbus might have been an afterthought and, once added, Shakespeare could have forgotten to omit Marcus' earlier lines.²⁶ If that was the case, this addition should have occurred "during the composition of the first scene", because later in the same scene "Tamora refers back to it ('And make them know what 'tis to let a queen / Kneel in the street and beg for grace in vain', 1.1.459-60)" (Shakespeare 2018: 102-3). Whichever the case, staging human sac-

25 Bate further claims that "This interpretation could be strengthened by emending 'at this day' to 'as this day', or (Jackson conj.) 'at this door' (here at the entrance to the tomb of the Andronici)" (Shakespeare 2018: 98).

26 "That the staging of the sacrifice is an afterthought would certainly account for the omission of Alarbus from the entry. It might suggest that Shakespeare forgot to go back and cross out 35-8" (Shakespeare 2018: 102).

rifice, except for Seneca's *Troades*, was not common, and also in Seneca the context was very different, as Polyxena's was a propitiating sacrifice not unusual in Greek culture, while Astyanax' killing was linked to fear of revenge.²⁷ Neither of the two motives is adduced by Titus' eldest son, Lucius, for the sacrifice of Alarbus. His argument is that "the shadows [of his brothers should] be not unappeased / Nor we disturbed with prodigies on earth" (1.1.103-4). Therefore, the limbs of the eldest of the Goths must be hewn, "*Ad manes fratrum* [to] sacrifice his flesh" (1.1.101),²⁸ interpreting, before Titus does, the law of retaliation which "religiously" (1.1.127) requires 'brothers for brothers' in a peculiarly brutal way. Lucius does not simply ask for Alarbus' life, but for his dismemberment and vilification. The irony of this word "religiously" is grasped by Tamora who in an aside reverts its meaning into "irreligious piety" (1.1.133), marking the moment when perspectives are suddenly turned around and civility is recognized by the barbarian as being barbarous. This is the very moment when the crisis of funeral rituals and of Roman *pietas* manifests itself: showing excessive, obdurate respect of the *manes* of the Andronici by following a savage retributive logic denounces the cruelty of 'excessive justice' and its turning into wild justice.²⁹

27 For a parallel between this initial scene and *Troades*, cf. Miola 1992: 18ff.; Bullough 1957: 26.

28 It has been noted that "The idea of committing murder to appease the shades of the dead, and particularly the use of the phrase *Ad manes fratrum*, recall the Senecan Medea's vision of her dead and dismembered brother Absyrtus, a vision which drives her on to kill her sons: *mihi me relinque et utere hac, frater, manu / quae strinxit ensem. victima manes tuos / placamus ista.* (969-971)": Heavey 2014: n.p.; the parallel between Medea and Tamora, however, remains in many respects unconvincing. The textual allusion rather suggests that possible memories of Seneca could easily be re-adapted as the context required.

29 Callaghan and Kyle connect this first episode with religious questions of retaliation and punishment and of conflation of justice and wilde justice in the spread of different forms and judicial violence in early modern England. In particular, they note that "this killing, the first reprisal at the very beginning of the play, is an act of specifically religious violence whose altar has been the tomb of the Andronici" and "suggests that the play's meditation on justice and reprisal is deeply entrenched in the internecine struggle of

What follows is on record: Demetrius incites Tamora to become a new Hecuba and Lucius re-enters triumphantly announcing the accomplishment of the horrendous rite of dismemberment and the burning of Alarbus' entrails on a sacrificial pyre. On stage, Titus performs the rite of interment and appeasement of his dead sons. The 'other' has been lopped and hewn and burnt for the bodies of young Romans to rest in peace; yet that lopping has othered the Romans from Rome and triggered a process of unruly justice:

Revenge is a kind of wild justice, which the more man's nature runs to, the more ought law to weed it out. For as for the first wrong, it doeth but offend the law; but the revenge of that wrong putteth the law out of office. Certainly, in taking revenge, a man is but even with his enemy; but in passing it over, he is superior; for it is a prince's part to pardon. . . . Public revengers are for the most part fortunate. . . . But in private revengers are not so. Nay rather, vindicative persons live the life of witches, who, as they are mischievous, so end they infortunate. (Francis Bacon, "On revenge", in Bacon 1999: 10-11)

The sacrifice of Alarbus which no-one opposes, and resembles very much a family business, is in fact an act of wild justice as condemned by Francis Bacon. It sparks off a chain reaction in the name of Hecuba, whose ghost is significantly present at the main turning points of drama: Tamora's beginning her revenge (1.1), Titus' vow for private revenge (3.1), the *anagnorisis* of Demetrius and Chiron's responsibility in the rape and mutilation of Lavinia, and Titus' "mortal revenge upon these traitorous Goths" (4.1.93). What we assist to is a progressive coalescing of Titus and Tamora into new versions of Hecubas who out-Hecuba Hecuba: from being assimilated to Priam in the opening scene, in 3.1 Titus himself re-enacts Hecuba's speechless reaction to the horror of the sight of his slain sons and resolves himself to retaliation in ways that he reiterates in 4.1, before performing his revenge as a piece of theatre of cruelty competing with Tamora's

Christianity in post-Reformation England. . . . This is not, however, to align the play with either Protestant or Catholic ideology, but to say that mutilation and dismemberment had both judicial and religious dimensions" (2007: 47, 49).

own, and, before her, with Hecuba's. In this respect Tamora and Titus get very close to each other, both crossing moral boundaries savagely, in ways that impede the final re-establishment of a neat divide between barbarity and civility. Lucius, the restorer of peace, called up "to knit again / . . . these broken limbs into one body" (5.3.69, 71), is the one who has first lopped and hewn the limbs of the young captive and dismembered ideas of Roman piety, triggering wild justice. He is the one who to the end confirms that the only justice he knows is wild. The two barbarians, after incorporation, will be expelled, tortured and let to be preyed upon by wild animals. Aaron will be "set breast-deep in earth and famish[ed]" (5.3.178); the "ravenous tiger" (5.3.194), Tamora, will be denied any "funeral rite, nor man in mourning weed, / No mournful bell shall ring her burial", but she will be "throw[n] . . . forth to beasts and devoid of prey: / Her life was beastly and devoid of pity, / And being dead, let birds on her take pity" (5.3.195-9). Being thrown out, Bate pinpoints, was "the fate of executed felons in Elizabeth England" (Shakespeare 2018: 318n197). Yet, to what extent is Tamora a felon compared to the barbarised Lucius himself, the initiator of an escalation of physical and symbolical dismemberment of Romanity? He is the one who will end the play on an ironically macabre couplet ("devoid of pity" / "let birds on her take pity", 5.3.198-9), and in Q2 will speak four more lines on justice done ("See justice done on *Aron* the damn'd Moore, / By whom our heuie haps had their beginning / Than afterwards to order well the state, / That like euent that nere it ruinate", 5.3.200-3). Interestingly, in those extra lines Lucius shifts the attention to a point of origin of chaos other than himself and extraneous to Rome and its barbarous sacrifices, but identical with the barbarian's own evil-doing as the primary cause of the dismemberment of the state and its values.

Ovid's story of revengeful Hecuba does not raise such questions, but Euripides' does. And ideas of wild justice as a crucial issue of this early play might have been inspired by the Latinized version of that Greek precedent in terms both of a dramaturgy of cruelty and of the dissolving of binarisms and construction of moral ambiguities. Perhaps not surprisingly the narrative and the ballad with the same subject of *Titus* we have do not contain the episode of the sacrifice of Alarbus setting off the wild reaction of

the queen of Goths and its Roman chain-reaction.³⁰ There may be a number of reasons for their not having it, but surely Shakespeare (or Shakespeare and Peele) gave it prominence making it the turning point of the play with a ‘Hecuba-effect’ worthy of Euripides’ ambiguities, in fact out-Euripiding Euripides.

Works Cited

- Alexiou, Margaret (2002), *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Avezzi, Guido (forthcoming), “Hecuba’s Rhetoric”, in Andreas Markantonatos and Eleni Volonaki (eds), *Poet and Orator: A Symbiotic Relationship in Democratic Athens*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bacon, Francis (1999), *Essays*, ed. by Brian Vickers, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bigliuzzi, Silvia (2018), “Romanity and *Sparagmos* in *Titus Andronicus*”, in Maria Del Sapio Garbero (ed.), *Rome in Shakespeare’s World*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura: 87-106.
- (forthcoming), “From Medieval to Early Modern Choric Threnody in Biblical Plays”, in Eva Von Contzen and Chanita Goodblatt (eds), *Enacting the Bible in Medieval and Early Modern Drama*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Billing, Christian (2007), “Lament and Revenge in the *Hekabe* of Euripides”, *New Theatre Quarterly* 23 (1): 49-57.
- Brodersen, Rupert (2018), *Emotional Motives in International Relations: Rage, Rancour and Revenge*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bullough, Geoffrey (1957), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 6, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia University Press.
- (1964), *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (1957), vol. 1, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia University Press.
- Callaghan, Dymphna and Chris R. Kyle, “The Wilde Side of Justice in Early Modern England and *Titus Andronicus*”, in Constance Jordan and Karen Cunningham (eds), *The Law in Shakespeare*, Houndmills,

³⁰ The orthodox genetic view is that the narrative came first, followed by the play and the ballad, but a few critics, including Bate (Shakespeare 2018: 82ff.), have suggested that the ballad and the narrative followed the play. On the play’s sources see also Bullough 1957.

- Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 38-57.
- Cooper, Thomas (1565), *Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae opera et industria Thomae Cooperi Magdalenensis. . . . Accessit Dictionarium historicum et poeticum . . .*, London: Hericum Wykes.
- Drakakis, John (2018), "Afterword", in Dennis Austin Britton and Melissa Walter (eds), *Rethinking Shakespeare Source Study. Audiences, Authors, and Digital Technologies*, New York and London: Routledge, n.p. (ebook).
- Enterline, Lynn (2004), *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (2000), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Euripides (1506), *Hecuba*, in *Euripidis tragici poetae nobilissimi Hecuba et Iphigenia, Latinae factae Erasmo Roterodamo interprete*, Paris: Ascensius.
- (1938a), *Hecuba*, translated by E.P. Coleridge, in Whitney J. Oates and Eugene O'Neill, Jr. (eds), *The Complete Greek Drama*, vol. 1, New York: Random House.
- (1938b), *Trojan Women*, translated by E.P. Coleridge, in Whitney J. Oates and Eugene O'Neill, Jr. (eds), *The Complete Greek Drama*, vol. 1, New York: Random House.
- (2018), *Hecuba*, ed. by Luigi Battezzato, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, Helen P (1993), "The Politics of Tragic Lamentation", in Alan H. Sommerstein, Stephen Halliwell, Jeffrey Henderson and Bernhard Zimmermann (eds), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*, Bari: Levante Ed., 101-43.
- Goodland, Katharine (2003), "Obsequious Laments": Mourning and Communal Memory in Shakespeare's *Richard III*", in Denny Taylor and Denis N. Beauregard (eds), *Shakespeare and the Culture of Christianity in Early Modern England*, New York: Fordham University, 44-79.
- (2005), *Female Mourning and Tragedy in Medieval and Renaissance English Drama: From the Raising of Lazarus to King Lear*, Aldershot & Burlington: Ashgate.
- Heavey, Katherine (2014), "Medea", in Yves Peyré (ed.), *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology* (2009-), <http://www.shakmyth.org/myth/149/medea/analysis> (Accessed 16 July 2018).
- Homer (2000), *The Iliad*, in *Chapman's Homer, The Iliad, The Odyssey, Translated by Chapman*, with an Introduction by Jam Parker, Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth editions.
- Jones, Emrys (1977), *The Origins of Shakespeare*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kenward, Claire (2011), 'Memory Wrapped Round a Corpse'. *A Cultural*

- History of English Hecubas*, PhD thesis.
- Loroux, Nicole (1998), *Mothers in Mourning*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Meyers Usher, Penelope (2018), "Greek Sacrifice in Shakespeare's Rome: *Titus Andronicus* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*", in Dennis Austin Britton and Melissa Walter (eds), *Rethinking Shakespeare Source Study. Audiences, Authors, and Digital Technologies*, New York and London: Routledge, n.p. (ebook).
- Miola, Robert S. (1992), *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mossman, Judith (1995), *Wild Justice. A Study of Euripides' Hecuba*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Newman, Jane (1994), "'And Let Mild Women to Him Lose Their Mildness': Philomela, Female Violence and Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (3): 304–26.
- Noble, Louise (2003), "'And Make to Pasties of Your Shameful Heads': Medicinal Cannibalism and Healing the Body Politic in *Titus Andronicus*", *ELH* 70 (3): 677–708.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (2001 rev. ed.), *The Fragility of Goodness. Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy* (1986), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ovid (1904), *Metamorphoses*, trans. by Arthur Golding, ed. by W.H.D. Rouse, Litt.D., London: de la More Press.
- (2000), *Ovid. Metamorphoses. Book XIII*, ed. by Neil Hopkinson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peele, George (1888), *The Tale of Troy*, in A.H. Bullen (ed.), *The Works of George Peele*, vol. 2, London: C. Nimmo.
- Peyré, Yves (2017), "Homeric Voices in *Antony and Cleopatra*", *Classical Receptions Journal* 9 (1): 36–54.
- Pollard, Tanya (2012), "What's Hecuba to Shakespeare?", *Renaissance Quarterly* 65 (4): 1060–93.
- (2015), "Hecuba", in Yves Peyré (ed.), *A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology* (2009–), <http://www.shakmyth.org/myth/107/hecuba> (Accessed 18 June 2018).
- (2017), *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sams, Eric (ed.) (1985), *Shakespeare's Lost Play. Edmund Ironside*, London: Fourth Estate.
- Seneca (1581), *Agamemnon*, trans. by John Studley, in Thomas Newton (ed.), *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies*, London: Thomas Marsh.
- (1968), *Agamemnon*, in Frank Justus Miller (ed. and trans.), *Seneca in*

- Nine Volumes*, vol. 9, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann.
- Shakespeare, William (1989), *The Complete Works* (1988), general editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1995), *Titus Andronicus*, Arden Shakespeare Third Series, ed. by Jonathan Bate, London and New York: Routledge.
- (2017), *Julius Caesar* (1998), Arden Shakespeare Third Series, ed. by David Daniell, London and New York: Routledge.
- (2018 rev. ed.), *Titus Andronicus*, Arden Shakespeare Third Series, ed. by Jonathan Bate, London, Oxford, New York, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Tassi, Marguerite A. (2011a), *Women and Revenge in Shakespeare. Gender, Genres, and Ethics*, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press.
- (2011b), “Wounded Maternity, Sharp Revenge: Shakespeare’s Representation of Queens in Light of the Hecuba Myth”, *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 37 (1): 83-99.
- Vickers, Brian (2002), *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Westney, Lizette I. (1984), “Hecuba in Sixteenth-Century English Literature”, *CLA Journal* 27 (4): 436-59.

On the Sources of Petros Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* (1720): Between Lodovico Dolce, Molière, and the *Commedia dell'Arte**

VAYOS LIAPIS

Abstract

This paper is concerned with what appears to be the earliest surviving modern Greek drama on a classical theme, namely *Iphigenia* by Petros Katsaitis of Cephallenia (1660?-1742?). Though nominally a tragedy, Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* is, in fact, best described as a tragicomedy, as it not only has a happy ending, but its latter part is unabashedly comic, even burlesque. For the 'tragic' portion of his plot (Acts 1-4 and part of Act 5), Katsaitis depends largely on Lodovico Dolce's *Ifigenia* (1560). Halfway through Act 5, however, Katsaitis' play takes a surprising turn to the comic by offering an unexpected happy ending: far from being sacrificed, Iphigenia is spared, and actually goes on to marry Achilles. Subsequently, the drama is invaded by stock *Commedia dell'Arte* characters, as well as by Italianised versions of some of Molière's characters. This is evidently a reflection of Katsaitis' familiarity with performances, on Cephallenia, by travelling Italian troupes, which will have put on *Commedia* shows and Italian versions of Molière's plays. Katsaitis' play is thus a document of literary influences and of theatre life in the Ionian islands at the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century.

In the summer of 1720, the Ionian island of Cephallenia, or Kefalloniá, became the site of an unprecedented theatrical encounter. The spectre of Euripides, channelled through the medium of the Italian

* I hope that this paper, which concerns an early modern Greek play shaped by multiple Italian influences, will be deemed an appropriate offering by an Italophile Hellene to the distinguished Italian Hellenist who is the honoree of this volume. I am grateful to Silvia Bigliuzzi for inviting me to contribute to this volume and for her suggestions, which improved both my argument and my translation of extracts from Dolce. I also wish to extend my heartfelt thanks to Gonda Van Steen and to Antonis K. Petrides for their perceptive reading of an earlier draft and for many salutary suggestions. All errors of fact or judgement are mine.

Renaissance playwright Lodovico Dolce, met the shadow of Molière, as well as a company of assorted Commedia dell'Arte characters. This rather remarkable feat was brought about by the Cephallenian poet and playwright Petros Katsaitis.

The very existence of Petros Katsaitis (1660?-1742?) was virtually unknown until as late as 1950, when the Greek scholar Emmanuel Kriaras published a critical edition, with introduction and notes, of that author's three extant works: to wit, the narrative poem *Lament for the Peloponnese* and the poetic tragedies *Thyestes* and *Iphigenia*.¹ These works are transmitted in a single manuscript source (MS. 28 of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Library), which had received a brief mention by Fotos Politis already in 1920,² and was described in 1939 by Antonios Sighalas (1890-1981), then Professor Extraordinarius of Papyrology and Palaeography at the University of Thessaloniki.³ Sighalas, however, mentioned Katsaitis only as the author of the *Lament for the Peloponnese*, and it is to Kriaras that we owe the discovery and scholarly study of Katsaitis' two tragedies.⁴

1. A Sketch of Petros Katsaitis' Life

A general outline of Katsaitis' biography may be reconstructed

1 See Kriaras 1950. For a survey of Katsaitis' work, with special emphasis on the *Lament for the Peloponnese*, see Carpinato 2005: 187-98; Liosatou 2015: 70-84.

2 Politis 1920 (non vidi), for which see Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 114, 131n1; Chassapi-Christodoulou 2002: i.226n211.

3 Sighalas 1939: 164-6 (*teste* Kriaras 1950: ζ'11). In 1940, Sighalas became Professor Ordinarius of Mediaeval and Modern Greek at the University of Thessaloniki.

4 First in Kriaras 1949 and then in Kriaras 1950, with critical edition of Katsaitis' extant works, introduction, commentary, and glossaries (cf. Evangelatos 1970: 51). As Kriaras (1950: ζ'-η') points out, the attribution of *Iphigenia* and *Thyestes* to Katsaitis is beyond doubt: in *Iphigenia's* dedication (to one Spyridon Katsaitis, on whom see Evangelatos 1995: 27*-8*139), and in the concluding address to the reader, Katsaitis explicitly names himself (Πέτρος ὁ Κατσαΐτης) as the author. Likewise, in *Thyestes'* dedication (to Count Metaxas of Cephallenia) Katsaitis explicitly identifies himself as the author of that tragedy.

on the basis of the information he provides in his own works, and with help from extant notarial documents relating to the author or his family.⁵ He was born on the island of Cephallenia (Kefaloniá), possibly around 1660; for not only was he old enough to take part in the “Morean War”, or Sixth Ottoman-Venetian War in 1693 (the war lasted from 1684 to 1699),⁶ but he is also named as his paternal uncle’s heir in a will drafted in December 1682, with no mention of a guardian, which means that Katsaitis will have been of age at that time (Evanghelatos 1995: 10*). He was the natural son of Stephanos (Stephanis) Katsaitis and Eleni (family name unknown), who apparently never married each other, although Eleni later married one Antzolis Magdalinos (Evanghelatos 1995: 11*–12*).

The conclusion of the Sixth Ottoman-Venetian War with the Treaty of Karlowitz (January 1699) left the Venetians in possession of, *inter alia*, Cephallenia and the Peloponnese. However, the Venetians did not remain masters of the Peloponnese for very long: a renewed Ottoman offensive, known as the Seventh Ottoman-Venetian War, or the Second Morean War (1715–1718), led to the Venetians losing the Peloponnese to the Ottomans (Treaty of Passarowitz, 21 July 1718). It would appear that Katsaitis had moved to the Peloponnese around 1690 or a little earlier, since he states in the dedication to the *Lament for the Peloponnese* that he had enjoyed “the maternal embrace” of his adoptive land “for more than twenty-five years” (79–80),⁷ that is to say, until the capture of

5 For the following sketch of Katsaitis’ biography I have relied on Kriaras 1950: ζ’-ιβ’ and on Evanghelatos 1995: 9*–30*; the notarial documents were brought to light by Evanghelatos 1995: 159–78, most of them having already appeared in the playbill of Evanghelatos’ production of *Iphigenia* in 1979 (the play was produced under the mock-archaizing title *Iphigenia in Lixouri, Ίφιγένεια ἐν Ληξουρίω*, Lixouri being the Cephallenian town where Katsaitis was born).

6 In a notarial document dated 17 October 1693 (notarized by one Konstantinos Miniatis), Petros Katsaitis entrusts his mother Eleni with the sum of 150 gold sequins (τζεκίνια, i.e. *zecchini*) for safekeeping, “because he too wishes to join the Armada” (επιδι καὶ αὐτός βουλετε να υπαγι εις την Αρμαδα), i.e. the Venetian armada fighting the Ottomans in the ‘Morean War’. See Evanghelatos 1995: 12*, 162–3.

7 Εἴκοσι πέντε καὶ πιλὸ χρόνους στὴν ἀγκαλιά της / μ’ ἔθρεφε καὶ μ’ ἐτίμησε κάλλι’ ἀπὸ τὰ παιδιὰ της (“For twenty-five years and more, she [sc.

the Castle of Nauplion by the Ottomans in July 1715.

After the capture of the Castle of Nauplion, Katsaïtis, who had sought refuge within the city's walls together with many others, was taken captive and sold as slave to a Turkish aga on the island of Crete, which had been an Ottoman possession since 1669. In 1717, the aga allowed Katsaïtis, only two years after his capture, to leave in order to raise the funds required for his manumission. In order to do so, Katsaïtis returned to his native Cephallenia,⁸ where he managed his finances ably enough to amass the required amount, probably by 1722, mainly by extracting legal compensation for property trespassed upon by neighbours and relatives during his absence, or by claiming debts owed him by his mother's estate.⁹ It is at the Cephallenian town of Argostoli, where he settled at first,¹⁰ that Katsaïtis composed his first extant tragedy, *Iphigenia*, dated 25 May 1720,¹¹ to be followed a year later by his *Thyestes* (July 1721).

As the natural son of a member of the lower aristocracy, Katsaïtis may not have enjoyed a formal education, but it is clear that he had excellent Italian,¹² was conversant with Italian lit-

the Peloponnese] nurtured me in her embrace and honoured me better than she did her own children"; Kriaras 1950: 204). For the date of Katsaïtis move to the Peloponnese see also Evangelatos 1995: 12*. As we saw above (n. 6), Katsaïtis will have returned to Cephallenia, perhaps for a short visit, in 1693. A second visit to Cephallenia is attested for the period October 1698-January 1699: see Evangelatos 1995: 12*-13*.

8 Katsaïtis will have returned to Cephallenia in the late 1717 or early 1718. A notarial document (Katsaïtis stands as guarantor for a house sold by his half-siblings) dated 22(?) October 1718 shows that Katsaïtis was on Cephallenia by that time: see Evangelatos 1995: 15*, with n. 34.

9 For details, ascertained by means of previously unpublished notarial documents, see Evangelatos 1995: 18*-20*.

10 See Evangelatos 1995: 15*-16*.

11 The date and place are provided by Katsaïtis himself in the colophon to *Iphigenia* (Kriaras 1950: 117, ll. 19-21): Στὰ χίλια ἑφτακόσια εἴκοσι ἔγραψά το· / τσ' εἴκοσι πέντε τοῦ Μαγιοῦ ἐδῶ ἐτέλειωσά το / στὸ Ἀργοστόλι, πῶλαχα ὕστερ' ὅκ τῆ σκλαβιά μου, / ὀπῶλαβα εἰς τὸ Μοριά διὰ τὰ κρίματά μου ("I wrote this in 1720; I finished it on the 25th of May here at Argostoli, where I happened to be after my slavery, which I suffered in Morea [=the Peloponnese] because of my sins").

12 As is evident from the text of a petition written by himself in Italian and addressed to the Provveditore of Cephallenia (dated 14 November 1722):

erature (his *Iphigenia*, as we shall see, follows closely Lodovico Dolce's *Ifigenia*), with Cretan Renaissance theatre, with some (perhaps second-hand) classical learning, and with Biblical or ecclesiastic texts, as attested by the abundance of Biblical and classical exempla evoked in his work.¹³ In his *Lament for the Peloponnese*, Katsaitis also implies that he had attended performances of comedies in the Peloponnese (perhaps at Nauplion).¹⁴

2. Katsaitis' *Iphigenia*: Preliminary Remarks

This paper will focus on the earlier of Katsaitis' two tragedies, namely *Iphigenia*, a play which – as shown again by Emmanuel Kriaras in a publication subsequent to his edition of the play – is based largely on Lodovico Dolce's tragedy *Ifigenia*, first published in 1551 and re-edited several times, both individually and together with Dolce's other classicizing tragedies.¹⁵ Dolce's *Ifigenia*, together with his *Giocasta*, *Medea* and *Hecuba*, were among the most notable Renaissance translations of Euripides; indeed, his *Giocasta* (an adaptation of Euripides' *Phoenician Women*) served as the model for one of the earliest English performances of Greek tragedy, namely George Gascoigne's and Francis Kinwelmershe's *Jocasta*, staged at Gray's Inn during the Christmas revels of 1566.¹⁶

see Evangelatos 1995: 22*, 173-4.

¹³ See Evangelatos 1995: 11*-12*. On Katsaitis' education see also Puchner 1991b: 263-4; Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 115-17.

¹⁴ *Lament* II 689-90 (Kriaras 1950: 252): Ποῦ εἶν' οἱ κωμωδίες καὶ τὰ φεστίνια, / ποῦ ἐκάναν τῆς ξεφάντωσης τῆ φτηνία; ("Where are now the comedies and the entertainments, which made for an abundance of revelry?"). Cf. Evangelatos 1970: 56 and 1995: 14*; Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 133n21.

¹⁵ See Kriaras 1961 for Dolce's play as the model for Katsaitis' *Iphigenia*. Dolce's play was first published individually as Dolce 1551, with second and third individual editions to follow several years later (Dolce 1566b, 1597). The play was also published as part of a multi-play volume also containing Dolce's *Giocasta*, *Didone*, *Thieste*, *Medea* and *Hecuba* (Dolce 1560; 2nd ed. Dolce 1566a). In this paper, references to *Ifigenia* will follow the third edition (Dolce 1597). Further on Dolce's *Ifigenia* as embodying the aesthetics of Late Renaissance and Mannerism see Giazon 2012 and 2014.

¹⁶ See Hight 1949: 121; Hall and Macintosh 2005: x. Further on

To my knowledge, Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* is the earliest surviving specimen of the reception of classical Greek tragedy in modern Greek – a genre that was to have a long history in subsequent Greek authors. In this case, of course, the reception is mediated through Dolce: Katsaitis does not seem to have been aware of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis*, of which Dolce's play is a rewriting.¹⁷ A self-styled τραγῆδία, or 'tragedy' (though in reality a tragicomedy, as we shall see), Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* is composed throughout in rhyming iambic couplets, of the standard 15-syllable variety, whereas Dolce's *Ifigenia* is, largely, in non-rhyming 11-syllable-verses. The change of metrical form is in all likelihood to be attributed to Katsaitis' familiarity with Cretan Renaissance theatre, in particular with Gheorghios Khortatzis' tragedy *Erofili*, in which the dialogue is, as always in Cretan drama, in rhyming 15-syllable iambic couplets. It is possible that Katsaitis came to know *Erofili* during his two-year stay in Crete: poetic narratives based on the play entered the Cretan ballad tradition (probably through public readings of manuscripts or chapbooks), and all surviving versions of those narratives are composed in the usual 15-syllable verse with couplet rhyme. It is equally likely that Katsaitis' familiarity with *Erofili* stems from performances of the play on Cephallenia or nearby islands, perhaps in the form of *omilies* (amateur open-air performances),¹⁸ or from chapbooks.¹⁹ It is noteworthy that Katsaitis omits altogether Dolce's choral odes, perhaps because he felt that the precedent of *Erofili* and other Cretan tragedies would have obliged him to compose the choral odes in the demanding

Gascoigne's and Kinweltershe's play see Ward 2013: 62-71.

17 Cf. below n24. In the Epilogue to his *Iphigenia*, Katsaitis, speaking *in propria persona*, mentions only the *Iliad* as a source for the Iphigenia myth (Kriaras 1950: 117): "Those of you who have read Homer's *Iliad* / will have heard of the war that took place in Troy / and will know very well the entire story / of Iphigenia, which I have turned into a tragedy." This is of course inaccurate since the sacrifice of Iphigenia is not mentioned in the *Iliad*.

18 See Puchner 1991a: 145-8; 1991b: 281; 1995: 61-5; and 2007: 253-4, with earlier bibliography; Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 117. There is evidence for a performance of *Erofili* in 1728 (i.e. eight years after Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* was composed) on the island of Zante (Zakynthos): see Puchner 1991a: 145.

19 A possibility raised by Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 117.

form of *terza rima*, a form which (one is tempted to speculate) was too great a challenge for Katsaitis' rather mediocre poetic talents.²⁰ For a few examples of echoes from Renaissance Cretan literature in Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* see n. 30 below.

Last but far from least, Katsaitis' play was clearly intended for performance, and may have actually been performed, on Cephalonia. In the epilogue, Odysseus addresses the

Worthy and honourable lords of Kefallonia,
 who have gathered in this place,
 and you, noble ladies, who took the trouble
 to gather today here in this place,
 out of the kindness of your heart and with so much eagerness,
 in order to attend a tragedy of the Greeks etc.
 (Kriaras 1950: 115)

And at the end of the epilogue, Odysseus, with conventional humility, thanks the audience for so generously deigning to watch such a humble spectacle, and requests their applause:

But now break this silence, all of you together,
 and if our tragedy has been to your liking, do give us a sign.
 (Kriaras 1950: 116)

What is more, the play's fifth act, in which Katsaitis breaks free from his model, is punctuated with authorial stage directions concerning the ceremony of *Iphigenia*'s sacrifice (Kriaras 1950: 84-6), but also the buffoonish comings and goings of the comic characters in the play's farcical coda (Kriaras 1950: 96-7, 101, 103-7, 110-13). There can be no doubt, then, that *Iphigenia* was composed primarily for performance; and although Katsaitis clearly did intend to have his play published as a book, his plans never came to fruition.²¹

20 On the limited role of the chorus in *Iphigenia* see further Puchner 1991b: 270-1. With regard to Katsaitis' versification, Kriaras (1950: λδ') points out that the author often has to resort to ungrammatical formations for the sake of the rhyme in his 15-syllable iambs, and that even so there remains a considerable number of imperfect rhymes throughout his work.

21 The MS is evidently prepared for publication, as shown by the extensive dedication to Spyridon Katsaitis and by the colophon, which is ad-

3. Katsaitis' *Iphigenia*: Plot and Structure

Prologue

The play begins with a lengthy, 216-word prologue, delivered by Agamemnon, who bemoans (1-78) the fact that men stand to lose face on account of female mischief, and then proceeds (79-216) to apply those remarks to the specific case of Helen's adultery and its effect on Menelaus, and to introduce the essentials of the plot (the Greeks' expedition in order to retrieve Helen, their tarrying at Aulis because of adverse winds, and Calchas' oracle to the effect that Iphigenia must be sacrificed). The Prologue appears to be of Katsaitis' own making and displays his typical garrulity and repetitiveness; there is certainly nothing comparable in Dolce's *Ifigenia*.²²

Act 1

In the opening dialogue between Agamemnon and an anonymous Servant, the king reveals that he has invited Clytemnestra and Iphigenia to Aulis on the pretext of the latter's imminent marriage to Achilles. However, he is now having second thoughts, as he cannot bear to sacrifice his own daughter, and asks the Servant to deliver a letter to his wife asking her to return to Argos. There follows a tense dialogue between Agamemnon and "Chalkias" (= Calchas), in which the king delivers a stock attack against seers, berating them for their hypocrisy and mercenary mentality. In the final scene, Calchas, alone, delivers a monologue voicing his suspicion that Agamemnon has decided to spare Iphigenia's life, and adding that the king's change of heart will provoke violent unrest among the Greek army.

This first act generally corresponds to the first act of Dolce's *Ifigenia*, except that Katsaitis has omitted, as everywhere else,

dressed to the 'wisdom-loving reader' (φιλομαθῆ ἀναγνώστη): Kriaras 1950: 3-6, 117, respectively.

²² On the lengthiness of the Prologue as typical of the Italian and Cretan theatre of the time see Evanghelatos 1970: 60-1.

Dolce's choral odes, and has considerably shortened a number of that author's monologues. For example, he has radically shortened and rephrased²³ the genealogical exposition that Dolce took over from Erasmus' translation of Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (49ff.).²⁴

Act 2

After a lengthy monologue by Odysseus about evil women in general and Helen's infidelity as the cause of the expedition against Troy in particular, there follows a dialogue between Odysseus and Menelaus, in which the latter reveals that the Greek army is indignant at their leader's unwillingness to sacrifice his daughter. In the following scene, Odysseus, alone, soliloquizes contemptuously about Menelaus' ridiculous uxoriousness as the ultimate cause of the war. There follows a brief dialogue between Odysseus and Agamemnon, in which the latter confirms his determination not to go ahead with the sacrifice, and a scene in which Menelaus berates his brother for his change of mind; Agamemnon, however, remains adamant. A Messenger announces that Clytemnestra, Iphigenia and Orestes have now arrived at Aulis, whereupon Agamemnon laments his harsh fate, and Menelaus, supposedly moved by his brother's tears, pretends to have changed his mind and advises his brother not to give in to pressure from the Greek army. Agamemnon, however, responds that he finds himself constrained to go ahead with the sacrifice, which must be kept secret from Clytemnestra. In the final scene, Menelaus, alone, confesses that he is unwilling to forgo vengeance for his wife's abduction, as this would compromise his honour.

At 740 lines, Act 2 is significantly longer than the corresponding act in Dolce's play (only 532 lines, including choral parts that have no counterpart in Katsaitis). Notably, the dialogue between Menelaus and Agamemnon's Servant at the opening of Act 2

²³ See Kriaras 1950: 17-18.

²⁴ See Dolce 1597: 7^v; Erasmus 1507: xxxvii^r. On Erasmus' translation of Euripides' *Iphigenia* see Rummel 1985: 29-39. For a more detailed comparison between the first acts of Katsaitis' and Dolce's plays see Chassapi-Christodoulou 2002: 229-31.

of Dolce's play has been replaced, in Katsaitis, with scenes i-v (352 lines), containing Odysseus' prologue, two dialogues (Odysseus–Agamemnon, Agamemnon–Menelaus), and two monologues (Odysseus', Agamemnon's). It is unclear whether these five scenes are based on some unknown model, or whether they are Katsaitis' own work. The latter possibility seems likelier, in view of those five scenes' prolixity and repetitiveness, which as we have already observed is a salient characteristic of Katsaitis' style.²⁵ After all, Odysseus has no counterpart in Dolce (see further below, section 4).

As an illustration of Katsaitis' style, I give below a rather characteristic example of his adaptation of Dolce's text. In Dolce, Menelaus' soliloquy, which concludes Act 2, is a 12-line piece, which has been blown by Katsaitis (sc. 8) into a 33-line speech, mainly thanks to added passages about the importance of honour for Menelaus – a theme which recurs time and again in Katsaitis.²⁶ Here is Dolce's text, followed by Katsaitis' reworking in the original Greek; both extracts are accompanied by my own translation:

Dolce (1597) 20^v

MENELAO (*solo*) Lasso, che questo natural amore,
 Amor di noi medesmi; è tanto, e tale,
 Che spesso al proprio honor n'appanna gliocchi.
 Ma, s'egli al fratel mio l'usato lume
 Toglie; rimaner già non vuò d'oppormi
 A quel ch'io debbo: cosi fo pensiero
 Di far, ch'Ulisse con la viva forza
 De l'eloquenza; che può, quanto vuole,
 Tenti di persuader, quanto io non posso.

²⁵ For instance, sc. 1 is a long-winded and repetitious monologue, in which Odysseus expatiates (otiosely, after Agamemnon's similar soliloquy in the prologue) on the 'evil woman' motif, offers a long series of Biblical and classical exempla, and adds, for good measure, the narrative of the stratagem he devised to avoid conscription, its discovery thanks to Palamedes' counter-stratagem, as well as the episode of Achilles' hiding, in feminine disguise, among the daughters of Lycomedes on the island of Scyros. In sc. 3 Odysseus, again, offers a variation of the same theme, namely Menelaus' ludicrous devotion to a bad wife. And sc. 5 is little more than an instantiation of perhaps the tritest gnomic theme, namely the mutability of fortune.

²⁶ Cf. Grammatas 1987: 32, 39n57.

Acciò, che questo vitupero indegno,
 Che ne la mia persona offende tutti,
 Si tolga da la faccia di ciascuno.

[Alas, that this natural love for ourselves is such, and so great, that it renders us blind to our personal honour. But if it deprives my brother of his customary eyesight [i.e., discernment], I do not propose to stay here and evade my duty. Thus, I am thinking of having Ulysses, whose keen force of eloquence can do what it likes, exercise his power of persuasion, inasmuch as I cannot. Thus, this shameful opprobrium, which in my person offends everyone, shall be lifted away from everyone's eyes.]

Katsaitis (Kriaras 1950: 41–2)

ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ Τούτη ἡ ἀγάπη ἢ φυσικὴ πῶχομε στὰ παιδιά μας
 ἔχει μεγάλη δύναμη στὸν νοῦ καὶ στὴν καρδιά μας,
 ὅπου συχνὰ καὶ τῆς τιμῆς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς κουκλώνει
 καὶ ὅλες μας τὶς στόχασες ἀπὸ τὸν νοῦ σηκώνει.
 Μ' ἂν εἶν' κ' ἐτούτῃ ἐθάμπωσε τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μου,
 ἐγὼ δὲν θέλω τὴν τιμὴ ν' ἀφήσω τοῦ ἑμαυτοῦ μου.
 Γιατὶ ἡ τιμὴ στὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι μεγάλη χάρη
 κι' ὅποιος τὴν χάση δύσκολα θέλει τὴν ξαναπάρει.
 Κ' ἐμὲ μοῦ τὴν ἐπήρανε κι' ἂ δὲν τὴν ξεγδικήσω,
 δὲν εἶναι δίκιο δίχως τῆς στὸν κόσμον πλιὸ νὰ ζήσω.
 Τιμὴ μου, πλήσιε θησαυρέ, περισσὶα ζηλεμένη,
 μὲ τόσον πόθο ἀπὸ μὲ καὶ κόπο μαζωμένη,
 πῶς ἄλλοι σ' ἐξοδιάσασι κ' ἐκαταστήσασι μὲ
 πτωχὸ πολλὰ ἀπὸ λόγου σου κ' εἰς εἵντα χρεῖαν εἶμαι!
 Ἐχάσα σε καὶ δίχως σου δὲν χρήζω πλιὸ τὰ πλοῦτη,
 μηδὲ μονάρχας ἤθελα νὰ 'μαι στὴ γῆν ἐτούτῃ.
 Σ' ἀπόκτησα σὲ κίνδυνα βάνοντας τὴ ζωὴ μου
 κι' ἄλλοι σ' ἔδαπανήσασι μὲ τόσῃ ἐντροπῇ μου.
 Ἐγὼ ὁ πτωχὸς σ' ἀπόκτησα κι' αὐτὴ πού 'χα τῆς δώσει
 τοῦ θησαυροῦ σου τὰ κλειδιὰ ἤθελε μὲ κομπώσει.
 Ἐγὼ ποῦρι σ' ἐκέρδαισα μὲ ἴδρωτα καὶ κόπο
 κ' ἐκείνη μου σ' ἐσκόρπισε μὲ ντροπιασμένον τρόπο.
 Μὰ τόσο αἶμα, τάζω σου, γιὰ σένα θεὲ νὰ χύσω
 νὰ θαρατάψω τὴν καρδιά κ' ἐσὲ νὰ πάρω ὀπίσω.
 Τὸν Ὀδυσσεά θεὲ νὰ βρῶ, ὅπου σ' αὐτὴ τὴν χρεῖα

μπορεί πολλά μὲ τὴν σοφὴ πολλή του εὐγλωττία
 εἰς ὅ,τι ἐγὼ δὲν ἤμπορῶ ἐκεῖνος νὰ πασχίσῃ
 μὲ τὴν πολλή του ἐνέργεια στὸ νὰ παρακινήσῃ,
 – γιὰτὶ ἀγκαλὰ κ' ἡ ἐντροπὴ ὅπου ἔναι καμωμένη
 σ' ἐμένανε, μὰ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὅλοι εἶναι βλαμμένοι –
 γὰρ νὰ πλυθῇ κ' ἐξαλειφθῇ ἐτούτ' ἡ κατασχὺνῃ
 τελείως, εἰς τὸ γένος μας καθόλου ν' ἀπομείνῃ.

[This natural love we feel towards our children holds sway in our minds and in our hearts, so much so that it often pulls the wool over honour's eyes and removes the power of reason from our minds. But if it has blurred my brother's vision, *I* will not relinquish my own honour. For honour is a great favour to men, and whoever loses it finds it very hard to win it back. It was taken away from me too, and if I cannot avenge myself, then it would not be right for me to live in this world without it. O honour, great and envied treasure amassed by me with much desire and toil, how have you been spent by others, so that I've been deprived of you and left completely destitute! Now that I've lost you, I have no desire for wealth, nor do I wish to be a monarch on this earth. While I acquired you at my life's peril, others have wasted you, much to my shame. Yes, I acquired you, miserable that I am, but I was deceived by the very woman I had entrusted with the keys to your treasury. I managed to win you with much sweat and toil, and she squandered you in a shameful manner. But I promise you, I am going to shed much blood for your sake, in order to satisfy my heart and win you back. I am going to find Odysseus, who can achieve much in this matter, thanks to his wise eloquence, and can attempt, with his energy, to do what I cannot, (namely) urge others (for the dishonour done to me also affects all the others), so that this opprobrium is washed away, cleaned up completely, and no trace of it may attach to our family anymore.]

Act 3

Clytemnestra, Iphigenia and Orestes arrive at Aulis, only to meet a downcast Agamemnon, who attempts to explain away his dejectedness despite the supposedly festive occasion (Iphigenia's

wedding). The king tries to persuade Clytemnestra to go back to Argos, leaving her daughter behind, but the queen predictably refuses. There follows a meeting between Achilles and Clytemnestra, with the former declaring that he knows nothing about his impending wedding to Iphigenia. In the ensuing scene (iv), Agamemnon's Servant reveals to Clytemnestra and Achilles that the wedding is a ruse indented to lure Iphigenia to her death. Achilles asserts that he will never consent to his name being used as a pretext for such an evil act, and Clytemnestra begs for his protection. Achilles offers to speak to Agamemnon in the hope of persuading him to change his mind, and encourages Clytemnestra to do so as well.

Act 3 follows closely the structure and the wording of the corresponding act of Dolce's play; Katsaitis has even allowed himself, contrary to his general practice of omitting choral parts, to keep, in sc. 5 (lines 467-70 and 535-8), two brief choral interventions also found in Dolce. On occasion, Katsaitis is also (uncharacteristically) more economical than Dolce. For instance, in sc. 5, Katsaitis has omitted from Clytemnestra's supplication to Achilles fourteen lines in which Dolce's heroine complained that she has no one except Achilles to turn to, given her husband's "harsh audacity and cruelty".²⁷ And in sc. 3, Clytemnestra's final response to Achilles is only four lines long (as opposed to eight in Dolce), and Achilles' reply to her is omitted altogether.²⁸ Here are, for easy reference and comparison, the relevant passages from sc. 3:

Dolce (1597) 26'

- CL. Dunque creder debb'io, che in questa cosa
 S'asconda inganno, e che beffata i sia?
 Già di quanto io n'ho detto, mi rincresce;
 E del mio vaneggiar prendo vergogna.
 Restate in pace: c'hoggimai non posso
 Non arrossir di riguardarvi in faccia,
 Poscia ch'io trovo havervi detto cosa
 Tutta fallace, e di menzogne piena.
- AC. Reina a me di tal favola auiene,

²⁷ See Kriaras 1950: 56; Dolce 1597: 29^r-29^v.

²⁸ For Katsaitis' text see Kriaras 1950: 51; cf. Dolce 1597: 26^f.

Come adivien a chi novella ascolta
 Non più intesa da lui: che quanto in essa
 Ripensa più, più meraviglia prende.
 Ma voi di ciò non vi turbate molto:
 Che forse questo error potrà giovarci.
 Intanto io me n'andrò cercando il vostro
 Honorato marito, infin ch'io'l trovi.

[CLYTEMNESTRA Am I to believe, then, that some deception is concealed in this affair, and that I have been outwitted? I already regret what I have said about this, and I am ashamed of my ravings. Do not be upset: for I shall never help blushing when I look you in the eye, since I find that I have told you something completely fallacious and full of lies.]

ACHILLES My Queen, to me this news comes as something that one hears for the first time, and that he does not understand: the more one thinks about it, the stranger it appears to him. But please do not upset yourself too much about this: this mistake may turn out to be of help. In the meantime, I shall go look for your esteemed husband, and try to find him.]

Katsaitis (Kriaras 1950: 51)

ΚΛΥΘ. Λοιπὸν ἐπιβουλιὰ καμιά σ' αὐτὰ εἶναι κρυμμένη,
 θεὸς νὰ πιστεύσω καὶ ἔμεινα μὲ τοῦτα κομπωμένη,
 ὥστε πού ὄ,τι ἐμίλησα ψεματινὰ τὰ γνώθω
 κ' ἐντρέπομαι νὰ σὲ θωρῶ· γιὰ τοῦτο τὰ μεταγνώθω.

[CLYTEMNESTRA I am bound to believe, then, that some deception is concealed in all this, and that I have been hoodwinked; so that I realize that everything I said is a lie, and I am ashamed to look at you; therefore, I regret all this.]

However, in at least one case, Katsaitis' shortening of the original has resulted in a structural fault in the dialogue. In Dolce (1597: 26^v), there is a three-person dialogue, in which Achilles urges Agamemnon's Servant to reveal the distressing news he has just alluded to, and Clytemnestra chimes in, assuring the Servant that she will guard the secret closely; at which point, the Servant turns to Clytemnestra, begging her benevolent understanding. Now, Katsaitis has omitted Clytemnestra's crucial intervention in

Dolce's three-person dialogue, incorporating its main thrust into Achilles' words (Kriaras 1950: 52); as a result, the Servant's address to Clytemnestra in Katsaitis comes across as abrupt and unmotivated.²⁹ Here are, for easy reference and comparison, the relevant passages, first Dolce's, then Katsaitis':

Dolce (1597) 26^v

- AC. Di queste tue parole veder parmi,
Che n'habbia a uscir qualche novella acerba.
- CL. Non ti tardi a scoprir, quel che m'è ascoso,
Dubbio, ò timor, ch'io lo palesi altrui;
Ch'io ti rendo sicuro, che giamai
Non l'intenderà alcun per questa lingua.
- S. Reina voi sapete, ch'io fui prima
Servo nudrito ne le vostre case etc.

[ACHILLES (*to the Servant*) From your words I seem to deduce that you are about to come out with some painful piece of news.

CLYTEMNESTRA (*to the Servant*) Do not delay to reveal what is concealed from me; let yourself not be prevented by doubt or by fear that I may disclose it to others. I assure you that no one will ever hear it from my mouth.

SERVANT (*to Clytemnestra*) O Queen, you know that I was once a servant raised in your house, etc.]

Katsaitis (Kriaras 1950: 52)

- ΑΧΙΛ. Λοιπὸν μὲ χωρὶς ἄργητα καὶ δίχως φόβο πέ μου·
ἐκεῖνο ποὺ κρατεῖς κρυφὸ τώρα φανέρωσέ μου·
καὶ θέλεις εἶσαι βέβαιος ποτὲ νὰ μὴν θελήσῃ
νὰ τὸ εἰπῆ ἢ γλῶσσα μου σ' ἄλλον νὰ τ' ἀγροικήσῃ.
- ΔΟΥΛ. Βασίλισσα, κατέχεις τὸ τὸ πὼς ἀναθρεμμένους
ἐστάθηκα στὸ σπίτι σας καὶ πάντα μπιστεμένους κτλ.

[ACHILLES (*to the Servant*) Now then, tell me, without delay and without fear; do reveal to me what you have been hiding. And you may rest assured that my mouth will never tell this to anyone else's ears.

²⁹ This is far from being the only dramatic fault of *Iphigenia*; for further criticisms see Puchner 1991b: 288-90, 291-6.

SERVANT (*to the Queen!*) O Queen, you know that I have been raised in your house and have ever been faithful, etc.]

Act 4

In the opening dialogue between Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, the king pretends that Iphigenia is to officiate in the impending sacrifice, while Clytemnestra (apparently in an aside) states that she is aware of her husband's true intentions. Iphigenia appears before her parents, and Clytemnestra elicits Agamemnon's admission of the harsh truth. Assisted (improbably) by the infant Orestes, Iphigenia begs for her life to be spared, but Agamemnon replies that the sacrifice is the only way to appease Artemis. After a pair of lamentations by Clytemnestra and Iphigenia, Achilles reports that the Greek army is in turmoil because of his unwillingness to allow Iphigenia's sacrifice. In an abrupt volte-face, Iphigenia declares that she will eagerly go to her death to serve the Greek cause and win eternal fame. While praising the girl's noble spirit, Achilles urges her to change her mind, but she remains unmoved and, in the final scene, tries to console her mother. This act has perhaps the highest concentration of recognizable linguistic and stylistic influences from Cretan Renaissance theatre, in particular Gheorghios Khortatzis' tragedy *Erofilis*.³⁰ At

³⁰ Thus, e.g., the phrasing of line 93 ὦ τύχη μου ἀντίδικη καὶ ριζικὸ καημένο (Kriaras 1950: 63) harks back to *Erofilis* Act 5, 485 ὦ φου, πρικύ μου ριζικὸ κι ἀντίδική μου μοίρα. Also, the Chorus' prayer to Artemis as the moon-goddess in *Katsaitis* (5.2.151-5, 171-5) recalls the first two stanzas of the chorus' address to the sun in the 4th choral ode of *Erofilis*: see Kriaras 1950: 86, 296. An interesting case of conflation between Dolce and Khortatzis is to be found in Iphigenia's qualification of her address to her father, to the effect that he does not deserve the paternal appellation: Κύρη, ἀκριβέ μου κύρη μου, καλὰ καὶ νὰ σὲ κράζω / κύρη μου δὲν ἐτύχαινε (Kriaras 1950: 63). Here, *Katsaitis* takes his cue from Dolce (1597: 34^v): "Padre mio caro padre: / Benche dovrei tacere / Questo nome di padre" etc.; however, the phrasing puts one in mind of Khortatzis' *Erofilis* Act 5, 435 ὦ κύρη μου, μὰ κύρη πλιὸ γιάντα νὰ σ' ὀνομάζω. *Katsaitis*' Act 4 may also conceal echoes from other works of the Cretan Renaissance; for instance, Kriaras (1950: 294) has identified in Iphigenia's plea for her life, with its reminders of her father's past acts of

the same time, it follows Dolce's model quite closely, except that Clytemnestra's denunciatory speech against Agamemnon in sc. 2 has been reduced to 69 lines (111-80) from 138 lines in Dolce.³¹

Act 5

In this act, Katsaitis veers away from Dolce to give his play a happy ending. After a meeting between Agamemnon and a number of Greek leaders (Odysseus, Menelaus, Achilles, Palamedes), Iphigenia offers herself willingly as a victim for the sake of Greece. The herald "Thalthybon" (Θαλθύβων, i.e. Talthybius) asks those present to offer a prayer, and the Priest prepares Iphigenia for sacrifice, while the Chorus intones a hymn to Artemis. Just before the sacrificial knife touches the girls' throat, however, a sudden tempest breaks out of nowhere. Enter the prophet Fenisos (Φενίσος), who reveals that Artemis does not wish for the sacrifice to go ahead, and denounces Calchas as a false and ignorant seer, who misinterpreted the goddess' will. Finally, Fenisos advises Agamemnon to marry off his daughter to a worthy husband and to sacrifice a deer in her place. Achilles asks for Iphigenia to be given to him in marriage, Agamemnon happily consents (but not before asking for the Greek leaders' approval), and everyone, including the happy couple, exit in order to prepare the wedding.

At this point (sc. 4-6), the play suddenly morphs into a frantic farce, with the acting space being invaded by an assortment of comic characters, most of whom are derived from the *Commedia dell'Arte* or from Molière (see further below, section 4). Capitan Kouviellos (Coviello), a *miles gloriosus*, claims that he has orders from Agamemnon himself to find Calchas and rip him apart as a punishment for his false prophecy. Calchas asks for protection from Barlakias (Barlacchia) and Skapinos (Scapino), and hides

affection towards her (lines 205-10, Kriaras 1950: 66), similarities with Isaac's pleas to Abraham in Vitzentzos Kornaros' (?) play *The Sacrifice of Abraham* 801-14. For further examples (not all of them compelling) see Puchner 1991b: 272-6. For echoes of *Erofili* in Katsaitis' other classicizing tragedy, *Thyestes*, see Kriaras 1950: 301-4; Puchner 1991b: 276-80.

³¹ See Kriaras 1950: 64-6; Dolce 1597: 35^v-7^v.

himself in a sack, so that Skapinos may carry him safely home. Unaware of the trick, Capitan Kouviellos confronts the company and asks his henchmen to start beating and kicking the sack. In the following scene, Barlakias, charged by Achilles with buying dragées for the wedding but having no money, decides to offer the apothecary Sgaranellos (Sganarelle) a supposedly valuable mummy in return for a hundred florins' worth of dragées. The "mummy", however, will be, in fact, Skapinos hidden in a coffin. The "mummy" duly delivered, there follows a piece of broad comedy, in which Skapinos takes advantage of the apothecary's absence to eat the candies the latter had left on the pharmacy counter. In the final scene, the *senex amans* Tibourtzios (Tiburzio) meets two plebeian women standing outside Barlakias' house and tries to court one of them. Persuaded to go and dye his hair in order to look younger, Tibourtzios comes back with his hair dyed a garish blue.

Not only the concluding farce but also the former, non-comic, part of Katsaitis' Act 5 have fundamental differences from the corresponding act of Dolce's *Ifigenia*. For instance, Iphigenia's last-minute rescue thanks to the intervention of a priestly figure has no counterpart in Dolce. As Pittas-Herschbach points out, it seems to be a device borrowed from pastoral tragicomedy, for example Giovanni Battista Guarini's immensely popular *Il Pastor fido* (1585), or one of its many spin-offs, including *L'Amorosa Fede* (1620) by the Cretan Antonio Pandimo (Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 119). In Guarini (5.6), the shepherd Mirtillo's sacrificial death is averted thanks to the intervention of the blind seer Tirenio; and in Pandimo's play (5.7), the seer Criseo prevents Erodafne's sacrifice at the last moment by revealing a hitherto unknown oracle.

In spite of his fundamental divergences from his principal model, Katsaitis has also retained and transformed, in his Act 5, a few details from the corresponding act of Dolce's play. For instance, the revelation, in Katsaitis, that Artemis requests a deer to be sacrificed in Iphigenia's stead is in all likelihood a development of the Servant's brief and incredulous mention, in Dolce, of 'certain claims' (cf. "alcuni affermano": Dolce 1597: 50^v) to the effect that Diana substituted a deer for Iphigenia at the last moment. Moreover, the same Servant's (Dolce 1597: 49^v) report of Iphigenia's words before the sacrifice – to the effect that she offers

herself willingly for the sake of Greece and that she requests only that no-one touch her veils – is rewritten in Katsaitis as a piece of theatrical *action*, in which Iphigenia herself makes a similar request to the Greek leaders (Kriaras 1950: 84). Finally, the herald Talthybius' request that everyone pray for a favourable outcome (Dolce *L.c.*) is transformed again into stage business in Katsaitis (*L.c.*): Talthybius' proclamation is accompanied by the sound of the trumpet—evidently the result of a literal reading of Dolce's "Taltibio . . . il publico trombetta" (where *trombetta* = "bugler", "herald" rather than "trumpet").³²

4. Characters and Their Origins in Katsaitis' *Iphigenia*

We saw in the previous section that, while Katsaitis' principal source was undoubtedly Lodovico Dolce's *Ifigenia* (as already pointed out by Kriaras 1961), there are a number of deviations, especially in Act 5, which suggest that Katsaitis either relied on his own devices or drew material from sources that cannot be immediately identified. At least some of these sources, however, are clearly of comic origin, as is evident from a number of characters in Act 5, who can be shown to derive principally from the *Commedia dell'Arte* and, in two cases, from Molière.³³ A brief survey of these characters is given below, with comments on their theatrical origins.

Capitan Kouviellos

Capitan Kouviellos (Καπιτὰν Κουβιέλλος) is obviously a slight-

³² See also Chassapi-Christodoulou 2002: 234 on Katsaitis' transforming into stage business what is merely a piece of messenger narrative in Dolce.

³³ For the echoes of the *Commedia dell'Arte* in *Iphigenia* see also Grammatas 1987, who sees the play as a parodic satire against the aristocratic establishment; see however the criticisms of Puchner 1991b: 320-3n507. In addition, the "mummy" trick in 5.5 may have been inspired by Giovanni Bonicelli's *Pantalon spezier* (1693), in which (2.23) Arlichino appears disguised as a skeleton referred to as a *mumia*, "mummy". The suggestion was made by Prof. Piermario Vescovo, *teste* Carpinato 2005: 192n20. For a critical edition of Bonicelli's play see Ghelfi 2014: 177-265, esp. 236.

ly Hellenized form of Capitan Coviello, one of the stock characters of the *Commedia dell'Arte*.³⁴ Admittedly, in the *Commedia* (especially in its Neapolitan variety), Coviello is usually a First Zanni, a wily scheming servant often appearing as a musician,³⁵ whereas in Katsaitis he embodies the age-old figure of the *miles gloriosus*, the braggart soldier. However, there is some evidence pointing to an affinity between the Coviello and the Capitano of the *Commedia*, so much so that “in some records he is actually styled Capitan Coviello”, as he is in Katsaitis.³⁶

Skapinos

In Katsaitis' list of characters, Skapinos (Σκαπίνος) is accompanied by the qualification “da Trufaldin”, i.e. “in the role of Trufaldino”. In other words, Skapinos is intended to be a fusion of two *Commedia* types, Scapino and Trufaldino, the former a First Zanni type (the scheming and cowardly ‘escape artist’)³⁷ and the latter a Second Zanni type (the foolish servant).³⁸ Two characters named Trufaldino and Capitan Coviello appear in an anonymous 1672 *commedia* entitled *Trufaldino medico volante*,³⁹ although I cannot find, in that piece, any similarities with Katsaitis' play beyond the coincidence of names.

34 See e.g. Katritzky 2006: 19, 26, 209, 219.

35 See Fava 2015: 111; Heck 2015: 259 fig. 27.2, 264-7.

36 Quotation from Nicoll 1963: 61. See also Pouglin 1885: 254: “On assure qu'au commencement du présent siècle [i.e. the 19th century], le type de Coviello figurait encore parfois dans les canevas des marionnettes italiennes, où il remplissait un rôle assez semblable à celui de l'ancien Capitan”. See also Oreglia 1968: 105, as cited in Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 134n28.

37 See e.g. Preeshl 2015: 116, 118.

38 See e.g. Fava 2015: 112; cf. Evangelatos 1970: 74. On the fusion see Puchner and White 2017: 181-2. Since both Scapino and Trufaldino are Zanni types, their fusion is not as “foolish” as claimed by Puchner 1991b: 299.

39 See Toldo 1910: 259-60; Franchi 1988: 450.

Barlakias

As specified in the list of characters, Barlakias (Μπαρλάκκιος) appears in the role of Finocchio (“da Finocchio”), the latter easily recognizable as a variant of the wily servant type.⁴⁰ However, the origin of the Barlakias figure itself is less easy to ascertain, and the problem of his origins has understandably perplexed scholars. I have been able to establish that Barlakias is, in fact, not derived from a theatrical character but from a historical figure. His name evokes that of Domenico Barlacchi, nicknamed “Il Barlacchia”, who was a herald of the Florentine Signoria and a famous actor around the mid-sixteenth century. Barlacchi enjoyed high esteem in his time. He was a friend of Lorenzo di Piero di Lorenzo de’ Medici, Duke of Urbino. He led a touring troupe that performed both in Italy and abroad, most notably at Lyons in 1548 before the French King Henri II, with a production of Bibbiena’s classic *La Calandria*, which inaugurated the tradition of *Comédie italienne* in France. And he had, posthumously, a number of pleasantries and jests ascribed to him.⁴¹ It was no doubt as the supposed protagonist of these pleasantries that Barlacchi was known to Katsaitis, perhaps through chapbooks circulating in the Ionian islands.⁴²

Tibourtzios

Like Barlakias, Tibourtzios (Τιμπούρτζιος), the name Katsaitis uses for his *senex amans*, has no identifiable precedent in the *Commedia*, and has been left unexplained by students of Katsaitis’ play. However, it should have been obvious that the name is de-

⁴⁰ See Nicoll 1963: 77; Preeshl 2015: 116.

⁴¹ See Speroni 1964: 252, 255-6; Cummings 2004: 105-6; Barasch 2005: 235; Plaisance 2008: 112, 117, 118, 122. Barlacchia’s fame is evidenced by, *inter alia*, the fact that Machiavelli himself chose to sign his autograph copy of Lorenzo Strozzi’s *Commedia in versi* in the words “ego Barlacchia recensui” (“I, Barlacchia, have examined and corrected this”): see Landon 2013: 55-6 for discussion. Recently, Stoppelli 2018 has argued for the attribution of the *Commedia in versi* to Machiavelli himself as opposed to Strozzi.

⁴² Thus, Barlakias is not “a complete fabrication”, *pace* Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 118, who follows on this point Puchner 1991b: 299; 2004b: 144.

rived from Tiburzio, a character who (as far as I can ascertain) was first introduced by Giovanni Briccio in his comedy *Il Pantalone imbertonao* (Viterbo, 1617). There is, however, an important difference between Katsaitis' and Briccio's Tiburzio figures: in Katsaitis, as indicated above, Tibourtzios is identified as a γέρος ἀγαπητικός, or *senex amans*, whereas Briccio's Tiburzio is a young man, with his father Pantalone in the role of the *senex amans* and his son's rival in love.⁴³ This difference does not necessarily preclude Katsaitis' dependence on Briccio, and *Il Pantalone imbertonao* also features, intriguingly, a Coviello, although the latter appears there in the role of a doctor rather than of the Capitano, as he does in Katsaitis. The Tiburzio figure rose to prominence in the comedies of Carlo Goldoni,⁴⁴ which however cannot have been known to Katsaitis, since Goldoni's theatrical activity, which began in the 1730s, postdates *Iphigenia*.

Sgaranellos and Porkoniakos

Katsaitis' comedy also includes two characters of ultimately Molièresque origin, namely Sgaranellos (Σγαρανέλλος) and Porkoniakos (Πορκονιάκος). Obviously, these figures are derived from Molière's Sganarelle and Monsieur de Pourceaugnac, respectively. The latter is the title character of Molière's homonymous *comédie-ballet* (1669), while the former was introduced by Molière in his early comedy *Le Médecin volant* and was used by him repeatedly in many of his lat-

43 Cf. Jordan 2008: 60. Puchner's speculations about Tibourtzios' being derived from Molière's Thibaud (in *Le Médecin malgré lui*) or from the same author's M. Thibaudier (in *La Contesse d'Escarbagnas*) are baseless (2004b: 150).

44 For example, in his comedies *I Due gemelli veneziani* (1747); *Il Padre di famiglia* (1750); *Il Giuocatore* (1750). It is perhaps with Goldoni's plays in mind that Constantini (1750) 184 mentions 'Tiburzio' as a comic character. Goldoni's Tiburzio became influential: for instance, in Giuseppe Cirillo's *I Malocchi* (Naples, 1789), Don Tiburzio is identified as 'amante di Camilla'. Also, in Filippo Cammarano's *Rachele ed Ippolito o sia Il Comico inglese* (Venice, 1792), Tiburzio is identified in the list of characters as 'Buffo della Compagnia'. For Greek translations of Goldoni (from 1741 onwards) see Puchner 1984: 76-7.

er pieces, from *Sganarelle, ou Le Cocu imaginaire* (1660) onwards.⁴⁵ Interestingly, in Katsaitis' list of characters, Sgaranellos is identified as "da specier e medico", i.e. "in the role of apothecary and doctor". As Evangelatos was the first to see, this probably bespeaks Katsaitis' familiarity with (an Italian version of) Molière's *Le Médecin malgré lui*, in which Sganarelle pretends to be a doctor.⁴⁶ Indeed, there is a number of striking similarities with Molière's play in Katsaitis:

1. In Katsaitis, Sgaranellos is called upon to provide a medicine for Porkoniakos' daughter, who has lost her voice (Katsaitis, Act 5, 781ff.; Kriaras 1950: 104). The same ailment affects Géronte's daughter Lucinde whom Sganarelle is called upon to treat in Molière's *Le Médecin malgré lui* (2.5) (Forestier *et al.* 2010: 749-54).
2. Katsaitis' Sgaranellos prescribes the same medicine as his counterpart in Molière, namely bread soaked in wine.⁴⁷
3. When Katsaitis' Sgaranellos invokes Aristotle's teachings in support of the treatment he proposes, Porkoniakos remarks that Aristotle "was a great man as I hear"; whereupon Sgaranellos raises his hand above his head and responds, comically, "Indeed, he was that much higher than me" (Act 5, lines 800-4; Kriaras 1950: 104). In Molière, Sganarelle cracks a similar joke: "*levant son bras depuis le coude*: Grand Homme tout à fait: un Homme qui était plus grand que moi, de tout cela" (Forestier *et al.* 2010: 751).
4. Katsaitis' Sgaranellos declines the noun *poeta*, stating the name of the relevant case as he does so ("nominativo . . . genetivo"); similarly, his counterpart in Molière speaks dog Latin ("*Ossabandus, nequeys, nequer, potarinum, quipsa milus*"), declines "Bonus, Bona, Bonum", and reels off faux-Lat-

⁴⁵ Molière also used Sganarelle in *L'École des maris* (1661); *Le Mariage forcé* (1664); *Dom Juan* (1665); *L'Amour médecin* (1665); and *Le Médecin malgré lui* (1666). See further Blackman 1947: 40-4, who argues for Sganarelle originating in the Zanni of the Commedia.

⁴⁶ Evangelatos 1970: 77n1, implicitly (and wrongly) criticized by Puchner 2004b: 168-9. Cf. also Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 134n30.

⁴⁷ Katsaitis: Act 5, ll. 788-91 (Kriaras 1950: 104); Molière: Forestier *et al.* 2010: 752-3.

in grammatical terms higgledy-piggledy (“Quia substantivo, et adjectivum, concordat in generi, numerum, et casus”) (Forestier *et al.* 2010: 751–2).

The first Italian translation of Molière’s plays by Nicolò Castelli (pen name of Fr. Biagio Augustelli) was published in four volumes in 1698 in Leipzig, with *Sganarello* appearing in the first volume and *Il signor Porcognacco* in the third.⁴⁸ Katsaitis may have had access to Castelli’s translation, or (perhaps the likelier possibility) he may have attended performances of (adaptations of) Molière’s plays by touring Italian troupes on Cephallenia.⁴⁹

Touring Italian troupes will also have been responsible for the familiarity, evinced in Katsaitis’ play, with Commedia dell’Arte characters and plot types (see above). There is evidence for performances of Commedia plays on Corfu as early as 1560 by Antonio da Molino, a pupil of the great Ruzzante (Panayotakis 1998: 58 with n. 119). There is, of course, nothing remarkable in Commedia plays being performed in the Ionian islands during the period of Venetian rule,⁵⁰ just as they had been performed, again under Venetian rule, in Crete in the sixteenth century.⁵¹ For the dissemination of the Commedia in the Ionian islands in later times (until the early eighteenth century) Katsaitis’ play is among the earliest and most important pieces of evidence; otherwise, the phenome-

48 See Castelli 1698; Toldo 1910: 202–3n3.

49 The latter possibility is the one privileged by Puchner and White 2017: 182. For possible cross-pollination between Molière and the *comédie italienne* see Puchner 1991b: 299–301; 2004b: 145–7, 162, 169–71; also, Puchner and White 2017: 182n35. Such cross-pollination will have taken complicated forms, as Puchner shows: thus, Molière’s *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac* shows influences from two Commedia dell’Arte scenarios, namely *Policinella pazzo per forza* and *Pulcinello burlato* (see e.g. Gaines 2002: 327); at the same time, Molière’s play gave rise to spin-offs by or for Italian players in Paris, namely *La Coquette ou l’Académie des dames* (1691) by Jean-François Regnard and the anonymous *L’Infortuné mariage d’Arlequin* (1718), on which see Attinger 1950: 139, 250; Jacob 1843–4: iii.164, nos. 3366, 3367.

50 Cf. Grammatas 1987: 28–9.

51 See Panayotakis 1998: 58–9. For the participation of Greeks in Commedia dell’Arte performances in Venice see again Panayotakis 1998: 35–6.

non has left only indirect or disputable traces.⁵² In all likelihood, Katsaitis and his public will have been familiar with performances by touring Commedia troupes on Cephallenia or nearby islands; however, one cannot exclude the possibility of printed *scenari* circulating in the islands.⁵³

Thalhybon

Thalhybon (Θαλθύβων, i.e. the herald Talthybius) appears also in Dolce's play. In Katsaitis' list of characters (Kriaras 1950: 8), Thalhybon is identified as "trombetta", which may have resulted from Dolce's phrase "Taltibio . . . il publico trombetta" (1597: 49^v). As we saw above, an over-literal reading of this phrase by Katsaitis (*trombetta* = "trumpet" rather than "herald") gave rise to a scene in which Thalhybon's proclamation before the Greek army is actually accompanied by the sound of a trumpet (Kriaras 1950: 84). However, there is also another possibility, namely that Katsaitis had (perhaps only superficial) knowledge of Jean de Rotrou's *Iphigénie* (Rotrou 1641: [2]), of which the list of characters also identifies the herald Taltibie as "trompette".⁵⁴

52 Such traces include: (i) Giacomo Casanova's report, in his *Histoire de ma vie*, that he hired a troupe of Commedia dell'Arte actors from Otranto for a number of performances on Corfu in 1745; but the report may be fictionalized; (ii) the loose, episodic structure of Savoyas Rousmelis' *Comedy of Pseudodoctors* (1745), featuring a false doctor speaking in Latin; (iii) the similarly loose structure of Demetrios' Gouzelis' comedy *Khássis* (Χάσσης); (iv) the 'omilíes' (amateur folk theatre associated with carnival festivities) of Zakynthos and, to a lesser extent, Cephallenia (attested only from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards), which feature the characteristic half-masks of the Commedia. For all of the above see Puchner 2004a: 104-7; cf. Grammatas 1987: 34; especially on the similarities between the comic portion of Act 5 of *Iphigenia* and Gouzelis' *Khássis* see Evanghelatos 1970: 59.

53 Cf. Puchner 1991b: 298-9, 2016: 46-7.

54 The coincidence was first pointed out by Kriaras 1950: ιζ'.

Fenisos

A similar possibility suggests itself with regard to yet another of Katsaitis' minor characters, the prophet Fenisos (Φενίσος, προορατικός).⁵⁵ The origin of this character is hard to identify, as there is nothing comparable in Dolce. It is an intriguing possibility that Katsaitis' choice of "Fenisos" was inspired by the name of Phénice, Clytemnestra's maid, in Michel Le Clerc's *Iphigénie* (1675). Surely, Katsaitis' familiarity (if any) with that play will not have extended beyond the list of characters, since even a cursory reading of Le Clerc's piece would have revealed to him that Phénice is a female character.⁵⁶

Odysseus

An important character, Odysseus has no counterpart in Dolce, although he is mentioned there on a couple of occasions in Act 2 – namely, when Menelaus fears that Odysseus may reveal Calchas' oracle to the Greek army, and when he thinks of enlisting the power of Odysseus' eloquence in order to change Agamemnon's mind.⁵⁷ It is possible that these sparse mentions suggested to Katsaitis the idea of including Odysseus among his play's characters. Another possibility is that the idea came from one of the French *Iphigénies* by Rotrou (1641), Racine (1674) or Le Clerc (1675), all of which feature Odysseus (Ulysse) as one of the characters. However, given that Katsaitis will have had, at best, only a cursory knowledge of the French plays, it may be simply that he decided to include Odysseus as a means of engaging his Cephallenian audience. His play-script repeatedly stresses that Odysseus is

⁵⁵ In the list of characters, Kriaras 1950: 8 prints "ΦΙΝΙΣΟΣ", perhaps an oversight. In his text (86ff.) he gives the correct form, Φενίσος.

⁵⁶ Pace Puchner (1991b: 307-9), who is followed on this point by Pefanis (2005: 74n24), there is no evidence to support the claim that Fenisos is to be seen as a Christian priest, who gives the lie to the superstitions of pagan religion (represented by Calchas); see the counter-arguments advanced by Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 120-1.

⁵⁷ See Dolce 1597: 19^r and 20^r, respectively.

king of Cephallenia (2.1, 2.2), and in one case (2.7) Odysseus' empty arrogance (φαντασιά) is attributed to his Cephallenian origin!⁵⁸ The joke here is clearly meant as a jibe at the play's audience, and may be compared to, e.g., the Shakespearean Gravedigger's remark that Hamlet's madness will go unnoticed in England because "There the men are as mad as he" (*Hamlet* 5.1). Significantly, as pointed out in section 2 above, the epilogue to the play is delivered by Odysseus, who addresses it to the "Worthy and honourable lords of Kefallonià" (Κεφαλονίτες ἄρχοντες, ἄξιοι καὶ τιμημένοι), stressing that he lords it over Cephallenia (identified metonymically through the Cephallenian place-names of Cranaea, Palike and Samos), Ithaca, Zakynthos and Leucas. He thus "accomplish[es] the full integration of the action and characters in the play with his own time and audience".⁵⁹ It is equally significant that in his dedication to Spyridon Katsaitis (a relative of the author's, a member of the Ionian nobility, and a graduate of the University of Padua's Law School),⁶⁰ Katsaitis parallels the dedicatee with Odysseus: "And even if you have a heartfelt longing for Achilles, I would have you stand as a new Odysseus. For in his greatness of soul he is similar to you, who have dedicated your life to your homeland".⁶¹

Palamedes

Like Odysseus, Palamedes has no counterpart in Dolce's play; he is also absent from the aforementioned French *Iphigénies*. The only Palamedes-play early enough for Katsaitis to have taken into account is Joost van den Vondel's *Palamedes*, published in Dutch

58 See Kriaras 1950: 25, 27 and 41, respectively. On Odysseus in Katsaitis see also Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 126-7; on the emphasis on his Cephallenian origin see Puchner 1991b: 310-11.

59 Quotation from Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 127.

60 See Evangelatos 1995: 16*-17*, 27* n39.

61 "Κι' ἂν εἶχες πόθο γκαρδιακὸ διὰ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, / ἐγὼ σὲ πέβω νὰ σταθῆς μὲ νέον Ὀδυσσεά. / Καὶ ἔχει μεγαλοψυχιά σὰν καὶ τὴν ἐδική σου, / ὅπου γιὰ τὴν πατρίδα σου ἔταξες τὴ ζωή σου": "Dedication", ll. 109-12 (Kriaras 1950: 6); see also Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 128-9.

in 1625,⁶² but it is out of the question that Katsaitis actually knew that play, since by all accounts he had only Greek and Italian. Intriguingly, Palamedes has a very limited speaking part in the last act of Katsaitis' play, and only interacts (respectfully) with Agamemnon, never with Odysseus.⁶³ That Katsaitis missed the opportunity of making dramatic capital out of Palamedes' traditional enmity with Odysseus (despite the fact that Odysseus in the play explicitly mentions Palamedes' discovery of his trick)⁶⁴ suggests that our playwright included Palamedes only as an afterthought, perhaps in order to evoke, through the mythic son of Nauplius, his own stay in the city of Nauplion, the fortress of which is still called Palamídhī (Παλαμῆδι).⁶⁵ But all of this must remain in the realm of speculation for the time being, in the hope that a better explanation for the inclusion of Palamedes in Katsaitis' play may be found.

5. Epilogue

This paper has focused on the textual sources of Petros Katsaitis' *Iphigenia*, the earliest extant modern Greek play that engages with Greek tragic myth (albeit mediated by Italian Renaissance tragedy). We have surveyed the plot and structure of the play, glanced at its influences from Cretan Renaissance drama (section 2), and identified its numerous similarities with, as well as its divergences from, its principal model, Lodovico Dolce's *Ifigenia* (section 3). Finally, we have explored the origin of some of Katsaitis' characters in the *Commedia dell'Arte* and in Molière (section 4). In this context, we have provided new arguments for the derivation of a couple of characters (Barlakias, Tibourtzios) whose origin was previously considered obscure. We have also suggested the possibility that two more characters (Thalthybon, Fenisos) may be derived

62 On Vondel's *Palamedes* see Bloemendal and Korsten 2012: Index, s.v. "Vondel, Joost van den – *Palamedes*".

63 See 5.1.99-108 and 5.3.347-50, in Kriaras 1950: 83-4, 91 respectively.

64 See 2.1.111-22; Kriaras 1950: 25.

65 As mentioned above, Katsaitis had sought refuge from the besieging Turks within the walls of that very fortress in 1715.

from French Neoclassical tragedy (namely, Rotrou's and Le Clerc's *Iphigénie* plays), although in this case Katsaitis' familiarity with the relevant texts will not have extended far beyond their respective lists of characters. Finally, we have speculated on the possible topical relevance of Odysseus and Palamedes.

The picture of Katsaitis that emerges from this survey is one of an earnest dilettante trying to find his feet as a playwright. His dependence on his Italian model is obvious on every page, and when he departs from it the results are rather unremarkable (see, e.g., above on 2.1-5, which as argued there may be Katsaitis' own invention). The most obvious and the most important of these divergences is, of course, the happy ending (*Iphigenia*'s sacrifice averted), which as Pittas-Herschbach has shown is redolent of the ethos of pastoral tragicomedy, and the inclusion of loosely connected comic scenes populated by characters drawn from the *Commedia dell'Arte* or Molière. The happy ending, and the transition from tragedy to farce, are poorly motivated: as Katsaitis himself admits in the Epilogue (Kriaras 1950: 117), he changed *Iphigenia*'s end "from death to marriage" merely in order to provide "joy and entertainment" to his audience. In other words, *Iphigenia* tries, and fails, to strike a balance between, on the one hand, Katsaitis' ambition to recreate the serious tone of Italian Renaissance tragedy and, on the other, to provide the kind of light-hearted, 'easy-viewing' theatrical entertainment that a segment of his (surely mixed) audience would no doubt have expected. It is conceivable that Katsaitis soon realized the shortcomings of this approach, hence the unalloyed tragic tone of his next play, *Thyestes*, written one year later.

In view of the above remarks, it seems unlikely that *Iphigenia* bears out the relatively sophisticated readings some scholars have forced on it. For instance, Puchner and Pittas-Herschbach have attempted, in different ways and with different emphasis, to interpret *Iphigenia* as a political play, in which the Trojan enemies are a transparent stand-in for the Ottoman Turks, who had conquered the Peloponnese only a few years earlier and against whom Katsaitis is trying to warn his compatriots.⁶⁶ Such

66 See Puchner 1991b: 306, 309-11; Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 128-31.

readings, however, rest on flimsy evidence and/or over-interpretation of the textual data. Thus, for instance, part of Puchner's case relies, improbably, on the presumed derivation of Φενίσοσ from Φοῖνιξ (Phoenix), on the basis of which he argues that Fenisos, by his near-homonymy to the mythical bird thought to regenerate from its ashes, symbolizes the 'reborn nation' of the Greeks (Puchner 1991b: 308); however, Fenisos' limited part in the play contains absolutely nothing to suggest a concern with Hellenic patriotism. Likewise, Odysseus' concluding advice to the audience, to the effect that they should always be ready to sacrifice their life for their homeland (Epilogue, ll. 32-3; Kriaras 1950: 116), is no more than a piece of conformist rhetoric, which need not conceal the topical references to the Ottoman threat Puchner detects in it (1991b: 310). Along similar lines, Pittas-Herschbach makes far too much of Katsaitis' dedicatory address to Spyridon Katsaitis with its emphasis on the latter's patriotism, or of his Iphigenia's (4.505-10) statement that a Greek failure to pursue the war would encourage the "barbarians" to put "the kingdom of the Greeks" under their yoke.⁶⁷ The emphasis on the dedicatee's patriotism need be no more than a conventional compliment, while Iphigenia's words are merely (as Pittas-Herschbach was aware) a slightly more forceful restatement of the corresponding part of Dolce's play, in which Iphigenia claimed that it would be "shameful" (*indegno*) to allow "the barbarians" to "curb the towering Empire of the Greeks".⁶⁸

If this paper has achieved anything, it is to show that Petros Katsaitis' *Iphigenia* is an early (and modest) experiment in incorporating into Greek tragic myth, as filtered through Italian Renaissance tragedy, diverse contemporary theatrical influences that will have been vividly felt in the Ionian islands (mainly the *Commedia dell'Arte* and Italianized versions of Molière). That the experiment did not yield outstanding results, and was not followed by later dramatists, makes *Iphigenia* all the more remarkable as an early, if solitary, landmark in the history of modern Greek drama.

67 Kriaras 1950: 75; Pittas-Herschbach 2002: 129.

68 "& è indegno / Sostener, ch'essi [*sc. i barbari*] in alcun tempo mai / Mettano freno a l'alto Imperio Greco": Dolce 1597: 43'.

Works Cited

- Attinger, Gustave (1950), *L'Esprit de la Commedia dell'arte dans le théâtre français*, Paris and Neuchâtel: Librairie Théâtrale.
- Barasch, Frances K. (2005), "Commedia dell'Arte", in *Comedy: A Geographic and Historical Guide*, vol. 1, Maurice Charney (ed.), Westport, CT, and London: Praeger, 233-47.
- Blackman, Eugene Joseph (1947), *The Influence of the French Farce and the Commedia dell'arte upon Molière*, MA thesis, Boston University.
- Bloemendal, Jan and Korsten, Frans-Willem (eds) (2012), *Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679): Dutch Playwright in the Golden Age*, Leiden: Brill.
- Carpinato, Caterina (2005), "Il Lamento di Peloponneso di Petros Katsaitis e Della sciagura e prigionia della Morea di Manthos Ioannou", in *Venezia e la guerra di Morea: Guerra, politica e cultura alla fine del '600*, Mario Infelise and Anastasia Stouraiti (eds), Milan: Franco Angeli, 187-208.
- Castelli, Nicolo di (1698), *Le Opere di G. B. P. di Molière, divise in quattro volumi . . . tradotte da Nic. di Castelli*, vols 1-4, Leipzig: Gleditsch.
- Chafee, Judith and Crick, Olly (eds) (2015), *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell'Arte*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Chassapi-Christodoulou, Efsevia (2002), *Η ελληνική μυθολογία στο νεοελληνικό θέατρο: από την εποχή του Κρητικού Θεάτρου έως το τέλος του 20ού αιώνα* [*Greek Mythology in Modern Greek Theatre: From the Era of Cretan Theatre until the end of the 20th Century*], vols 1-2, Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Constantini, Giuseppe Antonio (1750), *Lettere critiche giocose, morali, scientifiche, et erudite . . .*, vol. 6. Venice: Bassaglia and Pasinelli.
- Cummings, Anthony M. (2004), *The Maecenas and the Madrigalist: Patrons, Patronage, and the Origins of the Italian Madrigal*, Philadelphia: American Philological Society.
- Dolce, Lodovico (1551), *Ifigenia: tragedia di M. Lodovico Dolce*, Venice: Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari e f.lli.
- (1560), *Tragedie di M. Lodovico Dolce: cioè, Giocasta, Didone, Thieste, Medea, Ifigenia, Hecuba*, Venice: Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari e f.lli.
- (1566a), *Tragedie di M. Lodovico Dolce: cioè, Giocasta, Didone, Thieste, Medea, Ifigenia, Hecuba*, Venice: Farri.
- (1566b), *Ifigenia: tragedia di M. Lodovico Dolce*, Venice: Farri.
- (1597), *Ifigenia: tragedia di M. Lodovico Dolce*, Venice: Sessa.
- Erasmus, Desiderius (1507), *Euripidis tragici poetae nobilissimi Hecuba & Iphigenia: Latine factae Erasmo Roterodamo interprete*, Venice:

- Aldus Manutius.
- Evangelatos, Spyros (1970), *Ίστορία τοῦ θεάτρου ἐν Κεφαλληνίᾳ 1600–1900* [*History of the Theatre on Cephalonia 1600–1900*], PhD diss., Athens: Βιβλιοθήκη Σοφίας Ν. Σαριπόλου.
- (1995) *Ίφιγένεια [ἐν Ληξουρίῳ]: Διασκευὴ κειμένου, Εἰσαγωγή, Ἀνέκδοτα Ἔγγραφα, Περιγραφή Σκηνοθεσίας* [*Iphigenia (at Lixouri): Text Adapted with an Introduction, Unpublished Documents, and a Staging Description*], Athens: Ἐστία.
- Fava, Antonio (2015), “Official Recognition of the Pulcinella: The One Who Saved the Commedia from Extinction by Securing Its Continuity to the Present Day”, trans. by Mace Perlman, in Chafee, Judith and Crick, Olly (eds) (2015), *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell’Arte*, London and New York: Routledge, 108-13.
- Forestier, Georges *et al.* (2010), *Molière: Œuvres complètes*, vol. 1., Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard.
- Franchi, Saverio (1988), *Drammaturgia romana: repertorio bibliografico cronologico dei testi drammatici pubblicati a Roma e nel Lazio: secolo xvii*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Gaines, James F. (ed.) (2002), *The Molière Encyclopedia*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ghelfi, Maria (2014), *Trittico con Pantalone: La commedia cittadina veneziana di Giovanni Bonicelli e Tommaso Mondini (1688–1693). Pantalone bullo, Pantalone mercante fallito, Pantalon spezier: Edizione critica commentata*, PhD thesis, Università Ca’Foscari Venezia.
- Giazzon, Stefano (2012), “Il Manierismo a teatro: l’*Ifigenia* di Lodovico Dolce”, *Forum Italicum* 46 (1): 53-81.
- (2014) “La maschera dell’ambiguità: sull’*Ifigenia* di Lodovico Dolce”, *Per Leggere*, 26: 63-90.
- Grammatas, Theodoros (1987), “Η παρουσία της Commedia dell’arte στο εφτανησιακό θέατρο του ΙΗ’ αιώνα: η περίπτωση της ‘Ίφιγένειας’ του Πέτρου Κατσαίτη” [“The Presence of the Commedia dell’arte in the Theatre of the Ionian Islands during the Eighteenth Century: The Case of Petros Katsaïtis’ *Iphigenia*”], in idem, *Νεοελληνικό Θέατρο: Ίστορία-Δραματολογία* [*Modern Greek Theatre: History and Dramatic Production*], Athens: Κουλτούρα, 27-41.
- Hall, Edith and Macintosh, Fiona (2005), *Greek Tragedy and the British Theatre 1660–1914*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heck, Thomas F. (2015), “Incidental Music in Commedia dell’Arte Performances”, in Chafee, Judith and Crick, Olly (eds) (2015), *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell’Arte*, London and New York: Routledge, 255-67.

- Hightet, Gilbert (1949), *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacob, P. L. (1843-4), *Bibliothèque dramatique de Monsieur de Soleinne*, vols 1-4, Paris: Administration de l'Alliance des Arts.
- Jordan, Peter Edward Rees (2008), *The Pantalone Code: Patrician Fatherhood Unmasked in Sixteenth-Century Venice*, PhD thesis, University of Hong Kong.
- Katritzky, M. A. (2006), *The Art of Commedia: A Study in the Commedia dell'Arte 1560–1620 with Special Reference to the Visual Records*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Kriaras, Emmanuel (1949), “Ανέκδοτα λογοτεχνικά έργα τῶν ἀρχῶν τοῦ ΙΗ' αἰῶνα” [“Unpublished Literary Works from the Early Eighteenth Century”], *Νέα Ἑστία* 46: 1180-3, 1283-7.
- (1950), *Κατσαΐτης: Ἰφιγένεια, Θυέστης, Κλαθμὸς Πελοποννήσου / Katsaitis: Iphigénie, Thyeste, La Plainte du Péloponnèse* (Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes 43), Athens: Institut Français d'Athènes.
- (1961), “Τὰ βασικὰ ἰταλικά πρότυπα τῶν τραγωδιῶν τοῦ Πέτρου Κατσαΐτη” [“The Basic Italian Models of Petros Katsaitis' Tragedies”], *Νέα Ἑστία* 806: 169-71.
- Landon William J. (2013), *Lorenzo di Filippo Strozzi and Niccolò Machiavelli: Patron, Client, and the Pistola fatta per la peste / An Epistle Written Concerning the Plague*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Liosatou, Eugenia (2015), *La Guerra di Morea (1714–1718): Manthos Ioannou e Petros Katsaitis. Fonti, commenti, edizione critica*, PhD thesis, Università Ca'Foscari Venezia.
- Nicoll, Allardyce (1963), *The World of Harlequin: A Critical Study of the Commedia dell'Arte*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oreglia, Giacomo (1968), *The Commedia dell'Arte*, trans. by Lovett F. Edwards, London: Methuen.
- Panayotakis, Nikolaos M. (1998), “Ἰταλικὲς Ἀκαδημίες καὶ Θέατρο: οἱ Stravaganti τοῦ Χάνδακα” [“Italian Academies and the Theatre: The Stravaganti of Candia”], in Stefanos Kaklamanis and Ghiannis Mavromatis (eds), *Κρητικὸ Θέατρο: Μελέτες [Cretan Theatre: Studies]*, Athens: Στιγμὴ, 11-63 [first published in *Θέατρο*, 27/28 (1966): 39-53].
- Pefanis, Ghiorgos P. (2005), “Μακρινὰ ταξίδια μυθικῶν προσώπων: ἡ Κλυταμνήστρα καὶ ὁ Αγαμέμνων στο νεοελληνικὸ θέατρο (1720-1996)” [“Long Journeys of Mythic Characters: Clytemnestra and Agamemnon in Modern Greek Theatre (1720–1996)”], in idem, *Κείμενα καὶ νοήματα: μελέτες καὶ ἀρθρα γιὰ τὸ θέατρο [Texts and*

- Meanings: Studies and Articles on Theatre*], Athens: Σοκόλη, 63-113.
- Pittas-Herschbach, Mary (2002), "Identity and Difference in the *Iphigeneia* of Petros Katsaitis", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20 (1): 113-42.
- Plaisance, Michel (2008), *Florence in the Time of the Medici: Public Celebrations, Politics, and Literature in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, trans. by Nicole Carew-Reid, Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies.
- Politis, F. (1920), "Μιά ελληνική ίλαροτραγωδία" ["A Greek tragicomedy"], *Politeia* 19 April (non vidi).
- Pougin, Arthur (1885), *Dictionnaire historique et pittoresque du théâtre et des arts qui s'y rattachent*, Paris: Firmin-Didot.
- Preeshl, Artemis (2015), "The Many Faces of Brighella: The Knave We Love to Hate", in Chafee, Judith and Crick, Olly (eds) (2015), *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell'Arte*, London and New York: Routledge, 114-22.
- Puchner, Walter (1984), "Spielarten des Komischen im griechischen Theater", *Maske und Kothurn* 30 (1-2): 73-80.
- (1991a), "Tragedy", in David Holton (ed.), *Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 129-58.
- (1991b), "Ο Πέτρος Κατσαίτης και το κρητικό θέατρο" ["Petros Katsaitis and Cretan Theatre"], in idem, *Μελετήματα θεάτρου: το κρητικό θέατρο* [*Studies on Theatre: Cretan Theatre*], Athens: Μπούρας, 261-323.
- (1995), "Επιβιώματα της κρητικής αναγεννησιακής λογοτεχνίας στον ελληνικό και βαλκανικό λαϊκό πολιτισμό: παρατηρήσεις πάνω στην αλληλεξάρτηση της προφορικής και της γραπτής παράδοσης" ["Survivals of Cretan Renaissance Literature in Greek and Balkan Folklore: Observations on the Interdependence between Oral and Written Tradition"], in Evangelhia Antzaka-Weis and Lia Papadaki (eds), *Η λαϊκή λογοτεχνία στη Νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη (19^{ος} και αρχές 20^{ου} αιώνα): Συνάντηση εργασίας 21-22 Απριλίου 1988* [Folk Literature in Southeastern Europe (19th and early 20th centuries): A Working Meeting, 21-22 April 1988], Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 53-65.
- (2004a), "Traces of the Commedia dell'arte in Modern Greek Theatre in the 18th & 19th Century", in Eirini Papadaki (ed.), *La Commedia dell'arte nella sua dimensione europea: Giornata di studio, venerdì 14 novembre 2003, Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia*, Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 103-7.
- (2004b), "Μολιέρος και Κατσαίτης: ιχνηλασίες σε μια θαμπίη

- συσχέτιση” [“Molière and Katsaitis: Tracing a Dim Interrelation”], in idem, *Ράμπα και παλκοσένικο: δέκα θεατρολογικά μελετήματα* [*Proscenium and Stage: Ten Studies on the Theatre*], Athens: Πορεία, 143-71.
- (2007), “Early Modern Greek Drama: From Page to Stage”, *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 25: 243-66.
- (2016), “Νέα δεδομένα στην έρευνα για τα σενάρια της *commedia all'improvviso* του 16^{ου}/17^{ου} αιώνα: ο γραπτός λόγος μεταξύ δραματικής λογοτεχνίας και σκηνικού αυτοσχεδιασμού” [“New Research Data on the Scenarios of the *Commedia all'improvviso* of the 16th/17th Centuries: The Written Word Between Dramatic Literature and Stage Improvisation”], *Parabasis* 14 (2): 15-52.
- Puchner, Walter and White, Andrew Walker (2017), *Greek Theatre Between Antiquity and Independence: A History of Reinvention from the Third Century BC to 1830*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rotrou, Jean de (1641), *Iphygénie: Tragédie de Mr. de Rotrou*, Paris: Antoine de Sommerville.
- Rummel, Erika (1985), *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sighalas, Antonios (1939), *Ἀπὸ τὴν πνευματικὴν ζωὴν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν κοινοτήτων τῆς Μακεδονίας, τ. Α΄: Ἀρχεῖα καὶ βιβλιοθήκαι δυτικῆς Μακεδονίας* [*From the Cultural Life of the Greek Communities of Macedonia, vol. I: Archives and Libraries of Western Macedonia*], Thessaloniki: Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης.
- Speroni, Charles (1964), *Wit and Wisdom of the Italian Renaissance*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Stoppelli, Pasquale (2018), *Commedia in versi da restituire a Niccolò Machiavelli: edizione critica secondo il ms. Banco Rari 29*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Toldo, Pietro (1910), *L'Œuvre de Molière et sa fortune en Italie*, Turin: Loescher.
- Ward, Allyn E. (2013), *Women and Tudor Tragedy: Feminizing Counsel and Representing Gender*, Madison, NJ.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Il Genio della tragedia. Antigone nel *Vorspiel* di Hofmannsthal

GHERARDO UGOLINI

Abstract

Little known and underexplored, the *Prologue to Sophocles' Antigone* – the one-act play conceived by the Viennese playwright Hugo von Hofmannsthal in the spring of 1900 for a Berlin production of the Sophoclean tragedy – represents an interesting attempt at a metatheatrical reflection on the Greek foundations of modern theatre, on the paradigmatic eternity of classical myths, and on theatre as a ‘mystery’ that conveys contents more true than those of everyday reality. The essay reconstructs the genesis of *Vorspiel* and highlights its main compositional demands. An Italian translation of Hofmannsthal text follows.

Wir müssen uns den Schauer des Mythos neu schaffen.
Aus dem Blut wieder Schatten aufsteigen lassen.¹
(Hofmannsthal 1980: 443)

In una lettera ai genitori datata 11 marzo 1900 il ventiseienne Hugo von Hofmannsthal scrive da Parigi: “Il lavoro mi si impone letteralmente da sé nella forma più leggera e piacevole. Dentro di me sento una rara libertà interiore da tutti gli intralci e i fastidi e osservo la mia esistenza, la mia arte e tutto il resto con occhi completamente diversi, vale a dire con lo sguardo giusto”.² L’ambiente parigino, nella cui vita mondana l’artista viennese si era immerso fin dal suo arrivo poche settimane prima, doveva avergli stimolato quella sensazione di “libertà interiore” (“innere Freiheit”)

1 “Dobbiamo creare di nuovo il fremito del mito. Dal sangue far emergere nuovamente le ombre” (traduzione di G. Ugolini).

2 “Die Arbeit drängt sich mit förmlich auf, in der leichtesten, angenehmsten Form, ich fühle eine seltene innere Freiheit von allen Hemmungen und Belästigungen und sehe meine Existenz, meine Kunst und alles mit ganz andern, d.h. mit den richtigen Augen” (Hofmannsthal 1937: 18).

di cui parla nella citata lettera e al tempo stesso scatenato nuove energie e prospettive creative. Il giorno stesso in cui scrisse quelle parole ai genitori iniziò la stesura del *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*. Dopo neppure una settimana l'atto unico era completato, tant'è che il 17 marzo ne inviò un esemplare a Berlino e già il 28 poté essere messo in scena. Nel maggio del medesimo anno uscì anche la versione a stampa sulla rivista *Die Insel* con il cui fondatore, lo scrittore Rudolf Alexander Schröder, aveva fatto conoscenza a Monaco di Baviera in una sosta durante il viaggio a Parigi.³

Tra le molteplici 'variazioni' sul tema di Antigone che hanno segnato la storia del teatro mondiale quella di Hugo von Hofmannsthal non ha incontrato finora la valorizzazione che merita. Negli studi che ripercorrono il *Fortleben* della figura di Antigone nella cultura letteraria e teatrale moderna l'atto unico di Hofmannsthal viene inesorabilmente tralasciato o al massimo liquidato in poche righe.⁴ Eppure il *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* merita un considerevole apprezzamento sia per quanto riguarda l'evoluzione della drammaturgia del suo autore su soggetti di derivazione greca, sia per la peculiarità con cui è trattato il personaggio di Antigone e i significati che gli vengono associati. A quel punto della sua carriera il drammaturgo viennese si era già cimentato con temi desunti da tragedie greche: non solo aveva composto l'*Alkestis*, un "dramma secondo Euripide" ("Trauerspiel nach Euripides"), la cui stesura risale agli anni 1893-94, ma aveva anche cominciato a lavorare ad un progetto di riscrittura del-

3 Hofmannsthal 1900. A quanto pare due tentativi di pubblicare il testo, prima sulla rivista *Die Zeit* e quindi in *Über Land und Meer* non andarono a buon fine: cf. Hübner-Pott-Michel 1982: 724-5. Il *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* fu successivamente ristampato insieme con altri due prologhi scritti successivamente, il *Vorspiel für ein Puppentheater* e il *Prolog zur Lysistrata des Aristophanes*, in un volume intitolato *Vorspiele* (Hofmannsthal 1908). Immediato fu l'apprezzamento per il *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* da parte di Arthur Schnitzler, al quale Hofmannsthal aveva fatto mandare una copia con la preghiera di inviarlo al critico berlinese del giornale *Neue Freie Presse* in vista di una recensione dello spettacolo. Cf. Hofmannsthal-Schnitzler 1964: 136.

4 Non se ne parla affatto in Alonge 2008, Belardinelli-Greco 2010, Fornaro 2012, Silva 2017. Solo un breve accenno si trova in Molinari 1977: 171n5 e in Steiner 1986: 5-6.

la *Baccanti* euripidee le cui prime annotazioni risalgono all'estate del 1892.⁵ Per certi aspetti si può dire che il *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* faccia da spartiacque tra la produzione 'greca' giovanile e quella successiva culminante nei capolavori della maturità *Elektra* (1903) e *Ödipus und die Sphinx* (1906).

Non sappiamo quando di preciso Hofmannsthal, negli anni della sua formazione viennese, si sia dedicato allo studio del dramma sofocleo *Antigone*, quali siano state le fasi preliminari per la composizione del *Vorspiel* e neppure a quale traduzione del testo greco abbia fatto riferimento.⁶ È probabile che il primo approccio con la tragedia risalga agli anni del liceo, considerato che l'offerta didattica dell'*Akademisches Gymnasium in Wien* da lui frequentato tra il 1884 e il 1892 contemplava la lettura in originale dei classici della letteratura greca. Senza contare che in quegli anni l'adolescente Hofmannsthal avrà ben avuto occasione di assistere a qualche rappresentazione dell'*Antigone* al Burgtheater o in altri teatri della capitale austriaca. In una lettera a Marie Herzfeld del luglio 1892, l'anno della maturità, accenna alla lettura di drammi sofoclei senza però specificare quali⁷ e in una pagina del diario dello stesso anno riporta la traduzione tedesca della scena di Euridice (*Soph. Ant.* 1155ss.).⁸ Inoltre nel semestre invernale 1893/94 frequentò all'università il corso di Alfred Berger su "Drammaturgia degli antichi tragediografi" dove è verosimile che si parlasse anche dell'*Antigone* sofoclea.

L'idea di ricorrere alla forma poetica del "prologo" per brevi componimenti drammatici in riferimento a tragedie greche era maturata durante i soggiorni a Berlino nel maggio del 1898 e nel marzo del 1899. In particolare, tramite l'attrice del Deutsches

5 Il progetto *Baccanti* (che a un certo punto prende il titolo di *Penteo*) occupò Hofmannsthal per quasi tre decenni senza tuttavia mai giungere a conclusione. Le ultime annotazioni sono del 1918. Sul tema cf. Bohenkamp 1998, Ward 2000, Ugolini 2011, Turato 2014: 298-312. Sui lavori giovanili ispirati a temi della classicità greco-romana cf. Landolfi 1995: 15-31.

6 Verosimilmente a quella di Georg Thudichum (*Sofocle* 1827: 149-204). In generale sulla questione delle traduzioni usate da Hofmannsthal per i drammi di argomento mitologico cf. Bohenkamp 1976.

7 Lettera del 21 luglio 1892 (Hofmannsthal 1967: 28).

8 Sotto la data 21 maggio 1892. Si tratta della traduzione di Georg Thudichum (*Sofocle* 1827: 196-9).

Theater Louise Dumont, era entrato in contatto con l'*Akademischer Verein für Kunst und Litteratur* ("Associazione accademica per l'arte e la letteratura"), un circolo studentesco universitario fondato e guidato dal regista Hans Oberländer che si proponeva di riportare sui palcoscenici tedeschi la tragedia greca. La base era data dalle versioni dei drammi classici curate dal filologo classico Ulrich Wilamowitz von Moellendorff, all'epoca ordinario all'università di Berlino, e all'iniziativa aderirono attivamente molti giovani attori di spicco della scena berlinese (tra gli altri Louise Dumont, Friedrich Kayssler e Max Reinhardt). In alcune vibranti pagine delle sue memorie Wilamowitz rammenta l'atmosfera di quelle messinscene e in particolare la consulenza che diede a Oberländer per l'*Orestea* al Theater des Westens nel 1900 rivendicando con orgoglio di aver contribuito a far conoscere Eschilo ad un pubblico più ampio di quello degli studiosi.⁹ Tra i drammi portati in scena dall'*Akademischer Verein für Kunst und Litteratur* Wilamowitz ricorda l'*Orestea*, l'*Edipo re*, l'*Ippolito* e la *Medea*, senza nominare l'*Antigone*, forse perché non si basava su una sua traduzione.¹⁰

A Hofmannsthal, considerato in quegli anni l'*enfant prodige* della moderna letteratura in lingua tedesca, fu chiesto di scrivere una serie di brevi 'prologhi' da rappresentare prima di ciascuna messinscena della tragedia. Sappiamo che il poeta viennese progettò dapprima un *Prolog zu König Oedipus*, ma da quanto risulta non andò mai oltre il frontespizio concepito a Vienna nel gennaio 1900.¹¹ Ma col soggiorno parigino, iniziato il 10 febbraio e pro-

9 Wilamowitz 1929: 254-5. = Wilamowitz 1986: 315-17. La rappresentazione dell'*Edipo re* fu preceduta da una lezione di Wilamowitz sul tema "La rappresentabilità dell'antica tragedia greca". Cf. Flashar 1991: 112. In generale su Wilamowitz traduttore di tragedie cf. Flashar 1985; sull'attività dell'*Akademischer Verein für Kunst und Litteratur* berlinese cf. Flashar 1991: 110-26 e Ward 2002: 54-5.

10 Per l'*Antigone* fu utilizzata la traduzione di Franz Bader, un docente di liceo, non si sa se su indicazione dello stesso Wilamowitz. Cf. Flashar 1991: 113. Bader aveva pubblicato quattro anni prima la sua traduzione tedesca dell'*Antigone* e di altre tragedie sofoclee (Sofocle 1896).

11 Hübner-Pott-Michel 1982: 722; Ward 2002: 70. In generale sulla forma drammatica del "prologo", tanto congeniale a Hofmannsthal negli anni gio-

trattosi per circa tre mesi, ritrovò l'energia creativa che gli consentì di scrivere in pochi giorni il testo del *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles* e di inviarlo agli amici dell'*Akademischer Verein für Kunst und Litteratur*. Il 28 marzo 1990 vennero dunque rappresentati sul palcoscenico del Lessingtheater di Berlino dapprima il prologo di Hofmannsthal e quindi l'*Antigone* sofoclea. Tra gli interpreti vanno ricordati i nomi di Louise Dumont nei panni di Antigone, di Max Reinhardt in quelli di Tiresia e di Albert Heine (che in seguito diverrà direttore del Burgtheater di Vienna) in quelli di Creonte. Se quell'*Antigone* berlinese fu salutata dal pubblico e dalla critica come un grande successo, lo stesso non si può dire del *Vorspiel* di Hofmannsthal: le recensioni lo stroncarono pesantemente con il rimprovero di scarsa comprensibilità e nessuna pertinenza col testo sofocleo.¹²

In effetti la struttura e il contenuto del *Vorspiel* di Hofmannsthal hanno ben poco a che fare con la trama dell'*Antigone* di Sofocle; non si presenta come un rifacimento del modello greco, e neppure funge da riepilogo degli antefatti o precisazione delle circostanze dell'azione, come accadeva alle volte nei prologhi del teatro greco antico. La vicenda rappresentata nel breve *Vorspiel* – in tutto 204 versi pentametri giambici senza rima, secondo uno degli schemi metrici più comuni all'epoca per rendere la prosodia greca antica – si configura fin da principio come classico esempio di testo metateatrale, un apologo sul senso profondo del fare teatro e sulle origini greche della drammaturgia moderna. Finite le prove per la messinscena di una tragedia greca (non viene detto quale, ma si tratta ovviamente dell'*Antigone* di Sofocle, come si deduce anche dall'indicazione iniziale secondo cui sullo sfondo è rappresentato il palazzo di Creonte), uno studente-attore di nome Wilhelm (da leggere come tributo al Meister goethiano e alla sua "missione teatrale"),¹³ nonostante i richiami del collega Heinrich ad affrettarsi verso l'uscita, si attarda sul palcoscenico, catturato dai

vanili, e sulle ragioni estetiche di tale predilezione cf. la dettagliata analisi di Vogel 1993.

12 Cf. la ricostruzione delle critiche sulla stampa in Flashar 1991: 341-2n.19.

13 Per i numerosi richiami espliciti e impliciti a Goethe presenti nel testo del *Vorspiel* cf. Vogel 1992: 175n20 e soprattutto l'accurata analisi di Castellari 2006: 95-8.

movimenti di una figura nella penombra: non una persona in carne ed ossa, bensì una figura evanescente ed eterea, un “fantasma notturno”.¹⁴

Il dialogo che si sviluppa nei versi seguenti mette di fronte il giovane studente appassionato di teatro e il “Genio” della tragedia, che si presenta con un lunga veste ondeggiante e una maschera sul volto, elementi che il ragazzo riconosce immediatamente come appartenere all’antico e rimandare a un passato lontano nel tempo: “I Greci, quanto sono lontani da noi; eppure / lei indossa quella veste come se fosse sua”.¹⁵ Nel corso della conversazione la misteriosa figura svela allo studente il ‘mistero’ della tragedia greca, l’arcano della potente forza attrattiva che essa ha esercitato per secoli e che continua ad esercitare. Si tratta di una visione del teatro come evento che vive al di fuori delle contingenze temporali e grazie al quale si manifesta allo spettatore una verità più profonda di quella che si percepisce sulla superficie del reale. Mentre il Genio parla, cominciano a dissolversi i confini tra realtà e sogno, il palcoscenico diventa un mondo onirico *sui generis* dove le dimensioni del tempo e dello spazio restano come sospese.

Caratterizzato esteriormente come un *angelos* del teatro greco (bastone, mantello), e consapevole di esser stato inviato dagli dèi (“I sempiterni mi mandano da te / con un messaggio bello”),¹⁶ il Genio rappresenta una tipica figura letteraria di mediatore,¹⁷ nella fattispecie tra antico e moderno: non agisce attraverso un procedimento dialettico di scambio d’opinioni, bensì costringe il giovane Wilhelm a ‘vedere’ immagini del mondo antico, a percepire su di sé quel miscuglio di orrore, meraviglia e terrore che genera il teatro, fino alla capitolazione di fronte alla forza arcaica della tra-

14 “eine Nachtgestalt” (Hofmannsthal 1982: 213). Nel testo il personaggio è definito ripetutamente anche come “geträumtes Phantom” (213) e come “Schönes Gespenst” (215). I passi di Hofmannsthal sono citati dalla traduzione di Gherardo Ugolini pubblicata nella seconda parte di questo saggio.

15 “Die Griechen, sie sind doch recht fern – doch Sie, / Sie tragen dies Gewand als wärs das Ihre” (Hofmannsthal 1982: 213).

16 “Die ewig leben, senden mich an dich / mit einer schönen Botschaft” (Hofmannsthal 1982: 214).

17 Cf. Schmidt-Dengler 1974: 160-3.

gedia greca. Il Genio rende possibile l'approccio e la comprensione alla tragedia greca, la partecipazione a una cosa "spaventosa" ("an etwas Furchtbarem"),¹⁸ mediando tra lo spazio 'autentico' del teatro e quello esterno del mondo moderno, della "febbrile realtà", fatto di strade cittadine trafficate, di viadotti sui quali "rombano i treni che corrono / verso la campagna nell'aria solforosa".¹⁹ In altre parole il Genio persuade lo studente del fatto che il teatro non è, come lui credeva, il palcoscenico dove si rappresentano illusioni staccate dalla realtà vera della vita quotidiana. Viceversa, il teatro è il luogo in cui si disvela allo spettatore capace di 'vedere' una verità superiore e più profonda, ben lontana dall'hic et nunc contingente. Le 'visioni' evocate dal genio, dei veri e propri "incantesimi ipnotici"²⁰ riguardano alcuni episodi della saga labdacide con allusione all'autoaccecamento compiuto da Edipo dopo la scoperta della propria vera identità ("Nello specchio opaco della tua anima / Hai colto l'occhio terribile del re Edipo, / l'occhio roteante, l'abisso dell'accecamento, / e poi sanguinante e spento")²¹ e soprattutto alla figura di Antigone, di cui Hofmannsthal sottolinea non solo la ferma determinazione nell'andare incontro alla morte sicura pur di compiere la missione che s'è data, ma anche l'aspetto della 'sorellanza'. Il Genio la introduce usando l'espressione "l'ombra dell'anima più sororale di tutte" ("der schwesterlichsten Seele Schattenbild"),²² con una significativa citazione diretta di un verso di Goethe²³ e con allusione ad uno dei motivi più caratterizzanti del personaggio nella tragedia sofoclea, ovvero l'assolutizzazione della propria sorellanza, nella fattispecie il legame con il fratello morto Polinice, che vincola la protagonista del dramma a dargli sepoltura nonostante i divieti della città. Si tratta del cosiddetto "cal-

18 "an etwas Furchtbarem" (Hofmannsthal 1982: 218).

19 "auf Viadukten dröhnen Züge hin / durch schwefelfarbne Luft hinaus ins Land" (Hofmannsthal 1982: 214).

20 Cf. Vogel 1993: 176.

21 "und nahmest in der Seele dumpfen Spiegel / des Königs Oedipus furchtbares Auge, / das rollende, voll Abgrund der Verblendung, / und später blutige, gebrochene" (Hofmannsthal 1982: 215).

22 Ibid.

23 Si tratta del v. 135 della lirica *Euphrosyne*, in *Elegien II* (Goethe 1981: 194).

colo” di Antigone, ai vv. 905-12 del testo di Sofocle, in cui l’eroina si dichiara pronta a sacrificarsi per il fratello, mentre non avrebbe fatto lo stesso per un marito o per un figlio.²⁴

Il momento clou dell’iniziazione cui lo studente è sottoposto per opera del Genio è scandito da un rituale magico-sacrale: il Genio alita sul volto del ragazzo e questi, come un iniziato che improvvisamente accede ad una forma superiore di sapienza, sperimenta uno stato di trance estatica nel corso della quale vede scene di un lontano passato archetipico teatrale. Con questa breve didascalia Hofmannsthal presenta il rito dell’alitazione e i sintomi di sconvolgimento che immediatamente si producono:²⁵

Der Student neigt sich der Gestalt, die ihn anhaucht. Dann läuft ein starker Schauer durch seinen Leib. Der Genius ritt von ihm weg und steigt langsam die Stufen zum Palast empor, zweimal sich umblickend. Der Student richtet sich auf. Er ist blaß. Er wirft einen völlig veränderten Blick um sich. Hier bricht die Musik plötzlich ab.

[Lo studente si piega verso la figura che gli alita sopra. Un forte brivido gli attraversa il corpo. Il Genio si allontana da lui e lentamente sale i gradini che portano al palazzo. Per due volte si guarda intorno. Lo studente si rialza. È pallido. Lo sguardo che lancia intorno a sé è completamente diverso da prima. All’improvviso s’interrompe la musica.]

I cinquanta versi seguenti, gli ultimi di questo *Vorspiel*, sono un lungo monologo dello studente recitato sul palco quando il Genio si è ormai involato al di sopra delle quinte fino a sparire dietro la porta del palazzo reale. Ora non c’è più nessuna mediazione, nessuna evocazione negromantica. Lo studente non ‘vede’ soltanto, ma è pienamente partecipe della realtà scenica. Davanti a lui ci sono ‘realmente’ i gradini della reggia labdacide, la dimora del vecchio Laio, il trono di Edipo, il sangue che scivola dalle orbite vuote dei suoi occhi. Sente il miasma mefitico della putrefazione; percepisce il cadavere abbandonato di Polinice “che giace in campo

²⁴ Il passo è molto controverso ma da considerare autentico, nonostante l’auspicio di Goethe che qualche bravo filologo ne riuscisse a dimostrare l’inautenticità (Goethe 1908: 351).

²⁵ Hofmannsthal 1982: 217.

aperto”,²⁶ preda di cani e uccelli. Nello stato di trance suscitato attraverso il rito iniziatico, magicamente dotato di una profondità viviva e conoscitiva superiore, Wilhelm diventa testimone autoptico della verità dell’antico mito tebano. Da ultimo gli compare dinanzi agli occhi la stessa Antigone, principessa fragile, dalle “gracili spalle” (“schlanken Schultern”) e coi “capelli lisci” (“das schlichte Haar”) (ibid.). La delicatezza femminile di Antigone si accompagna alla convinta ed eroica determinatezza con cui avanza fendendo le onde della vita e del destino lungo il cammino che la porterà alla morte, di cui già reca il segno in fronte.²⁷

La musica era improvvisamente cessata nell’atto magico dell’alitazione. Ma dal momento in cui lo studente comincia ad aprire gli occhi sul mistero della tragedia, si sente nuovamente il suono di una musica che – come si evince dalle didascalie del testo – accompagna il monologo fino alla conclusione e scandisce col suo crescendo il passaggio dalla realtà alla dimensione atemporale. Il ritmo diviene sempre più incalzante via via che cresce il desiderio di conoscenza.²⁸ È così che diventa possibile allo studente vedere quello che comunemente lo sguardo umano non può sopportare

26 “dort drüben, wo auf offnem Feld ein Leichnam liegt” (ibid.).

27 “verso di me si muove / il suo piede e la sua veste; sulla fronte / reca i sette segni della morte ormai imminente! / Attraversa una secca. A destra e a sinistra, / la vita si ritira deferente da lei / in onde trasparenti e pietrificate” (“entgegen mir bewegt sich / ihr Fuß und ihr Gewand, auf ihrer Stirn / sind sieben Zeichen des ganz nahen Todes! / Sie geht durch eine Ebbe. Links und rechts / tritt in durchsichtigen erstarrten Wogen / das Leben ehrfürchtig vor ihr zurück!” (Hofmannsthal 1982: 218). Su questa Antigone come prefigurazione dei personaggi femminili dei successivi drammi di Hofmannsthal “capaci di opporre alla razionalità distruttiva del maschile la superiore, ‘notturna’ e sororale saggezza dell’obbedienza alle leggi della natura”: cf. Landolfi 1997 e Landolfi 2016: 30.

28 Sulla funzione della musica in questo *Vorspiel* cf. Schmid 1968: 144-5. Alla fine la musica – indica Hofmannsthal – assume “la forza di un’intera orchestra” fino a diventare “quella dell’ouverture vera propria” (“Die Musik hat die Kraft des vollen Orchesters und ist hier schon in die eigentliche Ouvertüre übergegangen”, Hofmannsthal 1982: 218). L’ouverture eseguita non poteva non essere quella che Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy aveva composto per la messinscena dell’*Antigone* nel 1841 al teatro di corte del Neues Palais di Potsdam (cf. Castellari 2006: 91).

di vedere (“un occhio umano non sopporta il vero”):²⁹ l’eternità di Antigone e del suo mito, così come il mistero del suo costante rivivere sulla scena. E alla fine allo studente-attore divenuto suo malgrado protagonista di un rituale iniziatico (cf. Landolfi 1995: 35), giunto al culmine del disvelamento tragico, non rimane che cedere arrendendosi al “soffio del divino” e abbandonandosi alla forza della musica. Emblematici al proposito i versi finali del *Vorspiel* (Hofmannsthal 1982: 219):

einwühlen muß ich mich in meinen Mantel,
 eh mich die übermäßigen Gesichte
 erdrücken! Denn dem Hauch des Göttlichen
 hält unser Leib nicht Stand, und unser Denken
 schmilzt hin und wird Musik!

[Devo nascondermi nel mio soprabito
 prima che quelle visioni smisurate
 mi soverchino! Sì perché il nostro corpo
 non resiste al soffio del divino, e il nostro pensiero
 si dissolve diventando musica!]

Anche in questo caso il riferimento alla musica non è certo casuale. Laddove la parola non è in grado di comprendere ed esprimere quello scuotimento emotivo che può essere trasmesso attraverso la tragedia, subentra la potenza della musica, la parola si fa musica. Se da un lato qui si può cogliere un’anticipazione dello scetticismo rispetto al potere della parola – un aspetto costitutivo della successiva produzione di Hofmannsthal (Schmidt-Dengler 1974: 161) –, dall’altro è impossibile non vedere un rimando implicito alla *Nascita della tragedia* di Friedrich Nietzsche, dove la musica è considerata come la quintessenza del dionisiaco e dunque del tragico.³⁰

La didascalia che chiude il *Vorspiel* indica il collasso fisico finale di Wilhelm. Troppo ponderoso è il mistero che gli si è disvelato; se il pensiero si dissolve e diventa musica, il corpo non regge la

29 “Ein menschlich Aug erträgt nichts Wirkliches” (Hofmannsthal 1982: 217).

30 Sull’importanza di Nietzsche e soprattutto della *Nascita della tragedia* per il giovane Hofmannsthal cf. Meyer-Wendt 1973, Steffen 1978, Szabó 2006. Oltre al ruolo della musica il tema nietzschiano principale che confluisce nel *Vorspiel* sembra essere la concezione ‘misterica’ della tragedia greca.

fatica di tante visioni e crolla a terra sui gradini di quel palazzo dove Edipo si è cavato gli occhi e dove Antigone s'è immolata eroicamente. Queste le parole della didascalia finale (Hofmannsthal 1982: 219):

Er sinkt, das Gesicht in seinem Mantel verborgen, auf die Stufen des Palastes, Der Vorhang fällt und bleibt unten, bis die Ouvertüre zu Ende gespielt ist.

[Tenendo il volto nascosto nel soprabito crolla sui gradini del palazzo. Cala il sipario e rimane giù fino alla fine dell'ouverture.]

Con una evidente anticipazione del finale dell'*Elektra*, anche qui il protagonista è sopraffatto dalla tensione e crolla sfinito, ripiegandosi su se stesso. In fondo anche Wilhelm, come poi Elektra e altri personaggi del teatro di Hofmannsthal, sperimenta una sua personale dissoluzione identitaria, un'estasi misterico-dionisiaca.

Al di là delle circostanze storiche che stanno all'origine della composizione del *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*, ovvero le innovative rappresentazioni berlinesi promosse dall'*Akademischer Verein für Kunst und Litteratur*, non c'è dubbio che esso possa e debba essere letto come una giovanile dichiarazione di poetica drammaturgica, consistente in una specifica concezione del tragico e delle modalità di rappresentarlo sulla scena moderna che andava contro la tradizione classicistica. Per Hofmannsthal si tratta di rievocare in una dimensione misterica e onirica al tempo stesso le figure del mito antico trasformandole in simboli eterni, in visioni assolute che trapassano i confini della temporalità. Con ciò l'autore sanciva "un rapporto nuovo e diverso con il teatro e, più in generale, con la propria creatività" (Landolfi 2015: 169), al quale si può dire sia rimasto fedele anche nelle successive rielaborazioni di tragedie greche dall'*Elektra* a *Ödipus und die Sphinx*. Inquadrate in questo modo, si capisce come il *Vorspiel* corrispondesse perfettamente allo "spirito delle rappresentazioni berlinesi" (Castellari 2006: 97), a quell'istanza di rinnovare le messinscene di tragedie greche attualizzandone il significato ma senza eccedere in effetti troppo stranianti.

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Alonge, Roberto (ed.) (2008), *Antigone, volti di un enigma. Da Sofocle alle Brigate Rosse*, Bari: Edizioni di Pagina.
- Belardinelli, Anna Maria e Giovanni Greco (eds) (2010), *Antigone e le Antigoni. Storia forme fortuna di un mito*, Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Bohnenkamp, Klaus E. (1976), "Deutsche Antiken-Übertragungen als Grundlage der Griechendramen Hofmannsthals", *Euphorion* 70: 198-202
- (1998) "'...eine aufregende Handlung'. Hugo von Hofmannsthals *Bacchen- und Pentheus-Entwürfe*", *Jahrbuch des freien Deutschen Hochstifts*: 193-230.
- Castellari, Marco (2006), "'Der schwesterlichsten Seele Schattenbild'. Über Hofmannsthals *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*", *Studia Austriaca* 14: 81-99.
- Flashar, Hellmut (1985), *Aufführungen von griechischen Dramen in der Übersetzung von Wilamowitz*, in William Musgrave Calder III, Hellmut Flashar e Theodor Lindken (eds), *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 306-57.
- (1991), *Inszenierung der Antike. Das griechische Drama auf der Bühne der Neuzeit*, München: Beck.
- Fornaro, Sotera (2012), *Antigone. Storia di un mito*, Roma: Carocci.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1908), *Goethes Gespräche mit J.P. Eckermann*, Leipzig: Insel.
- (1981), *Werke. Hamburger Ausgabe*, vol. 1 (*Gedichte und Epen I*), München: Beck.
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von (1900), *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*, in *Die Insel* 8: 230-41.
- (1908), *Vorspiele*, Leipzig: Insel.
- (1937), *Briefe 1900-1909*, Wien: Bermann-Fischer.
- (1967), *Briefe an Marie Herzfeld*, Heidelberg: Stiehm.
- (1980), *Aufzeichnungen aus dem Nachlaß (1889-1929)*, in Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Gesammelte Werke, Reden und Aufsätzen*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, vol. 3, 443.
- (1982), *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*, in Götz Hübner, Klaus-Gerhard Pott e Christoph Michel (eds), *Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Sämtliche Werke*, Kritische Ausgabe, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, vol. 3 (*Dramen* 1), 209-19.
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von e Arthur Schnitzler (1964), *Briefwechsel*, hrsg. von T. Nickl, H. Schnitzler, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Hübner, Götz Eberhard, Klaus-Gerhard Pott e Christoph Michel (1982), *Vorspiel*

- zur *Antigone des Sophokles. Entstehung*, in Götz Hübner, Klaus-Gerhard Pott e Christoph Michel (eds), *Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Sämtliche Werke*, Kritische Ausgabe, vol. 3 (*Dramen* 1), Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 721-7.
- Landolfi, Andrea (1995), *Hofmannsthal e il mito classico*, Roma: Artemide.
- (1997), “Il silenzio dell’*Antigone* di Hofmannsthal”, *Cultura tedesca* 8: 160-4.
- (2015), “Il Prologo all’*Antigone* di Sofocle di Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Storia e traduzione”, in Giovanna Mochi e Roberto Venuti (eds), *Miti della modernità. Scritti per Francesca Balestra*, Roma: Artemide, 167-87.
- (2016), “*Antigona* soror. Hofmannsthal, la classicità e il femminile eroico”, *ACME – Annali della Facoltà di Studi Umanistici dell’Università degli Studi di Milano* 2: 23-31.
- Meyer-Wendt, H. Jürgen (1973), *Der frühe Hofmannsthal und die Gedankenwelt Nietzsches*, Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Molinari, Cesare (1977), *Storia di Antigone da Sofocle al Living Theatre. Un mito nel teatro occidentale*, Bari: Dedalo.
- Schmidt, Martin Erich (1968), *Symbol und Funktion der Musik im Werk Hugo von Hofmannsthals*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Schmidt-Dengler, von Wendelin (1974), “Dichtung und Philologie. Zu Hugo von Hofmannsthals *Alkestis*”, *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 15: 158-77.
- Silva, Maria de Fátima (2017), “*Antigone*”, in R. Lauriola e Kyriakos N. Demetriou (eds), *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Sophocles*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 391-474.
- Sofocle (1827), *Die Tragödien des Sophokles, übersetzt von Georg Thudichum*, vol. 1, Leipzig-Darmstadt: Leske.
- (1896), *Sechs Tragödien von Sophokles in deutscher Nachdichtung von Franz Bader*, Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Steffen, Hans (1978), *Hofmannsthal und Nietzsche*, in Bruno Hillebrandt (ed.), *Nietzsche und die deutsche Literatur. Texte zur Nietzsche-Rezeption 1873-1963*, Tübingen: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag: vol. 2, 4-10.
- Steiner, George (1986), *Antigones. How the Antigone Legend Has Endured in Western Literature, Art, and Thought*, New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Szabó, László von (2006), “... eine so gespannte Seele wie Nietzsche. Zu Hugo von Hofmannsthals Nietzsche-Rezeption”, *Jahrbuch der ungarischen Germanistik*: 69-93.
- Turato, Fabio (2014), *Eredi ingrati. Mondo germanico e tragedia greca tra*

- nascita del II e apocalisse del III Reich (1871-1945)*, Venezia: Marsilio.
- Ugolini, Gherardo (2011), “*Le Baccanti* di Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Un progetto nel segno del dionisiaco nietzscheano” *Dioniso*, n.s. 1: 241-65.
- Vogel, Juliane (1993), “Schattenland des ungelebten Lebens. Zur Kunst des Prologs bei Hugo von Hofmannsthal”, *Hofmannsthal Jahrbuch* 1: 165-81.
- Ward, Philip (2000), “‘Bacchen des Euripides zu erneuern’. The *Pentheus Project* of Hugo von Hofmannsthal”, *Orbis Litterarum* 55: 165-94.
- (2002), *Hofmannsthal and Greek Myth: Expression and Performance*, Oxford, Bern-Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Wilamowitz, Ulrich von Moellendorff (1929), *Erinnerungen 1848-1914* (1928), 2. Ergänzte Auflage, Leipzig: Koehler.
- (1986), *Filologia e memoria*, Napoli: Guida.

Prologo all' *Antigone* di Sofocle*

HUGO VON HOFMANNSTHAL

(Su un palcoscenico teatrale. La scenografia principale – il palazzo di Creonte – è allestita. Gli attori se ne stanno andando. I tecnici spengono le luci.

Il primo e il secondo studente stanno sul proscenio. Il secondo si è già messo l'impermeabile e il cappello in testa. Il primo è a capo scoperto, tiene rovesciato sul braccio un lungo soprabito scuro.)

- SECONDO STUDENTE La prova è finita. Si va. Non vieni?
 PRIMO STUDENTE *(guardando verso lo sfondo che rappresenta la porta del palazzo)*
 Aspetta, voglio vedere che c'è là nel buio.
- SECONDO STUDENTE Ma dove?
 PRIMO STUDENTE Là sulla porta.
 SECONDO STUDENTE Non vedo nessuno.
 PRIMO STUDENTE Nessuno? Ma non la vedi? È molto agile, si va inerpicando su tra le ombre. E la sua veste, non vedi come si muove?
 SECONDO STUDENTE Sì, la vedo. È l'aria che la sospinge.
 PRIMO STUDENTE Ma chi vedi?
 SECONDO STUDENTE Quella veste sospesa nel buio.
 PRIMO STUDENTE Vedi solo una veste? Io vedo di più.
 SECONDO STUDENTE *(con le spalle già rivolte al palcoscenico, mentre anche tutti gli altri se ne sono andati e solo il fondo del palcoscenico è illuminato da una fioca luce)*
 Dai, Wilhelm, vieni!
- PRIMO STUDENTE Arrivo!
(Continua ad indugiare.)
- SECONDO STUDENTE Stanno chiudendo!
(Scompare chiudendo dietro di sé una porta pesante rivestita di ferro. È buio pesto.)

* Traduzione di Gherardo Ugolini, condotta sul testo tedesco pubblicato nell'edizione critica dei *Sämtliche Werke* da Götz Hübner, Klaus-Gerhard Pott e Christoph Michel (Hofmannstal 1982). L'unica versione disponibile in lingua italiana del *Vorspiel zur Antigone des Sophokles*, per quanto ho potuto accertare, è quella di Andrea Landolfi (2015).

- PRIMO STUDENTE Eccomi, arrivo.
(Fa per andarsene. Il Genio esce fuori dal portone del palazzo e scende piano piano i gradini. Indossa una veste ondeggiante e una maschera tragica sul volto. Lo avvolge una luce brillante, color latte.)
- PRIMO STUDENTE *(Fuori di sé)* Heinrich, sta venendo fuori!
 Heinrich, sta guardando verso di me!
(Poi sottovoce cercando di calmarsi da solo e sorridendo.)
 Che attrice!
(Il Genio si ferma davanti a lui. Porta dei bei bracciali sulle braccia nude; nella mano destra tiene un lungo bastone come usano i messaggeri.)
- STUDENTE Signorina, sono stato assai ridicolo a farmi spaventare da lei. Il fatto è che le prove sono finite, e così inaspettatamente...
(Si blocca, sorride imbarazzato, cambia tono.)
 Io sono un novellino anche in questo mondo dove il giorno segue alla notte, la caverna al palazzo,
 e una creatura artefatta segue all'altra.
(Si blocca di nuovo sotto lo sguardo misterioso che gli si punta contro. Fa un passo indietro e parla con una vivacità forzata.)
 Eccita enormemente la fantasia:
 anche il più insignificante ha un che di misterioso e finisce che un po' ce lo portiamo anche fuori.
(S'interrompe nuovamente, poi si fa forza e riesce ad andare avanti.)
 I Greci, quanto sono lontani da noi; eppure lei indossa quella veste come se fosse sua.
 Sì, lei qui tra le finzioni è a casa sua.
 E il mistero la circonda e l'alimenta.
 Quant'è invidiabile tutto ciò!
(Dopo un momento di silenzio assoluto, avvicinandosi alla figura con artificiosa spensieratezza.)
 Bellissima maschera, i tuoi occhi brillano!
 Non parlare! Non ancora! Il momento è prezioso!

L'abito più bello della bellezza è il mistero:
 voi dovrete stare sempre solo mascherati,
 e il vostro volto restare sempre nascosto
 e offrirsi solo allo sguardo di chi già vi ama.
 Ma la tua mano dammela. Le mani parlano!
*(Nel toccare la mano si ritrae tutto pallido e
 tremante.)*

Ah! Tu non sei una donna! Non sei un esse-
 re umano!

Tu sei la terribile presenza di qualcosa
 che subito fa raggrinzire la mia pelle.
 Perché mi deve capitare questo? *(A voce
 molto alta.)*

Com'è possibile, se io sono qui, che lei sia di
 là?

(Bisbigliando) È soltanto un sogno. Qui alla
 destra del mio letto

c'è il mio orologio, e là c'è la finestra, dove
 se no?

Un panno bianco si agita dalla parete
 e io l'ho preso per un fantasma notturno
 avvicinatosi qui da me. Dov'è il mio letto?
 È un'immagine così nitida che credo di
 sentire

come le sue mani toccano il bastone.

Non ho il coraggio neppure di dare uno sguardo.
 Fantasma, frutto dei miei sogni, cosa vuoi,
 fantasma?

GENIO
 STUDENTE

Con quale nome mi chiami?

O creatura emersa fuori da non so dove,
 la cui presenza mi raggela e m'ossessiona!
 Viandante alle cui suole non s'attacca polvere!
 Lo so, mi sveglierò, giacerò per terra da solo
 accanto al letto, dirò che non è stato niente!
 Però dammi un'informazione, dammi un segnale!
 Mi soverchia la dolcezza di questa follia!

GENIO
 STUDENTE

I sempiterni mi mandano da te
 con un messaggio bello.

La tua voce
 – io ci parlo! – è bella. Il messaggio che porti,

qualunque esso sia, dev'essere bello,
 perché la tua voce è rigonfia di letizia
 come la vela di una barca lontana nel cielo,
 con dentro amanti dimentichi del mondo.
 Benedetto è il vibrare della tua voce,
 così come una magnifica giornata d'autun-
 no, che i vecchi
 camminando lungo i muri in mezzo alle viti,
 con mano fredda e sguardo puro benedicono.
 Tutto ciò l'ho già sognato una volta.
 Ma non era così bello.

GENIO

(Battendo il bastone per terra.) Non stai sognando:
 ecco il messaggio che ti porto.

STUDENTE

Devi credermi per poterlo capire.

GENIO

Crederti? Ma chi sei tu?

STUDENTE

E tu chi sei?

Io? Io? Ma io sono qui e sono vero.

Questo è il palcoscenico; prima abbiamo provato
 una tragedia greca. Quelli che escono
 e chiudono le porte, sono i miei colleghi.

Fuori c'è la città con tante strade:
 sui viadotti rombano i treni che corrono
 verso la campagna nell'aria solforosa;
 là ci sono boschi e talvolta ci andiamo.

Ma qui e là ci circondano sempre
 destino e febbrile realtà,
 e nulla è vuoto. Come hai trovato lo spazio
 per approdare qui dal tuo Aldilà?

Chi ti ha scavato con le mani questo varco
 nell'aria viva? Cosa vuoi qui?

GENIO

I sempiterni mi mandano da te
 con il loro messaggio.

STUDENTE

Tu sei un fantasma,
 ti ha covato questo luogo qui, questa luce
 incerta, le pareti ingannevoli,
 le legioni di sogni che qui s'annidano.
 Bel fantasma, tu non sei altro che il parto
 di una casa stravagante: qui miserevoli
 sogni e sogni sublimi si danno
 appuntamento a vicenda.

GENIO

Eppure tu stesso torni volentieri qui,
e ogni volta rimesti destini terribili
tirando l'orlo del mantello.
Nello specchio opaco della tua anima
Hai colto l'occhio terribile del re Edipo,
l'occhio roteante, l'abisso dell'accecamento,
e poi sanguinante e spento.
E ci torni di nuovo e premi
per vedere l'ombra dell'anima più sororale
di tutte:

qui lei uscirà fuori verso di te,
Antigone, e come parlerà
e offrirà il suo corpo alla morte
con passo sacro e fermo, allora
la sua forza d'animo dalle sue labbra
volerà verso di te e legherà la tua anima
alle sue catene, così che essa, nuda
come la schiava che segue il carro del vincitore,
ti seguirà e dirà: "Doveva succedere.
Così voglio agire e così voglio dover morire.
Qui è la realtà, e tutto il resto
non è che metafora, un gioco di specchi".

STUDENTE

Mi pare che potrebbe essere così; tuttavia
vedo tutto

GENIO

come immerso tra i vapori e non si ferma!
Accoglilo e basta. Non ti si offre nulla di
stabile.
Come fa il gabbiano sulla cresta delle onde,
così la tua mente deve posarsi su ciò che
sfugge.
Il suo trono è trasparente e traballante.
Accoglilo! Non essere ottuso! Lasciati scuotere!
Da vette che fioriscono eternamente al sole,
sono stata mandata giù da te con un messaggio.
La sublime ombra di Antigone io precedo
nell'ora della morte che si rinnova,
e diffondo deferenza intorno a me.
Con forti mani scuoto l'aria e la fermo
così che potente si depositi, invisibile grem-
bo del destino,

disperdendo la nebbia dell'ottusa volgarità. Se anche a migliaia si affollano, solitudine assoluta io infondo dentro ogni cuore, freno l'inquietudine, ordino al tempo di arrestarsi. (*Batte fragorosamente il bastone per terra.*)

Quello che qui succede non è soggetto a lui. (*A questo punto inizia una musica sommessa che accompagna il dialogo.*)

STUDENTE

Emani forza e audacia. Eppure una maschera ti copre il volto e mi impedisce di vederlo. Come crederti?

Ambigua risulta una visione così velata: la maschera che porti è meravigliosa, ma la tua natura mi sembra valere di più, molto di più! (*Estasiato*)

Oh se potessi cogliere tutto, come vorrei davvero! (*Stanco e scoraggiato arretra di nuovo.*)

La tua vista alimenta di nuovo soltanto fantasticherie.

GENIO

Ti ho parlato e tu hai intuito, hai intuito bene. Non palpitare alla ricerca di un'altra rivelazione!

Ti ho scosso, che t'importa del come?

Io ti ho chiamato, ti ho agitato, io sono!

Ma la maschera non deve turbarti:

le persone più care portano

davanti a te una maschera sul volto:

un occhio umano non sopporta il vero.

Mascherato io sto di fronte a te,

messaggero di un'ombra. Credi in me?

STUDENTE

Vorrei credere. (*A questo punto la musica va in crescendo.*)

GENIO

Allora alito sui tuoi occhi.

(*Lo studente si piega verso la figura che gli alita sopra. Un forte brivido gli attraversa il corpo. Il Genio si allontana da lui e lentamente sale i gradini che portano al palazzo. Per due volte si guarda intorno. Lo studente*

si rialza. È pallido. Lo sguardo che lancia intorno a sé è completamente diverso da prima. All'improvviso s'interrompe la musica.)

STUDENTE

Quei gradini sono tremendi! Là sedeva Edipo e dalle sue labbra fuoriusciva la maledizione e sangue da entrambi gli occhi! (*Volge lo sguardo verso l'alto.*)

Era pesante il tetto sotto cui vissero, già il vecchio Laio! Il sole a picco, il cielo duro e scintillante come metallo. Vorrei trascinar via da qui il mio corpo! Il sole abbagliante è come inchiodato Su questa porta e niente mi rimane nascosto! Dentro e fuori devo vedere e sapere. Un soffio d'aria greve e fievole spira su di me,

Reca odore di polvere e il fumo cattivo della putrefazione. Viene da là. (*Si guarda intorno timoroso.*)

Laggiù dove giace un cadavere in campo aperto.

Se almeno si alzasse un forte vento e la polvere lo coprisse tutto, quel corpo.

Lì giace. Se si potesse bere una pozione e dimenticarsi di tutto questo!

Sento che dentro casa c'è qualcuno che si muove.

GENIO

Tu, non puoi aiutarci? Non puoi impedire nulla? (*Fa cenno di no e sparisce nella porta del palazzo.*)

STUDENTE

(*Chiamandolo a gran voce.*) A quale ufficio mi hai consacrato?

Come hai potuto aprirmi i pori?

In che genere di creatura visionaria mi hai trasformato?

Perché devo essere partecipe della cosa spaventosa che ora accadrà?

Il mio sguardo ondeggia attraverso quei muri spessi,

come si trattasse di acqua; e io vedo la vergine

Antigone, la coppa luccicante
del destino.

(A questo punto la musica ricomincia e diventa sempre più forte.)

Vedo le sue gracili spalle,
i capelli lisci; verso di me si muove
il suo piede e la sua veste; sulla fronte
reca i sette segni della morte ormai imminente!
Attraversa una secca. A destra e a sinistra,
la vita si ritira deferente da lei
in onde trasparenti e pietrificate.

(Gli sembra di vedere l'immagine che veramente gli viene incontro uscendo dall'oscurità del palazzo. Il soprabito scuro svolazza come una nuvola attorno al suo corpo sconvolto. La musica ora ha la forza di un'intera orchestra ed è già quella dell'ouverture vera propria.)

Questa splendida creatura non è di nessun
tempo!

Ha vinto una volta e continua sempre a vincere.
Come la vedo, la mia pelle s'increspa
come la stoppa sotto la vampa del fuoco.
Si ridesta in me ciò che in me è imperituro:
L'essenza più profonda erompe dalle creature
e intorno a me rotea sfavillante.
Sono vicino all'anima sororale,
molto vicino; il tempo è sprofondato e dagli
abissi

della vita sono stati sollevati i veli.

Devo nascondermi nel mio soprabito
prima che quelle visioni smisurate
mi soverchino! Sì perché il nostro corpo
non resiste al soffio del divino, e il nostro
pensiero
si dissolve diventando musica!

(Tenendo il volto nascosto nel soprabito crolla sui gradini del palazzo. Cala il sipario e rimane giù fino alla fine dell'ouverture.)

Fascism on Stage?

Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* (1944)

DOUGLAS CAIRNS

Abstract

Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* has divided audiences since its first performance in 1944. For some, Anouilh's play presented an occasion for celebrating the Resistance, but the initial production's sole review in the underground press was deeply hostile, by contrast with many positive reviews in the collaborationist press. The latter support an interpretation in which Creon's necessary maintenance of order is balanced by the 'purity' and 'grandeur' of Antigone's defiance, keywords of a movement that has been labelled 'aesthetic fascism'. The play's nihilism, however, encompasses not only Antigone's apparently gratuitous and pointless death, but also the sordid cynicism of Creon's brutal regime. The central confrontation in which Creon attempts to save his niece is a contest of strength in which he is the loser, an outcome which demonstrates both the limits of power and the possibility of resistance. Though Antigone comes to doubt her decision at the very last moment, Creon's own last words pay tribute to her victory. An unequivocally collaborationist reading is as impossible as an unequivocally pro-Resistance one. And if Antigone's stance can be seen in the context of 'aesthetic fascism', there is in the play little comfort for actual fascism as a historical political movement.

Jean Anouilh's *Antigone* premiered on 4 February 1944 at the Théâtre de l'Atelier, Paris. The production ran until the liberation of Paris, and was in fact the first production to be mounted when the theatre reopened after the liberation on 27 September 1944. Now widely acclaimed, the production continued into 1945 and was revived for several further seasons (in 1947, 1949, 1950, and 1953). It was performed in translation in New York in 1946 and at the London Old Vic in 1949, in a celebrated production in which Vivien Leigh played Antigone and Lawrence Olivier the Prologue/Chorus (see Freeman in Anouilh 2000: xlvi-lii; Fleming 2008: 166; Flashar 2009: 173). Thus in Paris in 1944, prior to the city's liberation and as the allies planned the invasion of France

for June of that year, there were no fewer than three *Antigones* in the city's theatres: Arthur Honegger's operatic version (which developed from his music for Cocteau's 1922 adaptation),¹ Anouilh's, and the first attested stage production of Robert Garnier's 1580 *Antigone, ou la piété*.² Anouilh's play had been completed and approved for staging by the censors in 1942, but its production was delayed, and so Honegger's version beat Anouilh's to the stage (Flashar 2009: 172). Anouilh was well aware of the potential of *Antigone* as a symbol for the Resistance, whose initial attacks in the summer of 1941 had elicited a series of reprisals from the occupying Nazis; he himself later described the period as "the time of *Antigone*".³ By 1944, the risk of subversive, anti-authoritarian responses to the production was one that concerned the German authorities (Flashar 2009: 172). For some audiences and critics, both before and after the liberation, Anouilh's play did indeed present an occasion for celebrating the Resistance (Witt 2001: 220-1, 228; cf. Freeman in Anouilh 2000: xlvi-xlviii; Fulcher 2006: 287). This understanding gained ground after the war, and became for many years the standard interpretation.⁴ At the same time, however, the initial production's sole review in the underground press was deeply hostile, taking the play's nihilism as tantamount to connivance with fascism;⁵ and in fact the play was extremely popular in collaborationist, fascist, and pro-German circles, receiving many positive reviews in the collaborationist press.⁶

1 See Cairns 2016: 133-4, with further references to scholarly discussions.

2 On which see Steiner 1984: 139-41. Garnier's play was adapted by the right-wing nationalist, Thierry Maulnier, and presented at the Théâtre Charles de Rochefort in May 1944: see Steiner 1984: 143; Witt 2001: 219.

3 Anouilh, letter to M. Flügge, 15 May 1979, in Flügge 1982: 2.44: "nous vivions au temps d'*Antigone*."

4 For the roots of this interpretation and its debunking, see especially Flügge 1982; cf. Witt 2001: 228; Fleming, 2008: 167-9; Flashar 2009: 168, 171, 173.

5 Claude Roy, *Les Lettres françaises* 14, March 1944, in Flügge 1982: 2.70-2; cf. Witt 2001: 228; Fulcher 2006: 287; Fleming 2008: 168. Both Witt and Fleming also cite similar responses in post-liberation criticism.

6 There is an exhaustive collection of contemporary reviews, together with comprehensive analysis of the play's historical contexts and later receptions, in Flügge 1982; for the reviews in particular, see 2.47-72. In English, see Witt 2001: 227-8; Fleming 2008: 168, 180-1; cf. Freeman in Anouilh 2000:

Both pro- and anti-Resistance interpretations typically see Anouilh's *Antigone* as a symbol of the Resistance and Creon as representing the Vichy regime of Marshal Pétain (or his head of government, Pierre Laval).⁷ Such straightforwardly allegorizing approaches do find their place in contemporary reviews; yet, especially among collaborationist and pro-fascist responses, a more complex interpretation emerges, in which Creon's necessary maintenance of order is balanced by the 'purity' and 'grandeur' of Antigone's defiance.⁸ Witt and Fleming have traced these and similar terms as keywords of a movement that Witt calls 'aesthetic fascism'; according to them, whether or not Anouilh's *Antigone* offers an apology for Vichy collaboration (and they are both inclined, at least to some extent, to believe that it does),⁹ it manifests a more abstract, less directly 'political' form of fascism that celebrates purity, sacrifice, and the beauty of suffering by contrast with the mediocrity of bourgeois contentment, conformity, and the compromises of politics.¹⁰

One of the early champions of the 'purity' manifested by Anouilh's *Antigone* was Robert Brasillach, a fascist writer and intellectual executed on 6 February 1945.¹¹ Anouilh, for his part, was not politically active (before or after the war), but he did continue to write under the German occupation, and his work was published in the collaborationist press.¹² His one major foray into active politics was a failed campaign to secure clemency for

xlvi.

7 See Freeman, in Anouilh 2000: xlvii-xlviii; Flashar 2009: 170; Guérin 2009, §§ 14-17; cf. and contrast Witt 2001: 218, 221n7, 226; Fleming 2008: 181-2. Witt and Fleming accept this characterization of Creon, but regard Antigone as, in one sense or another, 'fascist'. See also Deppman 2012: 523-4 (though this is, in general, a much more nuanced, open reading of the play).

8 See the responses cited in Witt 2001: 227-8; Fleming 2008: 181.

9 See especially Witt 2001: 226 (contrast 229); Fleming 2008: 182.

10 If Lacan's reference to Anouilh's 'little fascist Antigone' (1992: 250) is anything more than a glib sneer, this is perhaps its point. Lacan's own Antigone, whose beauty lies in her gratuitous pursuit of her desire for death, in fact has much in common with Anouilh's.

11 See Witt 2001: 227-8; Fleming 2008: 181. Cf. Witt 2001: 148-69, 185, 217-21 on similar themes in Brasillach's writings.

12 See Fulcher 2006: 286; Fleming 2008: 181.

Brasillach, whom he would later represent as an Antigone figure whose integrity was preserved in death; it is the Creon figure, who pronounces the death sentence, who “always plays a losing game”.¹³ This is a revealing comment; but its retrospective application to Anouilh’s *Antigone* is not straightforward.

It is time to discuss the play itself. At its core, it is close to the Sophoclean original: from the Guard’s report to the departure of Haemon, Anouilh follows the Sophoclean sequence fairly closely; Antigone’s final scene becomes a dialogue with Jonas, one of Anouilh’s three Guards, in which she dictates a farewell letter to Haemon, but even this scene, with Antigone’s doubts, hesitations, and second thoughts, has its roots in Sophocles; as if to underline its relation of similarity and difference with the original, Anouilh has Antigone quote Sophocles’ lines 891-2, “O tombeau! O lit nuptial! O ma demeure souterraine!”¹⁴ Following Antigone’s departure, Anouilh’s play proceeds as in Sophocles: a Messenger reports Antigone’s suicide, the confrontation between Haemon and Creon, and Haemon’s own suicide, united with Antigone in death. The Chorus (in this version, a single character who has also delivered the play’s Prologue) then reports the suicide of Eurydice (1946: 119-21 = 2000: 58-9). Creon is then left alone; but where in Sophocles he is left to contemplate the fulfilment of Tiresias’ warning, that he has brought on himself a disaster that mirrors the punishments he sought to impose on Polynices and Antigone, in Anouilh he carries on with his duties as head of state, leaving with his Page for a meeting of the Privy Council (1946: 122 = 2000: 60). Because Tiresias has been omitted, Creon’s presence at Antigone’s

13 “L’homme à la sentence, croyant le supprimer, l’a préservé. Quels que soient les mots dont il se grise, Créon joue toujours perdant” (“The man with the sentence, thinking to suppress him, has preserved him. Whatever the words he gets drunk on, Creon always plays a losing game”), Anouilh in Brasillach 1963-6: 4.xii, quoted in English in Witt 2001: 230. On Anouilh’s campaign for Brasillach’s reprieve, cf. Freeman, in Anouilh 2000: ix, xlvii.

14 Anouilh 1946: 111. Translated (Anouilh 2000: 55) as “Hail, then, my grave, my marriage bed, my underground home!” Since Anouilh’s play has neither line numbers nor Act/Scene divisions, references to the 1946 original and to Barbara Bray’s 2000 translation are by page number. Henceforth references in the form ‘1946: 111’ and ‘2000: 55’ refer to Anouilh’s play.

tomb is not due to his desire to rescue her and avoid the disaster against which Tiresias had warned; rather, he is leaving after having Antigone walled up alive when he hears Haemon's voice from within the tomb (1946: 118 = 2000: 58). In Anouilh's play, Creon's attempt to save Antigone comes earlier, in the confrontation between the two that is the centre of Anouilh's play and Sophocles'.

But Antigone cannot be saved – this is a given of the plot as dramatized by Sophocles and an aspect of Anouilh's own plot that is highlighted throughout by the play's self-referential metatheatricity. The tone is set by the Prologue/Chorus at the outset; as the curtain rises, “all the characters are onstage” – the stage direction informs us – “chatting, knitting, playing cards, and so on” (2000: 3).¹⁵ The Prologue then introduces the characters, even before they take up their roles – the girl who will soon be Antigone, “thinking she is going to die . . . though she's still young, and like everyone else would have preferred to live”,¹⁶ Ismene, Haemon, Creon (“playing a difficult game” now that he is “a leader of men”, “forsaking his books and his collector's pieces”, 2000: 4),¹⁷ the Nurse, Eurydice, the Messenger, and the Guards. The roles of the characters are also their fates, as we see clearly in the case of Antigone (1946: 9-10= 2000: 3):

Mais il n'y a rien à faire. Elle s'appelle Antigone et il va falloir qu'elle joue son rôle jusqu'au bout.

[But there's nothing to be done. Her name is Antigone, and she's going to have to play her part right through to the end.]

This perspective recurs throughout. After the Guard's an-

15 “Au lever du rideau, tous les personnages sont en scène. Ils bavardent, tricotent, jouent aux cartes” (Anouilh 1946: 9).

16 “Elle pense qu'elle va mourir, qu'elle est jeune et qu'elle aussi, elle aurait bien aimé vivre” (1946: 9).

17 “Cet homme robuste, aux cheveux blancs, qui médite là, près de son page, c'est Créon. C'est le roi. Il a des rides, il est fatigué. Il joue au jeu difficile de conduire les hommes. Avant, du temps d'Œdipe, quand il n'était que le premier personnage de la cour, il aimait la musique, les belles reliures, les longues flâneries chez les petits antiquaires de Thèbes. Mais Œdipe et ses fils sont morts. Il a laissé ses livres, ses objets, il a retroussé ses manches et il a pris leur place” (1946: 11).

nouncement of the first attempt to bury the body, the Prologue reappears as the Chorus, with reflections on the differences between tragedy and ‘drama’ or melodrama (1946: 53-4 = 2000: 25-6). Where the latter has heroes and villains and a sense of contingency, that catastrophe might just be avoided, tragedy is a genre in which the tale unfolds “all of itself”; it “does itself. Like clockwork set going since the beginning of time.” In tragedy, all are innocent: “It doesn’t matter if one person kills and the other is killed – it’s just a matter of casting”.¹⁸

Dans le drame, on se débat parce qu’on espère en sortir. C’est ignoble, c’est utilitaire. Là, c’est gratuit. C’est pour les rois. Et il n’y a plus rien à tenter, enfin!

[In drama you struggle, because you hope you’re going to survive. It’s utilitarian – sordid. But tragedy is gratuitous. Pointless, irremediable. Fit for a king! (1946: 54-5 = 2000: 26)]

Immediately, Antigone is led in by the Guards. The Chorus observes (1946: 55 = 2000: 26):

Alors, voilà, cela commence. La petite Antigone est prise. La petite Antigone va pouvoir être elle-même pour la première fois.

[Now it’s beginning. Little Antigone has been caught – and handcuffed. She can be herself at last.]

Just so, when Antigone is finally led away, the Chorus comments (1946: 117 = 2000: 58):

Là! C’est fini pour Antigone. Maintenant, le tour de Créon approche. Il va falloir qu’ils y passent tous.

[So. It’s all over for Antigone. Soon it will be Creon’s turn. Everyone’s turn will come in the end.]

The characters are similarly aware of their roles, and thus of their fates. “My name’s only Creon, thank God”, says Creon, distinguishing his role in the myth from those of the characters

¹⁸ “Cela n’a plus qu’à se dérouler tout seul. . . . Cela roule tout seul. C’est minutieux, bien huilé depuis toujours. . . . Ce n’est pas parce qu’il y en a un qui tue et l’autre qui est tué. C’est une question de distribution” (1946: 51).

whose names are Oedipus or Antigone (2000: 33).¹⁹ Antigone's role is to "to say no to [Creon] and to die",²⁰ and Creon's to kill her, as both know (1946: 73-4, 78-9, 82-3 = 2000: 36, 38-9, 40-1).

And yet Anouilh toys throughout with these generic expectations. Though the plot does ultimately opt for tragedy, with all its (supposed) inevitability, over the sordidness of melodrama, there is a pronounced element of bourgeois melodrama throughout: Sophocles' opening scene between Antigone and Ismene is transformed into a complex opening sequence in which the House of Labdacus is presented as a typical well-to-do household, in which Ismene's attempt to dissuade Antigone from an act that she has, in fact, already committed is embedded in scenes in which Antigone and her Nurse exhibit a tender mutual concern and Antigone and Haemon their mutual romantic love. (In complete contrast to her Sophoclean counterpart, Anouilh's Antigone, having decided to take on the task of burying her "sweetheart", Polynices,²¹ has even made a ham-fisted attempt to consummate her relationship with her actual sweetheart, Haemon – 1946: 36-44 = 2000: 17-20.) This conventional, domestic milieu – in which Creon had, on taking power, reluctantly to give up his passion for books and antiques (1946: 11 = 2000: 4), Antigone takes the trouble to make sure that there will be someone to look after her dog after she is gone (1946: 33-6 = 2000: 16-17), and Creon expresses what seems to be genuine avuncular concern by reminiscing about presents he had given Antigone in the past (1946: 70 = 2000: 34) – is what Antigone rejects in playing her tragic role to its conclusion.

Yet, even as that conclusion approaches, Anouilh flirts with the generic conventions that the Chorus has attributed to melodrama. Accepting, but also subverting the melodramatic plot of good versus evil ("J'ai le mauvais rôle, c'est entendu, et tu as le bon," 1946: 75 = "I've got the villain's part and you're cast as

19 "Moi, je m'appelle seulement Créon, Dieu merci" (1946: 68).

20 "Je suis là pour vous dire non et pour mourir" (1946: 82).

21 When Antigone returns home from burying Polynices' body, the Nurse assumes that she has a sweetheart (other than Haemon); Antigone at first agrees that, in a way, she does (1946: 16-18 = 2000: 7-9), thus picking up the incest theme that also surfaces in Sophocles' presentation of Antigone's devotion to her brother (Cairns 2016: 104-6).

the heroine,” 2000: 36), Creon makes one last attempt to save Antigone from her fate (1946: 84 = 2000: 41):

Écoute-moi tout de même pour la dernière fois. Mon rôle n’est pas bon, mais c’est mon rôle et je vais te faire tuer. Seulement, avant, je veux que toi aussi tu sois bien sûre du tien. Tu sais pourquoi tu vas mourir, Antigone? Tu sais au bas de quelle histoire sordide tu vas signer pour toujours ton petit nom sanglant?

[Listen to me for the last time. I’m cast as the villain, and I’m going to have you put to death. But before I do I want you to be sure of your role. Do you know why you’re going to die, Antigone? Do you realize what a squalid story it is you’re going to put your poor little bloodstained name to – for ever?]

As in Sophocles, there is a window of opportunity in which Antigone’s death just might have been averted. But whereas in Sophocles that window is quickly closed (when Antigone not only confesses to committing the deed in full knowledge that it was prohibited, but also justifies her decision in a way that forcefully demonstrates her acceptance of death and her contempt for Creon, *Antigone* 441-70), in Anouilh Creon’s attempt to prevent his niece’s death is the main focus of the long central confrontation (which Anouilh develops beyond the length of the Sophoclean original, until it occupies fully one third of the entire play, 1946: 62-99 = 2000: 30-49). That attempt appears to be on the verge of success, when, having spoken the lines quoted immediately above, Creon demonstrates that neither Polynices nor Eteocles was the hero of Antigone’s imagination (1946: 84-90 = 2000: 41-4); both were petty thugs, “common crooks” (2000: 44 = “deux larrons en foire”, 1946: 89), addicted to power and violence, who had tried to murder their father and who were each equally ready “to sell Thebes to the highest bidder” (*ibid.*). Creon had made a hero of one and a villain of the other purely for propaganda purposes – he “couldn’t afford to have a scoundrel in both camps” (2000: 43).²² Even the choice of which body to bury and which to expose had been arbitrary: they were so badly mutilated that it was impossible to tell them apart.

²² “Tu penses que je ne pouvais tout de même pas m’offrir le luxe d’une crapule dans les deux camps” (1946: 88).

Antigone's belief in her cause is shattered, and she makes, as Creon had wanted, to go to her room (1946: 90-1 = 2000: 44-5). This is where Creon makes his fatal error. This is not, as emphasized by Tiresias in Sophocles, the mistake of keeping a corpse in the world of the living and consigning a living person to a tomb, but that of referring to the conventional happiness of marriage and domesticity. Thinking back fondly to his own youthful idealism, and urging Antigone to "get married quickly . . . and be happy" ("Marie-toi vite, Antigone, sois heureuse"), he concludes (1946: 92 = 2000: 45):

la vie c'est un livre qu'on aime, c'est un enfant qui joue à vos pieds, un outil qu'on tient bien dans sa main, un banc pour se reposer le soir devant sa maison. Tu vas me mépriser encore, mais de découvrir cela, tu verras, c'est la consolation dérisoire de vieillir, la vie, ce n'est peut-être tout de même que le bonheur.

[Life's a book you enjoy, a child playing round your feet, a tool that fits into your hand, a bench outside your house to rest on in the evening. (*Pause.*) You'll despise me more than ever for saying this, but finding it out, as you'll see, is some sort of consolation for growing old: life is probably nothing other than happiness.]

But Antigone does think of the future – of compromises and accommodations such as Creon himself has made, of a Haemon who may grow up to be just like his father, of the conformity of saying yes "like the rest" (2000: 46 = "lui aussi", 1946: 93). And she does not want this (1946: 94-5 = 2000: 47):

ANTIGONE Vous me dégoûtez tous avec votre bonheur! Avec votre vie qu'il faut aimer coûte que coûte. On dirait des chiens qui lèchent tout ce qu'ils trouvent. Et cette petite chance pour tous les jours, si on n'est pas trop exigeant. Moi, je veux tout, tout de suite, – et que ce soit entier – ou alors je refuse! Je ne veux pas être modeste, moi, et me contenter d'un petit morceau si j'ai été bien sage. Je veux être sûre de tout aujourd'hui et que cela soit aussi beau que quand j'étais petite – ou mourir.

CRÉON Allez, commence, commence, comme ton père!

ANTIGONE Comme mon père, oui! Nous sommes de ceux qui posent les questions jusqu'au bout. Jusqu'à ce qu'il ne reste vrai-

ment plus la petite chance d'espoir vivante, la plus petite chance d'espoir à étrangler. Nous sommes de ceux qui lui sautent dessus quand ils le rencontrent, votre espoir, votre cher espoir, votre sale espoir!

[ANTIGONE You disgust me, all of you, you and your happiness! And your life, that has to be loved at any price. You're like dogs fawning on everyone they come across. With just a little hope left everyday – if you don't expect too much. But I want everything, now! And to the full! Or else I decline the offer, lock, stock and barrel! I don't want to be sensible, and satisfied with a scrap – if I behave myself! I want to be sure of having everything, now, this very day, and it has to be as wonderful as it was when I was little. Otherwise I prefer to die.

CREON There you go – just like your father!

ANTIGONE Exactly! Neither of us ever stops asking questions! Right up to the moment when there's not a spark of hope left to stifle. We're the sort who jump right on your precious, lousy hope.]

This, she believes, will make her beautiful, like her father, who was beautiful when all hope was gone, but when he could shun the ugliness of conventional happiness (1946: 96 = 2000: 47-8).

As in Sophocles, Antigone resembles her father.²³ Also as in Sophocles, she and Creon have vastly different notions of happiness, of what counts as prosperity or profit.²⁴ And as in Sophocles, Antigone's conception of happiness leads her to choose death over life (1946: 99-100 = 2000: 49-50):

LE CHŒUR Tu es fou, Créon. Qu'as-tu fait?

CRÉON (*qui regarde au loin avant lui*) Il fallait qu'elle meure.

LE CHŒUR Ne laisse pas mourir Antigone, Créon! Nous allons tous porter cette plaie au côté, pendant des siècles.

CRÉON C'est elle qui voulait mourir. Aucun de nous n'était assez fort pour la décider à vivre. Je le comprends maintenant, Antigone

²³ Soph. *Ant.* 379-80, 471-2, 856. Cf. Creon at Anouilh 1946: 68, "L'orgueil d'Œdipe. Tu es l'orgueil d'Œdipe" = 2000: 32-3, "The pride of Oedipus. You're its living image . . ."; 1946: 74, "Orgueilleuse! Petite Œdipe!" = 2000: 33, "Proud Antigone! Pocket Oedipus!"

²⁴ See Cairns 2016: 82-8.

était faite pour être morte. Elle-même ne le savait peut-être pas, mais Polynice n'était qu'un prétexte. Quand elle a dû y renoncer, elle a trouvé autre chose tout de suite. Ce qui importait pour elle, c'était de refuser et de mourir.

LE CHEUR C'est une enfant, Créon.

CRÉON Que veux-tu que je fasse pour elle? La condamner à vivre?

[CHORUS You're mad, Creon. What have you done?

CREON (*staring ahead of him.*) She had to die.

CHORUS Don't let her die, Creon! We'll all bear the scar for thousands of years!

CREON It was her choice. She wanted to die! None of us was strong enough to persuade her to live. I understand now. She was born to die. She may not have known it herself, but Polynices was only an excuse. And when that excuse wouldn't work any more she chose another. All that mattered to her was to refuse everything and to die.

CHORUS She's only a child, Creon.

CREON What do you want me to do? Condemn her to live?]

Antigone's fixation with death is a major theme in Sophocles too, but in Anouilh it has – along with her refusal to grow up and her petulant, child-like insistence on having it all, now – become the ultimate reason for her self-sacrifice.²⁵ Creon, for his part, loses the happiness that all his compromises have sought to preserve, because he did not understand Antigone's motives. Indeed, not even Antigone herself seems fully to understand these, since her final scene in the play shows her, along with the doltish Guard, Jonas, doubting her choice. Dictating (like a Resistance heroine) a letter to be conveyed to Haemon, she reflects (1946: 115 = 2000: 56-7):

Et Créon avait raison, c'est terrible, maintenant, à côté de cet homme, je ne sais plus pourquoi je meurs. J'ai peur . . . Oh! Hémon, notre petit garçon. Je le comprends seulement maintenant combien c'était simple de vivre . . .

[And Creon was right: it's awful, but here, with this man beside

25 On the infantile nihilism of Antigone's rebellion, cf. Genette 1992: 469; Ciani 2000: 14.

me, I don't know any more what I'm dying for . . . I'm afraid . . .
Oh Haemon! It's only now I realize how easy it was to live . . .]

Paradoxically, however, this tribute to Creon's world view is balanced, in the final scene, by Creon's tribute to hers. Unlike Sophocles' Creon, Anouilh's does not engage in extensive lamentation over the loss of his wife and son. Instead, he reflects on the rest that they now enjoy and he does not, as he prepares to carry on with his duties, telling his Page boy (1946: 121 = 2000: 60):

on est là, devant l'ouvrage, on ne peut pourtant pas se croiser les bras. Ils disent que c'est une sale besogne, mais si on ne la fait pas, qui la fera?

[There you are, face to face with what's to be done. You can't just fold your arms and do nothing. They say it's dirty work. But if you don't do it, who will?]

He goes on (1946: 122 = 2000: 60):

CRÉON Il te tarde d'être grand, toi?

PAGE Oh oui, monsieur!

CRÉON Tu es fou, petit. Il faudrait ne jamais devenir grand.

[CREON Are you looking forward to growing up?

PAGE Oh yes!

CREON You're mad, boy. It'd be best never to grow up, either.]

The ancient pessimism, on which Sophocles draws in his play, held that it is best not to be born, or failing that, to die as soon as possible.²⁶ Anouilh's Creon here pays tribute to Antigone's variation on that theme, in which early death avoids the ugliness of growing old. Antigone, at the end, sees the force of Creon's argument, and Creon Antigone's. Perhaps both are right; perhaps neither is.

Antigone believed in her duty to her brother, but was talked out of that belief. In end she dies because, at some level, she has

26 See esp. Soph. *Ant.* 460-70, with (*in primis*) Thgn. 425-8, Bacchyl. 5.160-2, *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 73-4 Rzach, Soph. *OC* 1224-7, Eur. fr. 285.1-2 Kannicht (*Bellerophon*), fr. 908.1 Kannicht, Alexis fr. 145.14-6 K.-A., Arist. fr. 44 Rose (65 Gigon), *AP* 9.359.9-10 (= Posidippus 22 Gow-Page).

to, and because, at least at the crucial point at which her decision matters, she wants to. But by that stage her choice appears to have no positive motivation; it appears arbitrary or, as the Chorus had described it, gratuitous. In the end, she doubts it even as a refusal of the compromises of adulthood; and yet she conceals her doubts and goes through the motions, playing (as the Prologue/Chorus said she would), her part through to the end.²⁷ And thus her death seems pointless. As some in the Resistance pointed out at the time, *Antigone* is no Resistance heroine.²⁸ It seems, on the face of it, that Anouilh has composed a play in which there are no heroes or villains; the play itself, in fact, seems to suggest that to see the world in those terms is a device of bad drama or corrupt politics. There is purchase, too, for the view of Witt and Fleming that *Antigone's* gratuitous and allegedly 'beautiful' self-sacrifice, along with her rejection of conformity (saying yes, as Anouilh repeatedly terms it), compromise, and politics and her preference for the purity of childhood over the adult world of bourgeois happiness, chimes with themes that recur in the writings that represent what Witt calls 'aesthetic fascism'. But if this is the case, we should notice the extent to which this undercuts any interpretation which sees

²⁷ See Freeman, in Anouilh 2000: xlii.

²⁸ Cf. above, n. 5, and esp. Claude Roy's words, in *Les Lettres françaises* 14 (March 1944) 5-6 (quoted in Flügge 1982: 2.71-2 and in translation by Witt 2001: 228 and Fleming 2008: 178): "Et l'Antigone qu'on nous propose n'est pas *notre* Antigone, la seule, la vraie . . . A force de se complaire dans le 'désespoir' et le sentiment de la vanité de tout, de l'inanité et de l'absurdité du monde, on en vient à accepter, souhaiter, acclamer la première poigne venue . . . Quand Créon lui demande pourquoi en fin de compte, elle meurt, elle répond 'Pour moi.' Cette parole sonne lugubrement, dans le même temps où, sur tout le continent, dans le monde entier, des hommes et des femmes meurent, qui mourraient, à la question de Créon, répondre: 'Pour nous . . . pour les hommes.'" [The *Antigone* which [the play] offers us is not *our* Antigone, the only Antigone, the true Antigone . . . By accepting despair and the feeling of the vanity of everything, the inanity and absurdity of the world one ends up by acclaiming . . . the first strong arm that comes along . . . When Creon asks why she insists upon dying she replies, "For myself." This answer resounds morbidly at a time when, as all over Europe, indeed over the entire world, men and women are dying who could, to Creon's question, reply, "For ourselves . . . For mankind."]

in Anouilh's presentation of Creon a justification of or apology for Vichy collaboration. For the world that the supposedly 'fascist' Antigone rejects is a world that her very 'fascism' constructs as a shoddy and sordid one; and Creon is its representative.

Perhaps, however, the meaning of Anouilh's play is less determinate than this approach would suggest. If Antigone abandons her positive ideals, and in the end dies because the alternative, life, involves too many sordid compromises, Creon is the incarnation of those sordid compromises. Unlike Sophocles' Creon, he is given no grand opening speech in which he enunciates the positive civic ideals by which he proposes to govern. Instead, he is from his first entrance characterized by cynicism and driven by expediency, constrained throughout by the need to appease the mob. Thus his first impulse, on hearing of the burial of Polynices' body, is to cover it up (1946: 51-2 = 2000: 24-5), not, at this stage, out of any desire to spare his niece (for he does not yet know that she is the perpetrator), but as a matter of news management, to avoid any impression that resistance to his regime exists. If the news does get out, he threatens, the Guards will be put to death. Accordingly, his command, once the Guards have returned with Antigone in handcuffs, to have them held incommunicado until he has questioned Antigone (1946: 64 = 2000: 31), and his suggestion to Antigone (1946: 64-5 = 2000: 31), that as long as no one knows what she has done, they can simply forget about it, can be attributed to the same motive. His assurance that he will "get rid of those three men" ("Je ferai disparaître ces trois hommes", 1946: 65) if Antigone returns to her room and conceals what she has done is chilling.

The much-touted reasonableness of Creon's position, in the central scene with Antigone, also bears examination. His statement of his principles, such as it is, comes not, as in Sophocles' play, prior to the discovery of the burial, but here, in the *agôn*. Contrasting (in words which echo the second stasimon in Sophocles' original) his own situation with the Labdacids' "private confrontation with destiny and death" ("un tête-à-tête avec le destin et la mort"), he describes himself as "un prince sans histoire" (1946: 68 = "an ordinary king with no fuss", 2000: 33), and continues (1946: 68-9 = 2000: 33):

Moi, je m'appelle seulement Créon, Dieu merci. J'ai mes deux pieds par terre, mes deux mains enfoncées dans mes poches et, puisque je suis roi, j'ai résolu, avec moins d'ambition que ton père, de m'employer tout simplement à rendre l'ordre de ce monde un peu moins absurde, si c'est possible. Ce n'est même pas une aventure, c'est un métier pour tous les jours et pas toujours drôle, comme tous les métiers. Mais puisque je suis là pour le faire, je vais le faire . . .

[My name's only Creon, thank God. I've got both feet on the ground and both hands in my pockets. I'm not so ambitious as your father was, and all I am at now I'm king is to try to see the world's a bit more sensibly run. There's nothing very heroic about it – just an everyday job, and, like the rest of them, not always very amusing. But since that's what I'm here for, that's what I'm going to do.]

He then turns to Antigone, takes her gently by the arm, and, with affectionate, avuncular concern, repeats his suggestion that they forget all about what she has done (1946: 69 = 2000: 34):

Tu vas rentrer chez toi tout de suite, faire ce que je t'ai dit et te taire. Je me charge du silence des autres.

[No you go straight back to your room, do as I told you and say nothing. I'll see that everyone else keeps quiet.]

But Antigone sets off in the opposite direction, straight back to the body. Creon stops her (1946: 70-1 = 2000: 34):

Tu ne comprends donc pas que si quelqu'un d'autre que ces trois bêtes sait tout à l'heure ce que tu as tenté de faire, je serai obligé de te faire mourir? Si tu te tais maintenant, si tu renonces à cette folie, j'ai une chance de te sauver, mais je ne l'aurai plus dans cinq minutes. Le comprends-tu ?

[Don't you realise that if anyone other than those three louts gets to know what you've tried to do, I shall have to have you killed? If you'll only keep quiet now and give up this foolishness there's a chance I may be able to save you. But in five minutes time it will be too late. Do you understand?]

Creon may genuinely wish to save his niece; but he also wants to make sure that her action does not furnish a rallying-point for opponents of his regime. He asks (1946: 73 = 2000: 35):

Pourquoi fais-tu ce geste, alors? Pour les autres, pour ceux qui y croient? Pour les dresser contre moi?

[Why are you acting like this, then? To impress other people . . . ? To set them against me?]

Though putting Antigone to death would, as in Sophocles, be designed to demonstrate his power and authority, the fact that Creon would feel it necessary to do so only if Antigone's deed became public reveals the extent to which his power is circumscribed by popular opinion, represented throughout the play as the voice of the unruly mob – the mob that would jeer as Antigone and Ismene, like aristocrats during the French Revolution, ride in the tumbril to their execution (1946: 26-7 = 2000: 12), that surrounds the palace baying for Antigone's blood (1946: 102 = 2000: 50), finally breaking in just as Antigone is about to be led off to her death (1946: 106 = 2000: 52).

It was, we learn, propaganda, the need to keep the mob in line, that dictated the exposure of the corpse. Creon himself is as revolted by that act as anyone else; it is, he confides, “not only horrible, but also . . . abysmally stupid” (2000: 37-8 = “ignoble, et . . . monstrueusement bête”, 1946: 77):

mais il faut que tout Thèbes sente cela pendant quelque temps. Tu penses bien que je l'aurais fait enterrer, ton frère, ne fût-ce que pour l'hygiène! Mais pour que les bêtes que je gouverne comprennent, il faut que cela pue le cadavre de Polynice dans toute la ville, pendant un mois.

[But it's necessary that Thebes should smell the body for a while. I myself would have preferred to have your brother buried, just for reasons of hygiene. But to make those clods I govern understand what's what, the city has to stink of Polynices' corpse for a month.]

Antigone's response is apposite: “You're loathsome,” she observes (2000: 38 = “Vous êtes odieux!”, 1946: 77). Creon replies:

Oui, mon petit. C'est le métier qui le veut. Ce qu'on peut discuter, c'est s'il faut le faire ou ne pas le faire. Mais si on le fait, il faut le faire comme cela.

[Yes, child. It's my job. Whether that job should or shouldn't be done is a matter for discussion. But if it is done, it has to be done like this.]

This is a Creon who is wholly devoid of the principle that animates his Sophoclean predecessor. His only concern is to maintain a position on whose justification he himself is agnostic and whose demands include policies and procedures that he himself regards as cynical and abhorrent. This is what saying yes to political office, to just doing one's job, entails (1946: 78 = 2000: 38):

ANTIGONE Pourquoi le faites-vous?

CRÉON Un matin, je me suis réveillé roi de Thèbes. Et Dieu sait si j'aimais autre chose dans la vie que d'être puissant . . .

ANTIGONE Il fallait dire non, alors!

CRÉON Je le pouvais. Seulement, je me suis senti tout d'un coup comme un ouvrier qui refusait un ouvrage. Cela ne m'a pas paru honnête. J'ai dit oui.

[ANTIGONE Why do you have to do it?

CREON One morning I woke up King of Thebes. Though heaven knows there were things in life I loved better than power.

ANTIGONE Then you should have said no!

CREON I might have. But suddenly I felt like a workman refusing a job. It didn't seem right. I said yes.]

As in Sophocles' play, Creon's strength or weakness as a leader is a central issue. Though Antigone began by making religion as well as kinship a reason for action (1946: 65-6 = 2000: 31-2) she soon agrees with Creon that "mass-produced mumbo-jumbo" about the ghost's need for funeral rites is "ridiculous" (2000: 35).²⁹ She is defying Creon not for other people, not even for her

29 1946: 72: "CRÉON Et tu risques la mort maintenant parce que j'ai refusé à ton frère ce passeport dérisoire, ce bredouillage en série sur sa dépouille, cette pantomime . . . C'est absurde! / ANTIGONE Oui, c'est absurde".

brother, but for “No one. Myself” (2000: 35).³⁰ Though she doubts her ability to “be brave for ever”,³¹ she is determined to resist his attempts to save her. It is this that will demonstrate the limits of royal power (2000: 36): “You’re the king – you can do anything . . . But not that.”³² It is at this point that Creon, who had previously taken Antigone’s arm in a gesture of avuncular concern (1946: 75 = 2000: 33), begins to twist her arm aggressively, playing “the villain’s part” to her “heroine”, presenting himself as “the strong one” whose turn it is “to take advantage” (1946: 74 = 2000: 36), yet still stressing his clemency and patience (1946: 75 = 2000: 37). But to no avail: “You’re twisting too hard now,” says Antigone. “It doesn’t even hurt”. Creon relaxes his grip.³³ The iron fist and the velvet glove are both visible, their purpose to preserve Creon’s position and demonstrate his strength, to obtain victory in a contest between a king and a girl.

Creon persists in his project, trying to save Antigone while explaining his own position in terms of the exigencies of office, the consequences of saying yes (1946: 76-9 = 2000: 37-8). But Antigone has no concern for his politics (1946: 78 = 2000: 38):

Eh bien, tant pis pour vous. Moi, je n’ai pas dit “oui”! Qu’est-ce que vous voulez que cela me fasse, à moi, votre politique, votre nécessité, vos pauvres histoires? Moi, je peux dire “non” encore à tout ce que je n’aime pas et je suis seul juge. Et vous, avec votre couronne, avec vos gardes, avec votre attirail, vous pouvez seulement me faire mourir parce que vous avez dit “oui”.

30 “Pour personne. Pour moi” (1946: 73), the statement that so infuriated Claude Roy: cf. nn. 5, 28 above.

31 “Je n’aurai pas du courage éternellement, c’est vrai” (1946: 73).

32 “Vous êtes le roi, vous pouvez tout, mais cela, vous ne le pouvez pas” (1946: 74).

33 “CRÉON J’ai le mauvais rôle, c’est entendu, et tu as le bon. . . . Moi, je suis le plus fort comme cela, j’en profite aussi. . . . Cela ne te semble pas drôle, tout de même, ce roi bafoué qui t’écoute, ce vieux homme qui peut tout et qui en a vu tuer d’autres, je t’assure, et d’aussi attendrissants que toi, et qui est là, à se donner toute cette peine pour essayer de t’empêcher de mourir? . . . / ANTIGONE (*après un temps*). Vous serrez trop, maintenant. Cela ne me fait même plus mal. Je n’ai plus de bras. / CRÉON *la regarde et la lâche avec un petit sourire . . .*”

[That's your look-out! I didn't say yes! What do I care about your politics and what you "have" to do and all your paltry affairs. I can still say no to anything I don't like, and I alone am the judge. You, with your crown and your guards and your paraphernalia – all you can do, because you said yes, is have me put to death.]

The death sentence will demonstrate not Creon's strength, but his weakness, not his power, but its limits. Antigone, though fated to die, is free; Creon is not.

Creon is, as Antigone continues, afraid (1946: 79 = 2000: 38–9):

ANTIGONE Non. Je vous fais peur. C'est pour cela que vous essayez de me sauver. Ce serait tout de même plus commode de garder une petite Antigone vivante et muette dans ce palais. Vous êtes trop sensible pour faire un bon tyran, voilà tout. Mais vous allez tout de même me faire mourir tout à l'heure, vous le savez, et c'est pour cela que vous avez peur. C'est laid un homme qui a peur.
CRÉON (*sourdement*) Eh bien, oui, j'ai peur d'être obligé de te faire tuer si tu t'obstines. Et je ne le voudrais pas.

[ANTIGONE You're not amused – you're afraid. That's why you're trying to save me. It would suit you best to keep me here in the palace, alive but silent. You're too sensitive to be a tyrant.³⁴ But just the same, as you know very well, you're going to have to have me put to death presently. And that's why you're afraid. Not a pretty sight, a man who's afraid.

CREON (*dully*) All right – I am afraid. Afraid you won't change your mind and I'll have to have you killed. And I don't want to.]

But though Antigone does not have to do what she does not want to do, Creon does. This is "what it means to be a king" (2000: 39).³⁵ Creon now accepts his subordinate role, and appeals not only to Antigone's pity, but to her "understanding" (*comprendre*): he is in a difficult position trying to steer the ship of state (the Sophoclean metaphor is developed satirically in unSophoclean detail, 1946: 81–2 = 2000: 39–40). He goes on (*ibid.*):

34 The line recalls the Euripidean Creon's self-assessment at *Medea* 348–9. Anouilh composed a *Medée* in 1946, first produced onstage in 1953.

35 "Et c'est cela, être roi!" (1946: 80).

Crois-tu, alors, qu'on a le temps de faire le raffiné, de savoir s'il faut dire "oui" ou "non", de se demander s'il ne faudra pas payer trop cher un jour et si on pourra encore être un homme après? On prend le bout de bois, on redresse devant la montagne d'eau, on gueule un ordre et on tire dans le tas, sur le premier qui s'avance. Dans le tas! Cela n'a pas de nom. C'est comme la vague qui vient de s'abattre sur le pont devant vous; le vent qui vous gifle, et la chose qui tombe dans le groupe n'a pas de nom. C'était peut-être celui qui t'avait donné du feu en souriant la veille. Il n'a plus de nom. Et toi non plus, tu n'as plus de nom, cramponné à la barre. Il n'y a plus que le bateau qui ait un nom et la tempête. Est-ce que tu le comprends, cela?

ANTIGONE (*secoue la tête*) Je ne veux pas comprendre. C'est bon pour vous. Moi je suis là pour autre chose que pour comprendre. Je suis là pour vous dire non et pour mourir.

CRÉON C'est facile de dire non!

ANTIGONE Pas toujours.

[And do you really think this is the moment for fine distinctions? Do you think there's time to debate whether you say yes or no, to wonder whether some day the price isn't going to be too high, whether afterwards you're going to be able to call yourself a man again? No! You grab the tiller, you stand up in the mountains of water, you shout an order – and if you're attacked you shoot the first comer. The first comer! He hasn't got a name. He's like the wave that's just broken over the deck, like the wind tearing at your limbs. He may be the man who smiled at you and gave you a light yesterday. He hasn't got a name any more. And neither have you, as you hang on desperately to the tiller. The only things that have got a name now are the ship and the storm. Do you understand?

ANTIGONE (*shaking her head*) I don't want to. It's all very well for you, but I'm not here to understand. I'm here to say no to you, and to die.

CREON It's easy to say no!

ANTIGONE Not always.]

'Understanding' is all very well – very reasonable, very adult. At one level, Antigone's refusal to understand exhibits the childish petulance that is an undeniable element of her characterization.

Yet 'understanding' also entails condoning Creon's subjection of all values to the survival of the state, even if the cost is too high, even if it means being prepared to "shoot the first comer", to deny that person a name, to give up one's own name, all in the name of the state. Thus when Antigone ultimately decides on death because she (again, petulantly and childishly) rejects Creon's brand of bourgeois contentment, this also entails rejection of the cynical compromises that are contentment's cost (1946: 92 = 2000: 46):

Quel sera-t-il, mon bonheur? Quelle femme heureuse deviendra-t-elle, la petite Antigone? Quelles pauvretés faudra-t-il qu'elle fasse elle aussi, jour par jour, pour arracher avec ses dents son petit lambeau de bonheur? Dites, à qui devra-t-elle mentir, à qui sourire, à qui se vendre? Qui devra-t-elle laisser mourir en détournant le regard?

[What kind of happy woman will Antigone grow into? What base things will she have to do, day after day, in order to snatch her own little scrap of happiness? Tell me – who will she have to lie to? Smile at? Sell herself to? Who will she have to avert her eyes from, and leave to die?]

Creon, in Antigone's eyes, is now as helpless as he was when he was fifteen (1946: 94 = 2000: 46); he and his ilk are ugly, like cooks or scullions (1946: 96-7 = 2000: 47-8). It is she who now gives the orders, commanding him to open the doors and let everyone hear her defiance (1946: 97 = 2000: 48).

There are those who argue that it is Creon who wins the contest with Antigone, Creon who comes off best in the play over all.³⁶ True, he does undermine Antigone's reasons for resistance, so that her death may appear arbitrary, gratuitous. True, Antigone doubts her decision at the very last moment. But Creon himself recognizes that his attempt to save Antigone was a trial of strength, and he lost (1946: 100 = 2000: 49):

C'est elle qui voulait mourir. Aucun de nous n'était assez fort pour la décider à vivre. Je le comprends maintenant, Antigone était faite pour être morte. Elle-même ne le savait peut-être pas, mais

36 See Steiner 1984: 193-4; cf. and contrast Witt 2001: 218, 226-7.

Polynice n'était qu'un prétexte. Quand elle a dû y renoncer, elle a trouvé autre chose tout de suite. Ce qui importait pour elle, c'était de refuser et de mourir.

[It was her choice. She wanted to die! None of us was strong enough to persuade her to live. I understand now. She was born to die. She may not have known it herself, but Polynices was only an excuse. And when that excuse wouldn't work any more she chose another. All that mattered to her was to refuse everything and to die.]

And Creon understands what this means. Though the Chorus, in the speech that closes the play, believes that “those who are still alive are quietly beginning to forget [the dead] and get their names mixed up” (2000: 60-1),³⁷ this is contradicted by much that has gone before. Creon knows that Antigone's defiance, if he cannot prevent it, will live on. Hence he wants her to know “what a squalid story it is [she's] going to put [her] poor little bloodstained name to – for ever” (2000: 41).³⁸ Thus the Chorus begs Creon not to let her die – “We'll all bear the scar for thousands of years!”³⁹ Though Creon ends the *agôn* as he began it, trying to stifle all word of Antigone's rebellion, the cat is out of the bag – Ismene bursts in and, as in Sophocles, declares her determination to share her sister's fate (1946: 97 = 2000: 48). Unlike in Sophocles, however, she meets Antigone's reproaches with a promise to complete what Antigone has done – “All right, Antigone – all right! I'll go tomorrow!”⁴⁰

Antigone is triumphant (1946: 98 = 2000: 49):

Tu l'entends, Créon? Elle aussi. Qui sait si cela ne va pas prendre à d'autres encore, en m'écoulant? Qu'est-ce que tu attends pour me faire taire, qu'est-ce que tu attends pour appeler tes gardes? Allons, Créon, un peu de courage, ce n'est qu'un mauvais moment à passer. Allons, cuisinier, puisqu'il le faut!

37 “Et ceux qui vivent encore vont commencer tout doucement à les oublier et à confondre leurs noms” (1946: 123).

38 “Tu sais au bas de quelle histoire sordide tu vas signer pour toujours ton petit nom sanglant?” (1946: 84).

39 “Nous allons tous porter cette plaie au côté, pendant des siècles” (1946: 100 = 2000: 49).

40 “Eh bien, j'irai demain!” (1946: 98 = 2000: 49).

[Hear that, Creon? Her too! And how do you know it won't spread to others when they hear me? What are you waiting for? Why don't you call your guards to silence me? Come on now, Creon, be brave – it won't take long! Come on, scullion! You have no choice – get it over with!]

However motiveless and arbitrary Antigone's opposition may be, the mere possibility of opposition that cannot be silenced or coerced into conformity demonstrates to all the weakness of power. Antigone forces Creon to acknowledge this, publicly, and thus to confess the limits of his power even as he uses it to make an example of her. This is her victory, and Creon's defeat, for a ruler whose entire conduct in office is determined by the need to control how things appear to the public, is substantial. Though in Creon's world – and perhaps in the world of the play in general – there are no heroes, this is, in effect, what Antigone will become, just by saying no in a world where everyone else says yes.

Neither Sophoclean tragedy nor Anouilh's version have much time for "lousy hope" (1946: 54, 95 = 2000: 26, 47).⁴¹ It is the absence of "le sale espoir" that makes tragedy, "pointless" and "gratuitous" as it is, "restful" (1946: 54-5: 2000: 26); "it would have been nice and peaceful for us all without" Antigone (2000: 60). "But now it's over. It's nice and peaceful anyway." All those who had to die are dead: "quite stiff, quite useless, quite rotten". The living forget; "Only the guards are left. All that has happened is a matter of indifference to them. None of their business. They go on with their game of cards" (2000: 61).⁴² But though Antigone's 'no' is stripped of its idealism, offers no positive programme, and risks falling into oblivion against a background of indifference, nevertheless it serves as a reminder of the limits of the ruler's power to

41 On the theme of hope in Soph. *Ant.*, see Cairns 2016: 63-4, 66-7, 84, 170-1nn18, 27, 33, 174n73.

42 "Sans la petite Antigone, c'est vrai, ils auraient tous été bien tranquilles. Mais maintenant, c'est fini. Ils sont tout de même tranquilles. Tous ceux qui avaient à mourir sont morts. . . . Morts pareils, tous; bien raides, bien inutiles, bien pourris. . . . Il ne reste plus que les gardes. Eux, tout ça, cela leur est égal; c'est pas leurs oignons. Ils continuent à jouer aux cartes. . . ." (1946: 122-3).

coerce. However it may be motivated, the very ability to say no is what the powerful fear; and surely the world of Creon – of compromises and conformity, but also of lies, violence, and casual brutality – is one to which one should say no. Antigone shows that there is always a way to resist and the extent to which even (apparently) futile resistance undermines the powerful.⁴³ Creon is not, therefore, given the positive portrayal identified by some commentators, both at the time and more recently.⁴⁴ An unequivocally collaborationist reading is as impossible as an unequivocally pro-Resistance one. And if Antigone's stance can be seen in the context of 'aesthetic fascism', there is in the play precious little comfort for actual fascism as a historical political movement. Creon's doctrine that the state comes first is shown to be cynical and amoral, since there is no price too high for the maintenance of order, and futile, since it serves no positive end. Both Creon's on-stage violence and the reported, offstage violence of Eteocles are presented as repugnant.

Those who serve such leaders, in the person of the boorish and callous Guards, offer the standard excuse (just obeying orders, 1946: 48, 55 = 2000: 22, 27), in all its standard inadequacy. The

43 Similar interpretations suggested themselves to pro-Resistance commentators in occupied France: see the recollections of Béatrix Dussane (*Notes de théâtre 1940–1950*, Paris: Lardanchet, 1951, 1.251), cited (in a translation by H. Hobson, *The French Theatre of Today: An English View*, London: Harrap, 1953, 45) in Witt 2001: 221n71: "Antigone's refusal became the symbol and the sublimation of the personal refusals of all and every one . . . This is by no means imagination. I felt like that myself when I saw the play, and others have confessed to the same experience." Cf. the post-liberation response (*L'Homme libre* 29 September 1944) cited by Witt 2001: 228.

44 See e.g. the review by Charles Méré in *Aujourd'hui*, 26-7 February 1944 (Flügge 1982: 2.57, quoted in English by Freeman in Anouilh 2000: xlvii), which paints Antigone as a "degenerate, unintelligent madwoman whose revolt produces only anarchy, disaster and death" ("l'inintelligente Antigone fait figure de demi-folle, de dégénérée . . . C'est la révoltée, l'anarchiste, génératrice de désordre, de désastre, de mort . . .") and Creon as the "real hero . . . the just ruler, a slave to his duty who sacrifices everything that is dear to him for the sake of his country" ("le héros, c'est au contraire Créon, le roi juste, esclave de son devoir et qui doit aux intérêts de sa patrie sacrifier, ses affections les plus chères"). For modern views, cf. n. 9 above.

Chorus/Prologue figure, who highlights their indifference to suffering at the play's close, characterizes them ironically at the beginning as "les auxiliaires toujours innocents et toujours satisfaits d'eux-mêmes, de la justice" (1946: 12; "agents – eternally innocent, eternally complacent – of justice", 2000: 5):

Pour le moment, jusqu'à ce qu'un nouveau chef de Thèbes dûment mandaté leur ordonne de l'arrêter à son tour, ce sont les auxiliaires de la justice de Créon.

[For the time being the justice they serve is the justice of Creon . . . until the day comes when Thebes designates Creon's successor, and they are ordered to arrest Creon himself.]

Just possibly, Anouilh here envisages the overthrow of the Vichy government. Perhaps, too, the mob that swarms the palace demanding the traitor's death is already conceived of as the mob that will clamour for the execution of traitors once the regime that Creon represents is overthrown. If, in that situation, Robert Brasillach is the Antigone-figure, the Antigones of the previous regime were different.

Consideration of these issues does not exhaust the richness of Anouilh's drama. Concentration on the political implications of Antigone's stance, in particular, risks obscuring the extent to which there is a genuine and recurrent tragedy of the everyday, one that has implications for all of us, in the play's emphasis on the brutality of the family, the mundanity of adult life, the sell-outs and compromises that come with it, the son's inevitable disillusionment with his father (1946: 103-4 = 2000: 51-2). Antigone's disgust at the thought of growing old, at the thought of Haemon turning out like his father, belongs with her depiction as a recognizable type – twenty years old, undernourished, undeveloped, dressed in black. Her refusal of adulthood takes on a particular societal and psychological character. In persisting with her rebellion, even though she has, in the end, no cause, she is the archetype of all the terrible Antigone-as-teenager productions that many of us have had to sit through.⁴⁵ The play's historical context

⁴⁵ "Do we", asks the writer of the programme notes to a production by TAG Theatre Company at the Glasgow Citizens' Theatre in 2000, "think of

gives these themes a hard political edge; but their bleak, nihilistic view of the world implicates even those who live in happier times. Most of us trade our youthful ideals for bourgeois contentment; we achieve ‘understanding’ and say ‘yes’ to compromise. This a “mortal wound” that we all share.⁴⁶ Though it is perhaps the historical circumstances of its genesis and the controversial nature of its reception that gives Anouilh’s play its prominence in the reception-history of *Antigone*, the play itself is of enormous interest for the audacity and skill with which it transforms and reconfigures the plot, as well as a very large number of motifs and themes, both major and minor, of Sophocles’ original. Along with *The Island*, by Athole Fugard, John Kanu, and Winston Ntshona, it must rank as one of the most thought-provoking and interesting of twentieth-century adaptations.

Works Cited

- Anouilh, Jean (1946), *Antigone*, Paris: La Table Ronde.
- Anouilh, Jean (2000), *Antigone*, translated by Barbara Bray, with commentary and notes by Ted Freeman, London: Methuen.
- Brasillach, Robert (1963-6), *Œuvres Complètes*, 12 vols, Paris: Club de l’honnête homme.
- Cairns, Douglas L. (2016), *Sophocles: Antigone*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Ciani, Maria Grazia (ed.) (2000), *Sofocle, Anouilh, Brecht: Antigone. Variazioni sul mito*, Venice: Marsilio.
- Deppman, Jed (2012), “Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone*”, in Kirk Ormand (ed.), *A Companion to Sophocles*, Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell: 523-37.
- Flashar, Helmut (2009), *Inszenierung der Antike: Das griechische Drama auf der Bühne der Neuzeit 1585-1990*, second edn, Munich: Beck. First edition 1991.
- Fleming, Katie (2008), “Fascism on Stage: Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone*”, in V. Zajko and M. Leonard (eds), *Laughing with Medusa: Classical Myth and Feminist Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 163-86.

Harry Enfield’s character, Kevin the teenager, and discover the timelessness of the teenage strop?”

46 1946: 105-6 = 2000: 52: “LE CHŒUR Il est parti, touché à mort. / CRÉON Oui, nous sommes tous touchés à mort. / CHORUS Haemon’s wounded, mortally. / CREON We all are.”

- Flügge, Manfred (1982), *Verweigerung oder Neue Ordnung: Jean Anouilhs Antigone im politischen und ideologischen Kontext der Besatzungszeit 1940-1944*, Rheinfelden: Schäuble.
- Fulcher, Jane F. (2006), "French Identity in Flux: Vichy's Collaboration, and Antigone's Operatic Triumph", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 150: 261-95.
- Genette, Jean (1992), *Palimpsestes*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Guérin, Jeanyves (2009), "Égisthe, Créon, Cauchon: Autour de l'Antigone de Jean Anouilh", in Sylvie Parizet (ed.), *Lectures politiques des mythes littéraires au XXe siècle*, Paris: Presses universitaires de Paris Nanterre: 275-91; cited by paragraph number from <https://books.openedition.org/pupo/1453> (Accessed 9 September 2018).
- Lacan, Jacques (1992), *The Ethics of Psychoanalysis, 1959-1960: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan*, translated by D. Porter, New York: Norton. First published as *L'éthique de la psychanalyse, 1959-1960: Le Séminaire de Jacques Lacan Livre VII*, edited by J.-A. Miller, Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1986.
- Steiner, George (1984), *Antigones: How the Antigone Legend Has Endured in Western Literature, Art, and Thought*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Witt, Mary Ann Frese (2001), *The Search for Modern Tragedy: Aesthetic Fascism in Italy and France*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Negotiating Oblivion: Twenty-First Century Greek Performances of Ancient Greek Plays

AVRA SIDIROPOULOU

Abstract

In Greece, for most of the twentieth century and going, theatre makers have turned to tragedy as a means of paying homage to their cultural identity and also of further challenging their artistic sensibilities, bearing, as they do, the added 'privilege' or 'burden' of their native heritage. This analysis focuses on productions/adaptations of Greek plays by established directors such as Theodoros Terzopoulos and Yannis Houvardas, as well as by the younger generation practitioners Dimitris Karantzas, Angela Brouskou, Costas Philippoglou and Lena Kitsopoulou, which seem to reflect the tensions that problematise the fidelity-innovation continuum in twenty-first century *mise-en-scènes*.

1. Context

The complex, troubled relationship of modern Greeks to their past is nowhere near as forcefully manifest as is in the way twenty-first century productions of tragedy in Greece have addressed the question of tradition and its discontents. Even though the "mythical, dysfunctional, conflicted world" of Greek tragedy has established itself as one of the "most important cultural and aesthetic prisms through which the real, dysfunctional, conflicted world of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has refracted its own image" (Hall in Hall, Macintosh and Wrigley 2004: 2), there are added layers of complication when a theatre artist confronts his or her own heritage directly. To any Greek who has been spoon-fed the splendid world of the tragic poets since childhood, the endless misfortunes of modern Greece's turbulent history seem to serve as a constant reminder that the thousands of years that separate them from their glorious ancestors are not to be measured simply in chronological terms.

To theatre artists, this disenchantment has often been fol-

lowed by an attitude of irony vis-à-vis tragedy, expressed in the desire to interpret the past through a contemporary lens, often communicating the dissonances and paradoxes of a globalised world. Several years deep into the postmodern era, for all its legitimised claims on deconstruction and revisionism, questions about ‘faithfulness’ and ‘sacrilege’ continue to generate controversy. New theatre genres that have been created through tireless innovation with hybrid forms, including the live-digital interface, but also with the audience’s immersion into the theatrical event. Greek theatre makers for most of the twentieth and twentieth-first century and going, have used some of these forms while turning to the classical canon in an attempt to pay homage to their cultural identity – bearing the ‘added privilege’ or burden of their native heritage – and also to further challenge their artistic sensibilities. My brief analysis touches upon relatively recent productions-adaptations of tragedy by established Greek directors such as Theodoros Terzopoulos and Yannis Houvardas, as well as by a handful of younger generation practitioners, namely, Angela Brouskou, Costas Philippoglou, Dimitris Karantzas and Lena Kitsopoulou.¹

2. Adaptation and Ethics

In Frank Kermode’s seminal thesis of 1975, “the books we call classics . . . possess intrinsic qualities that endure, but possess also an openness to accommodation which keeps them alive under endlessly varying dispositions” (1983: 44). The “openness to interpretation”, the way a classic lends itself to revision, may be part of a “capacity to support multiple interpretations over time”: the classic text is “complex and indeterminate enough to allow us our necessary pluralities” (121). The practice of adaptation seems to license and foreground heretical directorial choices relying on iconoclastic imagery and scenographic metaphors, daring characterisation and unusual casting. After all, engaging with the tragic form helps

¹ For more on directors’ strategies of updating the classics see Sidiropoulou 2015; on the issue of ‘faithfulness’ see Sidiropoulou forthcoming.

us re-understand fundamentals and reconsider absolutes from a (safe) distance, even though we are still confronted with the discomfort of identifying with painful or violent emotions.

These concerns naturally precipitate an avalanche of questions with regards to the ethics of directing. A prevailing ‘adaptationophobia’ still separates text from performance, the classics from their adaptations, readers from spectators, complying artists from radical iconoclasts. Although directors internationally remain ambivalent about how to maintain a healthy distance from the essential ‘antiqueness’ of the classical work and still be connected to its timeless properties, many consider it a challenge to stage Greek drama. After all, directing tragedy has always involved investigating alternative ways of recalibrating an old but resonant thought, reflecting on the conditions that still keep a work meaningful and thus ‘(re)producible’ after several thousands of years. For Greeks, in particular, the ‘family-ness’ of these plays suggests a sense of entitlement – even if covert. At one point of their career or another, most Greek theatre-makers – almost as a duty to their profession and to their national identity – will tackle the genre, either by “accepting Greek tragedy’s linguistic, structural and contextual limitations as a sacrosanct given and thus employ more conventional modes of staging, or, reversely, by tampering with the form with ironic distance, together with a desire for appropriation, which in itself betrays a sense of entitlement over tradition and its interpretation” (Sidiropoulou 2015: 32). The “rootedness” of Greek drama, combined with its “otherness”, has turned it into “an ideal shortcut, a liberating format which helps the artist, and the political activist, to circumvent, legitimately and with playful ease, centuries of cultural baggage” (Revermann 2008: 108).

Yet, playing it safe no longer seems to be a strong or viable option. The idea that one can achieve historical verisimilitude is in principle misguided, and recapitulating the original ancient performance seems to be an exercise in futility – its knowledge is for the most part hypothetical. Erika Fischer-Lichte draws attention to the distance of the ancient texts, which any staging should bring to light, and insists that revivals are actually unable to access the past because it is “lost and gone forever. What remains are only fragments—play texts torn out of their original contexts—

which cannot convey their original meaning” (Fischer-Lichte 2005: 234). In fact, Fischer-Lichte’s compendious remark hits the nail on the head: “whatever we think we know about the past is a kind of reinvention—a construction, a fantasy” (in Hall, Macintosh and Wrigley 2004: 352). All the same, the term ‘contemporary’ has also been abused by otherwise well-meaning experimentalists, its alluring connotations subjected to various degrees of misunderstanding, which are sadly bound to the clichés of deconstruction. Indeed, rather than being confused with the everyday or the realistic and the vernacular, ‘contemporary’ could ideally function as a barometer of pertinence, measuring the relevance level of the original material to situations and attitudes which are both familiar and significant today. One should also take into account what adaptation theorist Linda Hutcheon views as a “postmodern paradox”: a simultaneous “enshrining” and “questioning” of the past (2003: 126). Similarly, Patrice Pavis discusses the practice of “dusting” the text, an “idealist assumption according to which, correcting classical language is all one needs to do to reach the level of fictional world and of the ideologemes reduced to an *objet fixe*, a mixture of ancient and modern times” (1986: 5). At the same time, analysing ‘historicisation’, the process of interpreting plays “from the point of view that is ours at the present time”, with situations, characters and conflicts shown in their historical relativity, Pavis elaborates on the dangers involved in the artists’ tendency “to explain the present too much, by forcing the plays to say what suited us at the time” (2013: 208).

In Greece, the conspicuous shift in the perception of tragedy as a ‘sacred’ genre can be roughly located in the early to mid-1990s, when theatre artists started to ignore the strict mandates of adaptation criticism. Since then, many directors have tried to frame tragedy’s remoteness in a style notably less declamatory and formulaic than the one that had dominated Greek theatre for the greatest part of the twentieth century. Faithful to the revisionist attitude of many of their international peers,² they keep

2 One could certainly think of Tadashi Suzuki, Peter Stein, Arienne Mnouchkine, and more recently, of Katie Mitchell, Ivo van Hove, Crystof Warlikowski and Jan Fabre, to name but a few.

generating fierce controversy over the rights and wrongs of auteur practice, furthering the discussion on the ethics of directing. Significantly, these directors no longer shy away from confronting the remoteness of the classical work but try to expose the formal distance that separates us from the time of its birth and provide fresh insights for better understanding a genre that is simultaneously familiar and profoundly strange.

At the dawn of the new millennium, thanks to a variety of favourable cultural, social and economic factors, Greece experienced an even bigger theatrical boom, manifest in the proliferation of alternative theatre spaces, the intense festivalisation of the major cities and an updating of training methods brought back to the country by artists who had spent several years studying abroad. This changed landscape came along with the introduction and systematic application of a non-Realistic, non-psychological aesthetic on stage. It is no coincidence that many Greek directors who had been trained in theatre capitals such as London, Berlin or New York, applied back at home, with a degree of understandable delay, distinctive strategies of deconstruction and a notably postdramatic aesthetic, choosing to sacrifice linear story-telling in favour of sensorial dramaturgies that build on visual and aural impressions. Having become acquainted with the work methodologies of European avant-garde theatre artists, they have approached tragedy with a more critical eye, often applying openly satire and parody. Essentially, (modern) Greeks turn *to* (ancient) Greeks for inspiration and the comfort of connectedness, while also turning *against* them to solidify their own contemporary (European) identity, which to many appears quite separate from their country's celebrated but irrevocably gone past.

Year after year, the ancient theatre of Epidaurus, where most of the major productions of Greek drama are staged, becomes the locus of contention with respect to the ethics of directing, often dividing audiences into two different camps, namely, the 'traditionalists' and the 'revisionists'. Often, the plays are set in thoroughly altered environments, sometimes of special cultural significance, while the language is attuned to contemporary rhythms, subject also to the translator's degree of adherence to or deviation from what feels to be extraneous or foreign in the source text. It is

worth pointing out, however, that over the years, the Greek audiences have grown less weary of such updating strategies and more willing to accept the inevitable shift that has characterised recent interpretations of tragedy. While audiences are still known to walk out of ‘irreverent’ shows, booing the protagonists or penning vitriolic production reviews in their blogs, the increasing number in the ticket sales and a more sophisticated mindset towards less conventional or predictable readings are placing contemporary Greek spectatorship in the heart of Europe’s elite theatre goers.

As early as the mid-1980s, Theodoros Terzopoulos and Yannis Houvardas introduced to their native Greece a distinctly formalist aesthetic, revising perceptual codes of staging the dramatic canon. Earning themselves the privileged status of *auteurs*, they have approached the works of the three tragedians with a guilt-free, unbiased approach, exploring ways of attuning the words of the text to new rhythms and channeling the plays’ specific circumstances to express their perennial vitality and remain true to today. To do justice to their work, one surely needs to forego any moralistic notions identifying adaptations with acts of transgression, and experimentation with sabotage and provocation. Together with Terzopoulos and Houvardas, who have been well-established pioneers in Greece for many years, Angela Brouskou, Costas Philippoglou, Dimitris Karantzas, and Lena Kitsopoulou have also directed the Greeks with critical success, claiming their own share of artistic reputation.³

3 There is, of course, a multitude of Greek directors who have, at one time or another of their careers, dealt with the genre. Among the most adventurous ones, Simos Kakalas of Choros theatre, has tackled Euripides’ *Orestes* in three distinctly different versions, two in 2015 – Avlaia Theatre, Thessaloniki, and Epidaurus – and one in 2016, in Choros Theatre, Athens. Kakalas revisits the myth of Euripides as a way of delving into the Greek identity and, as a young Greek, understanding where he stands vis-à-vis the ancient tradition. Indeed, “the director combines the poetic fifteen-syllable verse, the theatrical codes of the Greek ‘bouloukia’ (the wandering troupes who used to play at squares [sic] in the nineteenth century), the technique of narration, parody and shadow theatre with manga masks, post-dramatic theatre, video projections and anime” (Neofytou 2017: 279). Stylised movement and the use of Kabuki-inspired masks add a heightened dimension to the performance, ambitious to capture the necessary remoteness of the tragic form.

In addressing tragedy, the aforementioned theatre makers have in different ways and forms, as well as in different degrees of deviation from the source texts, recontextualised its temporal and spatial aspects. Some have denounced discursive language in favour of a manifestly physical-plastic discourse, others have re-conceptualised character and rethought delivery of speech, and almost all have problematised the function of the ancient Chorus. The generous application of postdramatic elements (such as the emphasis on the kinetic and the visual) and of postmodern ones (namely, the intrusion of pastiche as well as of parody) has reflected a desire to break free from a tradition of staging tragedy in a manner that Pavis calls “archeological reconstruction” (1996: 212); an attitude anchored on the erroneous assumption that it is possible to recreate the staging conventions and conditions of an era that is no longer familiar or pertinent to us. Repudiating a predominantly bombastic style of acting – well matched to older productions’ reliance on period costumes and quasi-archaic stage design – the directors we are discussing have systematically worked towards reinventing the tragic form in distinct and original ways.

3. Artists

3.1 *Theodoros Terzopoulos*

Theodoros Terzopoulos’ emphasis on corporeality as a medium for generating universal meaning has led to an artistic idiom both vital and flexible enough to survive across national borders. In his work with Attis Theatre Company, Terzopoulos encourages global communication, inculcating the culture-specific elements of the tragic plays with a remarkably universal scope. Terzopoulos spent time at the Berliner Ensemble, working with the German playwright Heiner Müller, and later travelled extensively, researching physical expressions of acting in different corners of the globe. As a result, his work mixes Brechtian distancing with Artaud’s appeal to the senses – a poetry in space – and Asian forms of movement.

In his productions of tragedy – his multiple versions of *The Bacchae*, *The Persians* and *Prometheus Bound*, reworked over a

number of years, being among the most emblematic – Terzopoulos has focused on what he calls a ‘nucleus’ of meaning, concerned with specific themes that surface in each play.⁴ Far from creating an empathetic relationship with the audience, he wishes to bring home to the modern spectator the elemental forces of tragedy. To that effect, he has built a rigorous physical method that allows his productions to speak across different cultures and even beyond linguistic barriers, releasing energy and not emotion *per se*. Along these lines, instead of overly psychologising the tragic characters, he chooses to evoke archetypes; averse to taking the spectator through the minutiae of the plot, he delves deep into the actual myths that had inspired the Greek poets, often keeping just a few lines of the text, which are repeated in circles.

For Terzopoulos, ‘adaptation’ equals recourse to reductionist aesthetics. He has repeatedly renounced the title of ‘adapter’, eschewing in his work the process of direct updating that often characterises modern productions of tragedy. Instead of making forced adjustments to closely fit the tragic plays into an all too familiar context, he explores the grand energy that exists in them, deviating from the revisionist tactics of many of his contemporaries. Equally vehement is his refusal to sacrifice the structure and stature of tragedy, in order to create ‘plausible’ characters. For him, tragedy is a dense but open form, and therefore any new reading should shy away from a neatly arranged psychological interpretation.

Notably, for Terzopoulos, making meaningful theatre starts from the need to remember, to reclaim memory in a time of amnesia (McDonald 1991: 203), as well as to discover “the possibilities behind each word, each syllable, each letter, even” (qtd in McDonald 1991: 208) and realise them through ritual. One of the reasons why his work feels important and urgent today is that at a time when most of the so-called *alternative* theatre often fails to provide an original voice, reproducing ad infinitum hollow and ultimately pretentious forms, his art remains true to the need to explore fundamentals, to put out there what seems impossible to ex-

⁴ For example, ‘heroism’ in Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound* or ‘mourning’ in Euripides’ *Bacchae*.

press (Sidiropoulou 2016: 32).⁵

The conspicuous shift of focus in Terzopoulos' treatment of tragedy over the years is worth noting: while identifying a process of maturation might perhaps suggest an attitude of condescension, evidently there is an inner movement from the existential (and thus, personal) to the political (and thus, communal) dimension. Quite recently, one of the seminal events of the European Capital of Culture – Pafos 2017 programme, his production of Euripides' *Trojan Women* brought the twenty-first-century refugee crisis in startling focus, while also retaining the timeless perspective that is so central in the director's work. Indeed, the sustained human history of conflict and displacement, as Euripides' fourth-century anti-war tragedy testifies, has been ongoing, and the need for reconciliation and peace, profoundly common across East and West. True to highlighting the "drama of division and the deeply rooted human need for reconciliation" (Attis 2017), performers from a number of divided cities, such as Nicosia, Mostar and Jerusalem, but also from Greece and Syria, became the collective voice of human suffering across temporal and geographic borders. Placed all over a circle-confined area of the stage, battered military boots – a recurrent visual motif in Terzopoulos work – signalled the absence of the killed soldiers. Central to this drama was the presence of the Turkish-Cypriot Coryphaeus, personifying the human need to connect with others, despite representing the 'other' as the enemy. Gradually, the Chorus members would each pick the photograph of a missing soldier from the ground, calling out his name, to which the word 'missing' was uttered with deadly finality in each participating language (Greek, Turkish, Arabic, Hebrew, Croatian and Bosnian). The linguistic collage synthesised a voice of protest against violence and the absurdity of war. Needless to say, in divided Cyprus, just emerging out of another cycle of failed negotiations on the reunification of the country, the word 'kayıp' (Turkish for 'αγνοούμενος' or 'missing person') rang particularly poignant.

5 For more on Terzopoulos see Sidiropoulou in Rodosthenous (2017), *Contemporary Adaptations of Greek Tragedy. Auteurship and Directorial Visions*, London: Bloomsbury.

3.2 *Yannis Houvardas*

Houvardas' treatment of the classics has won him everlasting notoriety ever since his early work in Notos Theatre Company in Athens back in the 1990s. Former Artistic Director of the National Theatre of Greece, he has always held a tempestuous relationship with the canon, consistent with his strategy of extreme and thorough reconceptualisation of classical plays. Whether he stages Aeschylus, Shakespeare, Goethe or Chekhov, the premise remains the same: the work is updated, and while the source text remains mostly intact – even if interspersed with contemporary songs and ample cultural references – the action is ordinarily transposed into a setting manifestly different from that of the original.

Houvardas' recent readings of Euripides' *Orestes* (2010) and of Aeschylus' *The Oresteia* (2016) can serve as a springboard for additional questions on the “splendour” and the “misery” of interpreting the classics' (Pavis 2013: 204), respectively. While in both productions the directorial point-of-view filtered out whatever might have passed for antique detail, the two plays' relocation to today stimulated quite a different type of audience response.

In the case of *Orestes*, the idea of translating the Chorus of young, curious, but ultimately ‘insignificant’ women of Argos into a group of international students visiting the ancient site of Epidaurus and gradually becoming drawn into the very fabric of the tragedy, provided the director with a solid and imaginative base for addressing the ever-troubling ‘Chorus problem’: arriving at the theatre, the students are confronted by Euripides' dramatic characters. Engaging in a live ‘conversation’ with them, across time and myth, they establish a dialogue with the ancient text, eventually assuming the collective role of the Chorus. Affecting the production's scenography, the reimagining of the Chorus is accounted for in terms of ‘reframing’:

[Conceiving the Chorus in *Orestes*] I thought: what if among those young girls, there had also been some boys, could [this Chorus] function as representative of today's generation, which has a very superficial relationship to ancient Greek tragedy, the ancient civilization, the theatre of Epidaurus, but also, with the political issues

that the play brings forth? Which it experiences, but does not fully realise or analyse? . . . The Chorus enters the stage hyper-naturalistically. It does not stand out from the rest of the Epidaurus spectators. There is no choreography and neither is there any music. The two worlds are united through a modern code, but there is a slight difference: the protagonists are more stylised, abstract and poetic, while the Chorus is more everyday. (Houvardas 2010)

Significantly more time-conditioned, Houvardas' production of *The Oresteia* has also been less fortunate in its critical reception. Many critics reacted to the trilogy's being shrunk down to a "pocket version", castigating it as "intensely arrogant, intensely dynamic, intensely sick" (Kaltaki 2016). In evoking the atmosphere of a post-world war II Greek drawing-room, complete with sofas, small tea-tables, lamps, and popular anthems of the times, Houvardas domesticised Aeschylus' tragedy, while also failing to steer clear of extravagant, supernatural effect, such as, for example, the fog and smoke emanating from the beautifully lit box leading into the entrails of the palace. Quite unconvincingly, Clytemnestra becomes a hostess who introduces her guests into the evil house of Atreus in an apron, an image resonating with connotations of housewifery perfection.

Houvardas' defence of his work is put forward succinctly:

I'm always trying to keep to the essence of things. There are so many moments in the choral parts that seem impenetrable to us, because they point back to complex mythological stories in relation to other historical facts, that feature repetitions and a propensity towards lyricism. [In these moments] there is room to keep to the essence, the information, the style, and not to injure the play or Aeschylus . . . Even if I wanted to, I have never staged a production in which I am disrespectful to the theatre. I simply spoke through the play about those issues that were imperative to me. (2016)

Yet, his disclaimer notwithstanding, the relationship between source (Aeschylus' trilogy) and target (Houvardas' *Oresteia*) texts is so loose that even the production's sharp irony ultimately escapes us. We may laugh uneasily at Orestes' magnified eyeballs under his geeky spectacles or at how Cassandra is carried onto Agamemnon's shoulders like a sacrificial lamb with which he oc-

asionally fools around. We may feel amused at Electra's portrayal in her Sunday School best or at Athena's and Apollo's gaudy costumes, and at the Goth male Eumenides in long hair and moustaches; True, we tend to admire Houvardas' bold and inexhaustible ingenuity. Yet, we eventually distance ourselves from the performance, just as the director distances himself from the metaphysical and the civic import of the play in his desire (unconscious or conscious) to de-dramatise and demystify. In this sense, the contemporary/updated/thoroughly localised frame that the mise-en-scène establishes becomes a trap, which prevents a timeless flow of the text in ways that may have indeed been originally intended. If we are watching a family drama, we are still a long way from being moved by those irreconcilable forces beyond all things human, which actually set it into motion.

3.3 *Angela Brouskou*

Directing a fully-cast, unedited production of tragedy in Greece is considered both prestigious and expensive, and for the longest time, because of the high production demands, staging the Greek plays had been the privilege of an older-generation directors' elite. Angela Brouskou has been one of the very fortunate few Greek female directors to present her vision of tragedy in Epidaurus. Together with her company, Chamber Theatre, she approaches classical plays from a political angle, treating them as opportunities to test the limits of corporeality against notably stylised forms.

Brouskou's reading of Sophocles' *Electra* at the Athens Festival in 2006 was followed by her production of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* at Epidaurus in 2008, whose revisionist staging ultimately divided the spectators. At one moment in the performance, the actor playing Agamemnon appeared in a sailor's cap, adorned with garlands that he had presumably collected during his travels in some exotic land, and carrying a cigar and a whisky flask with him, while the Messenger arrived from Troy with a watermelon. Even more than those scenes, however, it was the treatment of the Chorus that caused the greatest uproar. It was depicted as a group of sycophants who sidled up to the state tyrant, a cluster of dogs, lick-

ing up to their master. Several other elements in staging and characterisation revealed Brouskou's "desire to reconsider the ways in which tragedy can be made relevant, namely, its dialectical relationship to contemporary society" (Sidiropoulou 2013: 170).

Brouskou's *Bacchae* (2014) placed the immanently ritualistic elements of the play within a modern-time setting filled with couches-thrones and reclining beds scattered on different parts of the stage. The mixed Chorus of Bacchantes (consisting of women and men) was both heightened and frenetic, especially during their frenzied dances or in the scene where they ran back and forth wildly, groping for the wine with which Dionysus sprinkled them. The god, performed by a female actor (Aglaia Papa), was dressed in a black suit and looked uncharacteristically composed, ironically complementing Pentheus' portrayal as a Nazi-type autocratic ruler, who obediently changed into drag costume in the climactic scene of the play. All in all, the eclectic costume design (for instance, the female performer impersonating Tiresias wore a cape over a mere slip and a bra) sabotaged the otherwise moving performance. The blood-shed presence of Agave unduly reinforced the daemonic element, which set a comedic tone in what is meant to be the most dramatic scene of the play. In general, the director often identified the horrifying with the parodic. Such was also the case with the staged earthquake over Semele's grave, which, according to one critic, "shook like the bed in the Exorcist" (Sarigiannis 2014b).

3.4 Costas Philippoglou

Philippoglou's intelligent physical theatre work has informed his readings of the Greek plays in startling ways. A director and a performer trained in the UK next to the Complicite, Philippoglou impressed the audiences of Epidaurus with his unpretentious approach to text, which helped him integrate all elements of design and sound into a unified whole. His productions of Sophocles' *Philoctetes* in 2014 – and soon to follow his 'Beckett meets Aeschylus' version of *Prometheus Bound* in 2015 – became emblematic in their aesthetic, affective, and highly political stance.

Thrilling both audiences and critics, these productions came as somewhat of a relief after a series of pompous and flippant festival stagings of the Greeks, and generated optimism that directing Greek tragedy today in a way that is both contemporary and meaningful can still be possible.

At some point, the director had argued that what drew him to that particular tragedy was the fact that, while it seemed fundamentally static, it was actually permeated by movement that struck right into the heart of the subconscious (Philippoglou in Sella 2015). Therefore, it is no surprise that his directorial take on *Philoctetes*, admirably served by a strong cast of actors, was primarily physical.

Conjuring the idea that our world is in need of moral restructuring, Kenny McLellan's set design evoked a modern construction site, where the all-male Chorus of seven worked on moving wood and iron items to build a variety of structures, including bridges and ladders. Interestingly, the Chorus was choreographed freely in actions that seemed integral to the dramaturgy. Thus, the iconic metaphor of construction represented a vision of the world on which we are to build. Contemporary in its minimalist aesthetic, the acting area was defined geometrically, yielding a huge arena space physically contained within a long cyclical bench. In this space, the performers balanced on moveable structures loosely resembling see-saws. The outside fence parameter of the stage was often lit up in striking blue, while the change in colour was also manifest in the lighting scheme of the floor, which alternated between black and white, created by lighting designer Nikos Vlassopoulos. In the spirit of the abstracted set design, the costumes were also elegantly timeless (linen jackets, dress shirts, and so forth), their earthy hues providing a sharp contrast to the metallic colours of the set.

The three male protagonists of the play (*Philoctetes*, *Odysseus* and *Neoptolemus*) seemed at ease with the world of the play, their movement ebbing and flowing seamlessly to reflect the dramatic tensions of the text. At certain moments, the Chorus remained static – its different members spread all over the stage to create resonant tableaux vivants, which would later give way to explosive moments of physicality. What might have been stiff stylisation on other occasions

here became a fluidity of movement that embraced the rhythms of the play itself.

Speaking of the text: while Philippoglou refrains from ‘messing around’ with the play’s inner structure, he does introduce outside elements that frame it in a way that makes the experience for the audience even richer. For example, he stages the opening scene by having the protagonist read an excerpt from Seamus Heaney’s adaptation of *Philoctetes*, *The Cure at Troy* (1991):

CHORUS

Philoctetes.

Hercules.

Odysseus.

Heroes. Victims. Gods and human beings.

(1-4)

In particular, Philippoglou was praised for his clarity of vision, which was also translated into clarity in staging. What was quite obvious from the beginning was that his intention was not to “prove himself smarter than Sophocles’ text” (Sarigiannis 2014a). Instead, his sense of theatrical poetry was that of subtlety and nuance – silences became text and the imagery was more than just ordinarily beautiful: it was meaningful, dynamic and relevant. One such memorable instance is the moment in which the Chorus members share the role of Hercules on microphone, while sheets of book pages float over the stage, reflecting something stronger than mere theatre magic: a felicitous strike of the right metaphor, which comes from a careful, visionary reading.

In the end, Philippoglou’s *Philoctetes* avoided the quirks of ‘directorialism’; the production managed to get the artist’s predominant form (physical theatre) to serve his conception of the tragedy, rather than manhandle it. Never does the strenuous movement in the performance feel arbitrary or disconnected – instead, it becomes so necessary that it is hard to imagine the action without it.

3.5 *Dimitris Karantzas*

Breaking away from the tradition of acting and directing tragedy as an extroverted and notably loud stage business, Dimitris Karantzas' *Medea* experimented with the formal requirements of tragic speech and thought, but with an introspective eye that granted the performance a mood of reflection and visceral power. The production was staged at the little theatre of Epidaurus⁶ and received laudatory reviews. According to the programme notes, it was a "dialogue" of Euripides' tragedy with Pier Paolo Pasolini's film script of *Medea*, Jean Anouil's eponymous play and Heiner Müller's *Medeamaterial*. The novelty of the director's approach lay not so much in the synthesis of the different dramaturgical sources, as in his decision to have three male performers embody the different 'stations' of Medea's story.

For one thing, the conflict between the human and the sacred/divine, which is at the heart of the tragedy, is rendered surprisingly quiet, challenging the customary declamatory style of many Greek productions. The near whisper dominating the performance gives it an otherworldly, almost metaphysical tone, which aptly brings to the fore the heroine's "sacred personality" and "spirituality" (programme notes). As the director explains when comparing his reading of *Medea* with Euripides' *Bacchae*, this is "an opportunity to research the reclaiming of one's identity, what can happen when a Dionysiac figure is brought into contact with a logocentric society" (Karantzas 2017b).

Quite effectively, the narrative line has the performers go back in time and speak the text in past tense, so as to reinforce the impression of personal story extending into myth. Two ac-

⁶ The small theatre of Ancient Epidaurus was established in the Acropolis of the ancient city of Epidaurus at the South-Western slope, before the period of Asclepius. Dedicated to the god Dionysus, it was used mainly for the events of the Dionysian cult. From the dedicatory inscriptions, it can be concluded that the construction of the theatre was held during the fourth century, with the sponsorship of prominent rulers and upper class people. A remarkable characteristic of the theatre is the inscriptions, which constitute a real – living museum. (Information on the Municipality of Epidaurus web site: <http://www.epidavros.gr/en/sightseeing/47-to-mikro-theatro.html>).

tors (Christos Loulis and Michalis Sarantis) also used excerpts from Pasolini's film script, interspersed with lines from Euripides. The exactly choreographed movement – the actors would frequently freeze in place during the narrative – transformed them into mythical creatures from a fairytale: we learn about Medea's far away land, the arrival of Jason and the stealing of the Golden fleece, and, finally, of Medea's decision to become a murderess, in order to follow her lover to his country, in which she is to become a stranger. Nonetheless, the distance from the events is never entirely done with, especially when the third actor (Yiorgos Gallos) enters the scene to assume the character of Medea, joining the other two men in recounting her tale. More jarringly, the three male performers synthesise Medea's myth from the disparate fragments of her story, and, ironically, subtly and gradually build a collage portrait of her femininity. If anything, the tension between the male-female perspective is established more potently – through the irony of having a man impersonate the character of Medea – especially as the narrative engages Medea's own point-of-view and appears to fully condone her actions. As they struggle to put together Medea's life, a variety of captivating experiments take place. For example, the three actors performing Medea go in and out of character, as though they have stepped out of their male-hosting-a-female body, to describe and comment on the facts of the story. In more involved moments, Medea delves deep into the character's vulnerability, hurting from betrayal, in notably low tones. Commenting on the production concept, Karantzas explains that the production engages representation and an involvement with the characters. However, there are also moments when we “step outside from the tragedy to create a dialogue with Pasolini's material – how Medea can recover her relationship with the light and with the sun”, which is the main argument of the performance (Karantzas 2017b).

The a-local, timeless mood is reinforced by scenography. The action is set against what looks like an art installation, covering the orchestra pit with white women's corsets, in the middle of which springs up a twig, a small tree. The timeless black suits, adequately formalistic, add, without intruding, to the mood of ritual – the three men have been variously viewed as priestly figures or as bridegrooms preparing for their wedding. The ingenuity of the

scenographic concept makes the children's sacrifice scene a memorable one: the tree is torn out of the ground, dirt and roots all visible, while Sun emerges out of the deepest recesses of the earth, a chthonic force that burns everything around it. The glaring light that permeates the entire stage foregrounds the act of killing in full irony, sanctifying Medea's act.

Needless to say, the ritualistic movement, hosted within the abstracted environment, is conducive to a reading that supersedes any psychologised interpretations of the betrayal motif. Drawing from Heiner Müller's *Medea Material*, the ending makes good use of the polysemy involved in the male-female duality: "I want to cleave mankind in two / And live in the empty centre" (Müller 1995: 53). Here, the adaptation transcends the gender politics of the production with an all-too-human statement of catharsis and reconciliation. Ultimately, while the performance context may also foster elements of chamber drama, with all its intimacy and whispering tones, the energy that pervades the minimalist action is bacchanalian. The director wishes Medea to gradually shed off her female side, in her desired union with a "different nature", sun (Karantzias 2017a). The Dionysian force "utterly devastates in absolute clarity the narrow-minded, conservative society in which Medea found herself". The sun "burns down the landscape, just so a new one can be born" (Karantzias 2017a).

3.6. Lena Kitsopoulou

Among the most radical revisionists of the younger generation of Greeks is the writer-director Lena Kitsopoulou, whose *Antigone-Lonely Planet* [*Αντιγόνη-Lonely Planet*] (2017) was staged in the form of a performance-lecture at the Onassis Cultural Centre in Athens, conceived as an ironic, satirical reading of Sophocles' celebrated tragedy. A group of four skiers, whose function mirrors that of an ancient Greek chorus, come together at a conference, to offer their views on the play and report their personal tragedies, directly addressing the audience. The idea that anybody – whether an expert or a layman – can speak about *Antigone* eventually leads to a fascinating brainstorming on the rights and wrongs of abiding

by the law or breaking the rules, as well as to a series of observations on the nature and efficacy of collectivity.

The ruling idea of Kitsopoulou's adaptation is that we all carry within us an Antigone, a Creon, or a tragedy equal in stature to Sophocles' drama. The very premise of an Antigone-themed conference as the main locus of action is part of the playwright's desire not only to bring the past closer to the present, but to demystify the tragedy's privileged position within Greece's production history. Kitsopoulou explains her process of writing the play:

I am not doing Sophocles' *Antigone*. I am doing my own play, inspired by *Antigone* and try to locate her, to follow her, to grasp her. In the first part of the play . . . I present a lecture about Antigone, asking my own questions through Antigone [on] what tragedy means to a modern person, what violence, dilemmas, madness, loneliness, love and faith mean. In the process, I find in [actress] Sophia Kokkali a contemporary Antigone, and follow, as much as I can, in a filmic way, her imprisonment within life . . . I am looking for the tension between living and dead, through the fragments of the play and those of my mind, as it experiences death every day. (Kitsopoulou 2017a)

The artist has always used satire and deconstructive strategies to comment on whatever she feels is ailing in contemporary Greek society. Clichés drawn from modern Greek popular culture – recurrent motifs in Kitsopoulou's work – are main structural elements. Everything – text, imagery, emotions – becomes deconstructed, until the tragic and parodic merge into one. The four speakers pontificate passionately about the simplest things, a fact which generates humour. This is clearly the case in one of the monologues of a father who suffers at his daughter's rebellion, as she opts for tennis instead of skiing, her father's sport. That said, the concept that people with little to do with either *Antigone* or the theatre can comfortably discuss what connects them to the characters, identifying in them their own afflictions, would ultimately generate controversy in the spectators.

Bearing associations of 'Greekness', the conference room is decorated with photographs of famous Greek actresses who had performed Antigone in the past. Besides the four skiers (in full sports gear), the audience is constantly startled by an on-

slaught of surreal images, such as a scuba diver who parades on stage and is murdered off-stage, and, more surprisingly, a bear that comments on the difficulties of being a skier. Pitted against such grotesque moments of hilarity are snippets from Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* and lines from the author's imagined dialogue with Rainer Werner Fassbinder. We are also bombarded by references to popular clichés and stereotypes of modern Greek life and society (including allusions to the tycoon Aristotelis Onassis, whose Cultural Foundation was actually hosting the production) as well as with the fears and anxieties of the writer (namely, mottos such as "cigarettes can lead to bad teeth and teratogenesis"; "security guards can be violently abusive"). Kitsopoulou endorses the aesthetics of kitsch as a lens that refracts the ailments of the Greek middle class.

The arsenal of directorial quirks is inexhaustible: things are constantly improvised, variety sketches produce coarse laughter, brief film footage and popular Greek songs alternate with exaggerated images of splatter and gags. Yet, while Kitsopoulou's humour often makes perfect sense, sometimes the audience's perceptual faculties are tested to the limit, as her never-ceasing sense of the bizarre parodies the solemn premise of Sophocles' tragedy. Her pastiche strategies are grounded on the conviction that tragedy and comedy can interchange, that "good humour conceals pain", that "tragedy has comedy in it" (Kitsopoulou 2017b). If anything, this is a ritual of deconstruction and demystification: of tradition, of antiqueness of any illusory identification with the grandeur of one's classical 'Greekness':

I don't think of ancient Greek drama as something otherworldly or difficult, or as something intimidating. I think it includes me... it's in the tiniest snapshot of daily life, and in the most extreme weather phenomenon. It's condensed poetry, and all I can do is to adjust my small self in it. I know I have a place in there, I know it speaks about me. (Kitsopoulou 2017c)

In the second part of the show, the director changes gear: we watch a shocking video sequence of Antigone crawling across the marble floors of the building, 'shedding' behind some of her vital organs, before she is finally boxed into a glass coffin. The ico-

nography is extreme: blood is everywhere, while Antigone is being brutally victimised by security guards and then interacts sexually with the body of her dead brother. In the most dramatic and visually stunning scene, after the character is buried alive inside her transparent tomb, the audience is asked to leave the theatre space, before the performance ends, to quietly register the final shocking moments of the play. The performance ends without a definitive end. As the spectators leave the space, one is left with the impression that the tragedy will go on forever.

One may well claim that Kitsopoulou's theatrical universe is ruled by chaos, as if she is trying to plunge into the abyss of human pain. Be that as it may, while the director she has been celebrated as the 'enfant terrible' of Greek theatre, it is worth considering that her plays and performances – praised as pieces of revolt against bourgeois complacency – are ultimately sponsored by the very capitalist structures of established cultural institutions, depending for the survival upon the system they are meant to be criticising.

On a Hopeful Note

The dangers of deconstruction and revisionism have repeatedly fed the discussion on adaptation and the limits of directorial freedom, also based on the assumption that unless developed intuitively, an originally fresh idea can slide into mannerist pattern. However, many straightforward renderings that claim affinity to the ancient conventions of performance fail to either move the spectators or invite critical understanding or both; in such orthodox productions, the original text often falls into deep slumber and eventually fades into oblivion, as if collapsing under the weight of the centuries that it has carried on its shoulders. Indeed, much of modern theatre's inability to arouse strong reactions in today's disillusioned audiences can be attributed precisely to the fallacy of recreating – or slavishly aping – the imagined conditions of an era that are no longer applicable or interesting to us (Sidiropoulou 2015: 45).

Even though the issues involved in directing the classics re-

main open, acknowledging the levels of both indebtedness and divergence from the original (ancient) source in any act of directorial rewriting could perhaps foster a more mature and honest attitude to adaptation. Calling a performance an ‘adaptation’, ‘new reading inspired by’ or ‘version after’ from the start could be an effective way of paying tribute to the original author and also making clear from the outset that a degree of divergence from the source text will be in operation. This way, the audience can find it easier to endorse any radically different outlooks on the familiar myths. Theoretically at least, both directors and spectators have had time to resolve within themselves such troublesome notions as respect or sacrilege towards the source text.

The love-hate relationship of the modern Greeks to their long tradition is perhaps fuel to the dynamic, ever-fluid potential of adaptation, sustaining the question of why and how the classics can be still meaningful today. Through their innovative work, the directors who have – although briefly – been featured in this article add further ammunition to the argument that we can no longer retell the stories of our predecessors without first considering the factors that can render them relevant today. In acknowledging the fact that the past is quite separate from their present, these artists ultimately go through a ritual of mourning. In different ways, their work seems to capture the sense of loss that gradually comes after the burial of a loved one: it is mixed with a hopeful – if wistful – acceptance that in remembering the dead we are in fact keeping them alive amongst us.

Works Cited

- Attis Theatre, <<https://www.attistheatre.com/en/%CE%A0%CE%A1%CE%9F%CE%93%CE%A1%CE%91%CE%9C%CE%9C%CE%91.html>> (Accessed 29 June 2018).
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2004), “Thinking about the Origins of Theatre in the Twentieth Century”, in Edith Hall, Fiona Macintosh and Amanda Wrigley (eds), *Dionysus Since 69. Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millennium*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 329-60.
- (2005), *Theatre, Sacrifice, Ritual. Exploring Forms of Political Theatre*, Abingdon: Oxon.

- Hall, Edith (2004), "Introduction: Why Greek Tragedy in the Late Twentieth Century", in Edith Hall, Fiona Macintosh and Amanda Wrigley (eds), *Dionysus Since 69. Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millennium*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-46.
- Heaney, Seamus (1990), *A Cure at Troy. A Version of Sophocles' Philoctetes*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Houvardas, Yannis (2010), "Interviewed by Vena Georgakopoulou, 'Who's Responsible for Young People's Depression?'" , *Ta Nea*, 24 July, <<http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=186218>> (Accessed 14 July 2018).
- (2016), "Interviewed by Myrto Loverdou. 'There can be no Politics without Deception'", *To Vima*, 18 June, <<http://www.tovima.gr/culture/article/?aid=808348>> (Accessed 11 September 2016).
- Hutcheon, Linda (2003), *A Poetics of Postmodernism. History, Theory, Fiction*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Kaltaki, Matina (2016), "This was not Oresteia", *Lifo*, 11 July, <<http://www.lifo.gr>> (Accessed 2 October 2016).
- Karantzas, Dimitris (2017a), "Interviewed by Efi Marinou. 'I no longer believe in ideas'", *Efimerida ton Syntakton*, 1 July, <http://www.efsyn.gr/arthro/den-pisteyo-pia-se-kamia-idea> (Accessed 5 May).
- Karantzas, Dimitris (2017b), "Interviewed by Dimitris Mastroyannitis. 'How to stage *Medea* with three performers'", *Athens Voice*, 8 June, http://www.athensvoice.gr/culture/theater/357821_pos-tha-anevei-i-mideia-me-3-ithopoiouys (Accessed 25 April 2018).
- Kermode, Frank (1975), *The Classic: Literary Images of Permanence and Change*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Kitsopoulou, Lena (2017a), "Interviewed by Danaï Dragonea. 'Lena Kitsopoulou Experiences a Tragedy'", *Vice*, 18 Dec., <<https://www.vice.com/gr/article/7xw484/h-lena-kitsopoyloy-zei-mia-tragwdia>> (Accessed 25 June 2018).
- (2017b), "Interviewed by Selana Vrondi. 'The dark seduction of Lena Kitsopoulou'", *Kathimerini*, 27 Nov., <<http://www.kathimerini.gr/936015/gallery/periodiko-k/an8rwpoi/h-skoteinh-saghnh-ths-lenas-kitsopoyloy>> (Accessed 20 June 2018).
- (2017c), "'Αντιγόνη-Lonely Planet' Press Release": <<https://antigone.sgt.gr/after-performance-talk-with-lena-kitsopoulou?lang=gr>> (Accessed 22 June 2018).
- McDonald, Marianne (1991), *Ancient Sun, Modern Light. Greek Drama on the Modern Stage*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Müller, Heiner (1995), *Waterfront Wasteland Medea Material Landscape with Argonauts*, ed. and trans. M. von Henning, in Heiner Müller:

- Theatremachine*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Neofytou, Tania (2017), "Theatrical Traces of the Past in the Contemporary Theatre: The Case of Simos Kakalas", *Journal of Literature and Art Studies* 7 (3): 278-87.
- Pavis, Patrice (1986), "The Classical Heritage of Modern Drama: The Case of Postmodern Theatre", trans. Loren Kruger, *Modern Drama* 29 (1): 1-22.
- (1996), *Analyzing Performance. Theatre, Dance, and Film*, trans. David Williams, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- (2013), *Contemporary Mise en Scène. Staging Theatre Today*, London: Routledge.
- Philippoglou, Costas (2015), "Interviewed by Olga Sella. 'I Wish I Would Only Direct Tragedy'", *Kathimerini*, 16 August, <<http://www.kathimerini.gr/827034/article/politismos/8eatro/k-filippogloy-makari-na-ekana-mono-tragwdia>> (Accessed 3 August 2018).
- Revermann, Martin (2008), "The Appeal of Dystopia: Latching onto Greek Drama in the Twentieth Century", *Arion*, Third Series, 16 (1): 97-118.
- Sarigiannis, Yorgos (2014a), "'Philoctetes': When Poetry Reigns", *To Tetarto Koudouni*, 7 September, <http://totertartokoudouni.blogspot.com/2014/09/blog-post_86.html> (Accessed 2 July 2018).
- (2014b), "'Bacchae': the new thing without anything new", *To Tetarto Koudouni*, 10 August, <<http://totertartokoudouni.blogspot.com/2014/08/blog-post.html>> (Accessed 24 July 2018).
- Sidiropoulou, Avra (2013) "Greece", in Anne Fliotsos and Wendy Vierow (eds), *International Women Stage Directors*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- (2015) "Adaptation, Re-contextualisation and Metaphor. Auteur Directors and the Staging of Greek Tragedy", *Adaptation* 8: 31-49.
- (2016), "Directors' Theatre in Greece. Stages of Authorship in the Work of Michael Marmarinos, Yannis Houvardas and Theodoros Terzopoulos", *Gramma Journal of Theory and Criticism* 22: 121-33.
- (2017), "Greek Contemporary Approaches to Tragedy: Terzopoulos' Revisions of Aeschylus", in George Rodosthenous (ed.), *Contemporary Adaptations of Greek Tragedy. Authorship and Directorial Visions*, London: Bloomsbury.
- (forthcoming), "Adaptation and the Ethics of Directing", in Vayos Liapis and Avra Sidiropoulou (eds), *Adapting Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

'Guidaci a passo di danza'. Cori comici sulla scena

MARTINA TREU

Abstract

The special Issue of *Skenè* 1.1.2018, *The Chorus in Drama*, edited by Guido Avezzi, was dedicated to exploring a crucial problem in the study of ancient theatre and its reception: the Chorus, a source of many practical issues for those who adapt, re-write, or stage ancient plays. In my opinion, the Chorus may be decisive for the success of a show. In support of this hypothesis, this paper analyses the most problematic aspects regarding the comic Chorus in ancient texts, and compares some interesting solutions offered by modern directors and playwrights.

Guidateci fuori, abbiamo danzato abbastanza, per oggi
Aristofane, *Nuvole*, 1510

Guidateci . . . , a passo di danza, fuori scena
Mai nessuno prima osò farlo
congedare un coro comico a passo di danza
Aristofane, *Vespe*, 1535-7

1. Contenuto, metodo e obiettivi dello studio

Il primo numero di *Skenè* (*The Chorus in Drama: Avezzi 2015*) è dedicato al coro, componente fondamentale del dramma antico e oggetto di attenzione crescente non solo nel panorama degli studi internazionali, ma anche sulla scena. In Italia il coro aristofaneo è protagonista di molti spettacoli di successo, in particolare a Siracusa, anche se – come vedremo – resta un banco di prova arduo per chi adatta, interpreta e mette in scena la commedia antica. Per meglio individuare i problemi da affrontare, e poi vedere alcune soluzioni adottate da registi e drammaturghi, è necessario ripercorrere per sommi capi il comportamento del coro in Aristofane, le tecniche drammatiche, i rapporti di forza, le esigenze che governano le scelte

formali di linguaggio o di stile. Su queste basi potremo poi verificare la resa scenica, con particolare attenzione all'impiego della danza e della musica, prendendo ad esempio le commedie per noi più significative.¹ L'intento ultimo è dimostrare come il coro comico, se funziona, può diventare il 'cuore pulsante' di uno spettacolo ed essere 'rivelatore' di pregi e difetti dell'intera messinscena (cf. Treu 2007 e Caneva-García-Reig 2019).

Il presente contributo combina lo studio del testo con la pratica scenica ed è frutto di un percorso di ricerca, critica e lavoro in teatro (perlopiù come *Dramaturg* e consulente alla drammaturgia corale: cf. nota biografica). Da un lato l'analisi testuale può fornire spunti utili per la riscrittura e la messinscena; dall'altro, le esperienze sul campo offrono spesso motivi di riflessione, permettono di percepire uno spettacolo 'dall'esterno', con gli occhi del pubblico, ma anche 'dall'interno', con lo sguardo di chi affronta il testo di Aristofane come copione da rappresentare (prima a tavolino e poi in scena), assiste il regista nel reclutare coreuti, compositori, coreografi, immagina e realizza tramite il coro un sistema complesso di gesti, coreografie, scenari, musiche.

Il trattamento del coro nei testi antichi appare condizionato da molti fattori, che a loro volta si ripercuotono sulla scena, e comporta un gran numero di variabili non riconducibili a norme generali. Ma sulla scorta di alcuni studi aristofanei (a cominciare da Russo, 1984) è possibile distinguere nella commedia un piano relativo alla vicenda (che caratterizza i personaggi) e uno che chia-

¹ Per ragioni personali e affettive, oltre che scientifiche, mi fa piacere dedicare a Guido Avezù uno studio sul coro comico, oggetto di interesse comune, in ricordo degli anni passati con Diego Lanza a Pavia e a Padova. In quelle sedi ho coltivato lo studio del coro grazie a loro e altri maestri, pionieri e ispiratori dei miei lavori (in particolare quelli, citati in bibliografia, su cui baso le riflessioni che seguono). Rimando alla bibliografia per ulteriori dettagli, limitandomi a citare qui Claude Calame (cf. da ultimo Calame 2006), Carlo Ferdinando Russo, Dario Del Corno e Umberto Albini: su questi ultimi cf. ad esempio i numeri 21 (2012) e 36 (2017) della rivista *Stratagemmi. Prospettive teatrali* e rispettivamente del primo autore *Erinni e Boy Scouts. Il coro nelle riscritture moderne del dramma antico* (De Finis 1989: 79-88), del secondo *Come può parlarci il coro greco* (Albini 1993). Ringrazio inoltre l'Archivio INDA e i curatori del volume per avermi concesso di tributare questo affettuoso omaggio.

miamo “azione scenica”, dove si osservano ruoli e funzioni svolte da attori e coro, a prescindere dalla loro personalità drammatica. Confrontando i due piani possiamo individuare nella commedia aristofanea poche costanti fondamentali (ossia componenti tipiche e ricorrenti, specialmente riguardanti il coro e i suoi rapporti con gli attori) e con un’indagine sistematica evidenziare il ruolo del coro come motore e propulsore dell’azione (cf. Treu 1999).

In primo luogo emerge l’importanza strategica della sezione di commedia che comprende l’ingresso del coro o *parodos* e combina l’efficacia comunicativa del canto corale, della musica e della danza (anche sulla scena contemporanea, come vedremo). Qui si presenta il coro al pubblico e si caratterizza come personaggio, si definiscono i rapporti di forza e soprattutto la relazione conflittuale o di alleanza istituita con i personaggi interpretati dal primo attore (che talvolta appare in più ruoli, nel prologo e nel seguito della commedia, talvolta affiancato da una spalla nella cosiddetta ‘coppia comica’ con un altro attore). In ogni caso è lui di norma l’interlocutore privilegiato del coro (per quantità e qualità delle battute) e determina sul piano della vicenda relazioni che variano da una commedia all’altra (o nell’arco di una stessa commedia, quando il coro ad esempio si trasforma da antagonista ad alleato o aiutante del protagonista).

I coreuti godono di uno *status* privilegiato, e collettivo, dentro e fuori la finzione scenica al tempo stesso: qualunque ruolo interpretino, rimangono cittadini ateniesi; non si spogliano mai del tutto del costume e delle maschere, non perdono di vista la realtà. Tant’è vero che, quando la commedia presenta un’allegoria, il coro può fornire la ‘chiave’ per interpretarla. Così ad esempio spettano proprio al coro i riferimenti più espliciti all’uomo politico reale (Cleone) che è bersaglio comune dei *Cavalieri* e delle *Vespe* (rappresentate a Siracusa rispettivamente nel 2018 e nel 2014: cf. oltre). In entrambe il coro contribuisce in modo determinante a innalzare il ‘tasso di aggressività’ della commedia e la incardina su un doppio binario, con un’azione parallela a quella degli attori; da un lato si scaglia contro l’antagonista (rispettivamente Paflagone e Bdelicleone), dall’altro veicola, promuove e amplifica il messaggio polemico in modo esplicito, sistematico e con ben più ampio respiro rispetto agli attori: sia per l’atteggiamento combattivo e la pro-

pensione alla lotta dalla *parodos* in crescendo (grazie a ritmi ben calibrati in *climax* e apposite coreografie che mimano lo scontro) sia per il peculiare ricorso alle forme più complesse di *psogos* (attacchi personali nominali e diretti contro persone reali, estranee alla vicenda e non incarnate in scena da attori).

Lo *psogos* è una delle armi più potenti del coro comico, a giudicare dalle commedie conservate e dai resti di quelle perdute, specie nella parabasi: come sottolinea Degani, “nella parabasi – è noto – il tono della commedia si fa più serio, al di sopra di ogni finzione scenica, e anche gli attacchi ai vari personaggi non hanno mai la contingenza di semplici battute ironiche e salaci e di comiche buffonate” (Degani 1960: 195; cf. anche Cornford 1961: 195-225; Sifakis 1971; Bowie 1982; Newiger 1987; Mastromarco 1987; Totaro 2000; Imperio 2004). Ma anche nel resto della commedia il coro usa lo *psogos*, l’aggressività verbale e le altre munizioni in suo possesso in modo ben più organico, coerente, sistematico e mirato rispetto agli attori (cf. Treu 1999: 37-8).

Già dalla prima commedia conservata, gli *Acarnesi*, il coro comico ha in più l’eccezionale prerogativa di lanciare maledizioni (*Ach.* 1143ss.) ed esercitare anche al di fuori della parabasi lo *psogos* ‘di qualità’ che caratterizza maggiormente i coreuti rispetto agli attori: in generale i primi lo esercitano ‘dall’alto’, per il loro *status* collettivo, spesso rafforzato dall’autorità di una personalità drammatica privilegiata e dominante; gli attori al contrario prediligono la *vis* comica ‘dal basso’, specie nei panni di personaggi ignobili e vili (come vedremo, il Salsicciaio dei *Cavalieri* batte l’avversario Paflagone-Cleone proprio perché è peggiore di lui). Inoltre, la distribuzione dello *psogos* corale nel *corpus* aristofaneo conservato appare regolata da principi di armonia e coerenza ben visibili a un’analisi puntuale. In particolare vige una sorta di ‘legge di compensazione’ (a livello complessivo, nell’arco di una commedia, ma anche nelle sue singole sezioni o parti: cf. Treu 1999). L’aggressività del coro aumenta man mano che ci si avvicina al reale, e cresce in modo proporzionale alla pericolosità del bersaglio nascosto dietro il personaggio comico. E quando gli attacchi si concentrano su di lui diminuisce lo *psogos* verso altri bersagli, evidentemente per non disperdere l’effetto su troppi fronti.

Ne abbiamo un ottimo esempio nelle due commedie già ci-

tate, *Cavalieri* e *Vespe*, accomunate da un avversario forte e legato al demagogo Cleone. Quest'ultimo giustifica l'eccezionale aggressività scatenata dal coro, che raggiunge l'apice nel primo *agon* dei *Cavalieri* e nell'*agon* delle *Vespe*. Qui si concentra la maggior parte delle battute rivolte al secondo attore nelle scene precedenti a ogni *agon* e dedicate allo scontro fra coro e attori nelle rispettive commedie. Nelle prime sei commedie conservate queste due scene costituiscono l'unica eccezione alla regola che impone normalmente il primo attore come interlocutore privilegiato del coro per qualità e quantità di battute. Nelle *Vespe* il gioco delle parti fra primo e secondo attore e i caratteri dei personaggi fanno sì che il coro fino all'*agon* si opponga al deuteragonista, che impersona a nostro avviso Bdelicleone (si vedano le varie ipotesi sull'attribuzione dei ruoli in Treu 1999:21-4), ma poi i giudici mutano radicalmente opinione, con una 'conversione' che assume maggior risalto proprio perché lo scontro è stato tanto violento; nei *Cavalieri*, invece, il fatto che l'aggressività si trasmetta dal coro al primo attore senza mai esaurirsi si deve al bersaglio polemico della commedia, Cleone, impersonato sulla scena dal secondo attore.

A tale riguardo si deve sottolineare che la sorte subita nel finale dal Paflagone, non a caso, è condivisa in altre commedie da quei personaggi (generalmente interpretati dal secondo attore) cui corrispondano nella realtà individui noti, oggetto di derisione e scherno condivisi, quali Lamaco negli *Acarnesi* o Socrate nelle *Nuvole*. Tale aggressività, in simili casi, è prima catalizzata sul personaggio e poi trasferita dalla vicenda alla realtà sfruttando la persona fisica dell'attore. Un esempio lampante è ancora nei *Cavalieri*, dove quasi tutta la carica aggressiva degli attori e del coro è convogliata sul Paflagone, cioè su Cleone; ben poco spazio, dunque, è lasciato ad altri idoli polemici se non quando mediante loro si può colpire indirettamente Cleone (cf. *Eq.* 253-4, 400-1, 407-8). Lo *psogos* corale è assente dalla prima parabasi mentre raggiunge la massima concentrazione nella seconda parabasi (*Eq.* 1274-315); nel resto della commedia lo *psogos* è esercitato esclusivamente dagli attori (*Eq.* 1362ss.), mentre il coro si limita a rivolgere elogi benauguranti al terzo attore-Demos.

Il coro di questa commedia si distingue fra quelli aristofanei non solo per la violenza dei suoi attacchi, ma per la frequen-

za e convinzione con cui simmetricamente elogia i suoi beniamini: al salsicciaio, ad esempio, dedica l'encomio che chiude l'*agon* (Eq. 457-60), il saluto beneaugurante che apre la parabasi (Eq. 498-502), gli elogi entusiastici che precedono e seguono il resoconto della missione alla *Boulè* (Eq. 611-23, 683-90). Il testo dei *Cavalieri*, in particolare, sembra suggerire che il coro intervenga in aiuto del primo servo e del salsicciaio assalendo fisicamente il Paflagone e impedendogli di nuocere (cf. Treu 1999: 24-53, nonché Barone 2002: 303-24 e 367-81). Anche il coro delle *Vespe* nella prima parte della commedia si limita a due brevi battute di *psogos* isolate, rispettivamente l'invocazione ironica a Teoro (*Vesp.* 418-19) e la domanda rivolta al secondo attore (*Vesp.* 464-70): la maggior parte dello *psogos* si concentra nel canto corale a scena vuota situato nella seconda parte della commedia (*Vesp.* 1264a-91). Molto violento, ma non nominale, è l'attacco condotto contro di lui nella parabasi (vv. 1029-37); anche il successivo canto corale è dedicato allo *psogos* (vv. 1265a-91). Il terzo canto corale, infine (vv. 1450-73) è riservato a espressioni d'invidia per la sorte di Filocleone e elogi nei confronti del figlio. In questa parte della commedia lo *psogos* ricompare anche nei dialoghi fra gli attori, ma ha portata ben limitata rispetto agli attacchi del coro.

2. Il coro a Siracusa

Possiamo ora confrontare quanto emerge dai testi con il trattamento riservato al coro comico da registi e drammaturghi in anni recenti, con una doverosa premessa storica: nella seconda metà del Novecento il coro aristofaneo è stato protagonista di produzioni importanti soprattutto all'estero, molto meno in Italia (a parte poche eccezioni, come il *musical* di Garinei e Giovannini ispirato a *Lisistrata*: cf. Treu 2009: 55-6 e Olson 2013: 839, 952-6). Ancora oggi, per la cronica carenza di fondi che affligge il teatro italiano, il coro viene spesso tagliato o ridotto. Poche produzioni possono contare su spazi capienti per le prove e per lo spettacolo, e possono sostenere finanziariamente il costo di reclutare un numero adeguato di coreuti validi e adatti a sostenere la parte (in origine ventiquattro, per Aristofane, ma anche meno sulla scena contem-

poranea). Di qui la pratica diffusa di operare sostanziali riduzioni dei coreuti (limitandoli a pochi o a uno solo) e delle parti corali. Se questo vale per ogni coro, in generale, quello comico appare afflitto da un handicap aggiuntivo per le caratteristiche sopra descritte, *in primis* l'aggressività e lo *psogos*. Il suo peso in scena non è comparabile a quello dei cori tragici, a Siracusa e in altri festival: la commedia stessa del resto è stata a lungo confinata in produzioni estive e minori, del circuito locale, talvolta ridotta a esperimento nell'uso delle maschere, curiosità folkloristica o intermezzo buffonesco.

Solo dagli anni Novanta il coro aristofaneo si afferma tra le compagnie indipendenti, nei siti archeologici e nei teatri storici, come l'Olimpico di Vicenza o il teatro greco di Siracusa (almeno a partire dagli *Acarnesi*, 1994. Per gli anni precedenti cf. Amoroso 1997). Qui da oltre cento anni (nel 1914 il primo *Agamennone*) gli spettacoli classici continuano ad attirare un pubblico fedele di cittadini siracusani, da sempre ospiti assidui del teatro, ma anche di turisti italiani e stranieri. Nel numero di persone coinvolte vanno contati anche attori, coreuti, maestranze e personale della Fondazione INDA, artigiani, artisti locali, tecnici e soprattutto gli allievi dell'Accademia del Dramma Antico "Giusto Monaco": oltre a recitare negli spettacoli classici, da qualche anno sono protagonisti di produzioni 'corali' autonome a Siracusa e in *tournee* (cf. il sito <http://www.indafondazione.org>). Questa preziosa componente collettiva, in rappresentanza della città, contribuisce ad avvicinare Siracusa all'antica Atene per il ruolo centrale del teatro – e in particolare del coro – come espressione di una comunità o corpo civico (cf. Besana-Esposito-Treu 2018).

In *primis* attraverso il coro, la città si raccoglie e si specchia nel suo teatro, mantenendo viva la memoria della *polis* greca. Si accende la competizione, pur in mancanza di concorsi drammatici veri e propri sul modello ateniese. Il pubblico a suo modo si fa giudice, segue le prove e commenta l'allestimento: a chi frequenta assiduamente Siracusa capita di assistere o partecipare a vivaci discussioni per individuare il miglior attore, regista o coro, con schieramenti contrapposti tra partigiani dell'uno o dell'altro spettacolo. In questo senso, ben al di là della 'cronaca', la vita 'politica' di Siracusa e del suo territorio influenza più o meno direttamente

la scelta e l'allestimento dei drammi, e si ripercuote inevitabilmente sul coro.

Ne possiamo cogliere riflessi evidenti sui quotidiani e nelle riviste di settore a stampa o online (quali *Hystrio*, *Stratagemmi*, *Prospettive teatrali*, *drammaturgia.it*, *doppiozero.it*, *dramma.it*), dove si riconosce il peso scenico crescente del coro, specie nei recenti cicli di spettacoli classici siracusani, sottolineandone la molteplicità, versatilità e complessità di funzioni (cf. ad esempio Treu 2013b, 2014b; Giovannelli 2017a). In particolare Giuseppe Liotta (già presidente dell'Associazione Critici di Teatro) insiste ripetutamente sulla resa del coro come importante indicatore della qualità della regia, spesso più soddisfacente nelle commedie che nelle tragedie. In "Fuori dal coro" critica le *Baccanti* siracusane del 2012 per la mancanza di armonia che caratterizza tanto la recitazione degli attori quanto i movimenti del 'doppio Coro', mentre in "La preminenza del coro" elogia gli *Uccelli* diretti da Roberta Torre (Liotta 2012). Anche l'anno seguente Liotta considera il trattamento del coro sintomatico dei difetti comuni alle due regie tragiche (parla di funzione "esponenziale ondivaga, un po' di qua, un po' di là a seconda delle necessità della scena"), e vi contrappone il coro delle *Donne al parlamento* che "arricchisce la scena della sua bella e vivace presenza" (Liotta 2013).

Seppure positive, tuttavia, quasi tutte le pagine critiche si concentrano sulla *verve* e sull'energia del coro, ma non si fermano sul suo rapporto col pubblico e con gli attori, sulla capacità di sostenere e accompagnare la vicenda, sullo *psogos*. Le recensioni della commedia inoltre occupano solitamente uno spazio esiguo, rispetto alla tragedia, nel caso di Liotta come di molti altri critici. Ed è anche questo un segnale di una tendenza ancora diffusa: per quanto la commedia si affermi sempre di più (risuotendo apprezzamenti e consensi da critica e pubblico), tuttavia sembra ancora 'discriminata' rispetto alla tragedia. Nei comunicati stampa, nei convegni, nei programmi di sala ha meno rilievo delle tragedie; spesso è relegata a sedi minori, a fine stagione, in date meno frequenti e frequentate.

Perfino le traduzioni delle commedie, diversamente dalle tragedie, in passato non sempre erano commissionate per la scena, né recenti come richiede un genere che per sua natura invec-

chia assai rapidamente. Al contrario si adottavano, per risparmiare, traduzioni libere da diritti d'autore e quindi irrimediabilmente datate. E si scoraggiavano i registi dal modificarle, com'è possibile verificare nei libretti via via pubblicati. Questioni simili, dalla traduzione alla collocazione della commedia, sono già state oggetto di critica da più parti (cf. Treu 2010a). Basti qui citare l'ottimo allestimento di *Donne al parlamento* diretto da Vincenzo Pirrotta nel 2013: inspiegabilmente relegato al Lunedì – tradizionale giorno di chiusura dei teatri – e dunque penalizzato come una produzione minore. Eppure il lavoro sul coro e l'impegno complessivo della compagnia dimostrano una cura e una coerenza fuori dal comune, al pari dei precedenti spettacoli di Pirrotta (cf. Treu 2005c: 198-204, 264-76; Treu 2006, 2013b, 2014b; Giovannelli 2013). Il regista e attore siciliano torna in qualche modo alle origini, al nucleo originario del dramma antico, risalendo la parabola discendente del coro comico: scrive *ex novo* una parabasi 'moderna', che è una novità assoluta per il teatro greco di Siracusa (l'adattamento precedente, *Le donne in assemblea* di Luciano Colavero, 2-20 giugno 2004, era opportunamente dislocato al Castello Maniace di Ortigia a debita distanza, temporale e spaziale, dal colle Temenite: cf. Treu 2005c: 293-6).

Nell'anno successivo (2014) la fondazione INDA festeggia il centenario degli spettacoli classici con l'*Oresteia* (cui spettano gli onori della cronaca). Ma la nostra attenzione va alle *Vespe* di Aristofane dirette dall'attore e regista Mauro Avogadro, degno coronamento della stagione per la coesione tra attori, coro e musicisti, per la forte componente di danza e musica, per la versatilità e la bravura degli interpreti e la complessiva efficacia dell'allestimento.

Va premesso che la stessa commedia aristofanea era già apparsa a Siracusa nel 2003, sempre associata a *Eumenidi* per il *trait d'union* del processo (nel primo caso subito da Oreste, nel secondo caso oggetto di denuncia, da parte di Aristofane, in quanto strumento di un sistema politico spesso manovrato da fazioni e 'clientele'). Per il debutto assoluto della commedia a Siracusa c'era grande attesa, e anche un certo 'sospetto' di partigianeria, dato che il premier Berlusconi era imputato all'epoca in vari processi. E tuttavia il regista prescelto, l'*outsider* Renato Giordano, fa una scelta controcorrente e spiazzante: smorza ogni possibile coloritura politica, non traspo-

ne nel presente nomi di personaggi o vittime dello *psogos* (neppure i due cani sotto processo), affida la parabasi a un attore, nel ruolo generico di “poeta” che evita accuratamente ogni riferimento al presente. Su tutto predomina una vena intimista e malinconica, una sorta di elegia della vecchiaia che trova nel coro e nel protagonista validi esponenti: oltremodo impegnati in elaborate coreografie, musiche e canti appositamente composti, perlopiù di ispirazione orientale, a cui si riconosce dignità autonoma tale da meritarse una registrazione e vendita su CD. Lo stesso accade, si noti per inciso, con le ultime *Rane* siracusane dirette da Giorgio Barberio Corsetti (cf. Treu 2017a) di recente trasmesse in prima serata su Rai1 (Sabato 1 settembre 2018), dopo il record di incassi e il tutto esaurito nel 2017, e la replica eccezionale a Siracusa del luglio 2018. Anche in questo caso appaiono determinanti le parti corali, ricche di canti e danze, e le musiche eseguite a cappella dal gruppo vocale Sei Ottavi, che accompagnano dal vivo l'esibizione di attori e ballerini, ma poi sono anche incise e vendute *online* come prodotto autonomo, a ulteriore conferma del successo ottenuto.

In questa prospettiva ci appare premonitrice la scelta di Giordano (*Vespe* 2003) che arricchisce la *performance* corale di canti e danze e ne fa la chiave di volta dello spettacolo: la componente musicale e coreografica diviene sempre più dominante, anche e perfino sul testo. E vale la pena di ricordare che quell'edizione 2003 seguiva il clamoroso ‘caso’ scatenato nel 2002 da Luca Ronconi, che al suo debutto siracusano fu accusato di ‘usare’ le *Rane* aristofanee per attaccare i principali esponenti dei partiti di centrodestra allora al governo: cf. Treu 2005c: 89-92 e 121-32; Treu 2009: 60-1; Hall-Wrigley 2007: 267-75.

Il regista aveva infatti previsto in origine, nella scenografia della commedia, tre enormi manifesti che incorniciavano l'orchestra e rappresentavano (non in modo realistico, ma come maschere grottesche e distorte alla Francis Bacon) gli onorevoli Fini, Casini e Berlusconi. L'intento dichiarato era trasporre sulla scena la presenza in Aristofane di nomi e volti ben noti al pubblico antico, ma non a quello contemporaneo. L'operazione, per quanto discutibile, aveva il pregio di spostare il fuoco della comunicazione dal piano verbale a quello visivo e di interpretare in modo moderno alcune caratteristiche fondamentali della commedia antica: l'icasticità,

l'uso di codici non realistici quanto simbolici, la prevalenza di maschere e tipi sui personaggi.

Ci pare di poter mettere in relazione questa scelta con l'analisi condotta sullo *psogos*, in particolare sulle vittime 'per antonomasia' che rappresentano un'intera categoria di persone, con caratteristiche simili, trasfigurate in 'maschere', icone, veri e propri stereotipi. In virtù di questo principio dunque sarebbe non solo lecito, ma anzi opportuno per il regista moderno sostituire a nomi e volti originari quelli di personaggi di oggi, purché presentino tratti paragonabili o affini. Specialmente se entra in causa il coro, che per sua natura tende a istituire parallelismi tra la realtà e la scena. Nel caso delle *Rane* ronconiane, peraltro, i manifesti controbilanciavano una presenza corale alquanto rarefatta e poco incisiva: il primo coro animalesco era ridotto a un cameo della sola Annamaria Guarnieri in costume verde che sbucava dalla botola scenica e con movenze grottesche e parodiche affrontava sbefeggiandolo Dioniso/Popolizio, mentre il secondo coro di iniziati, capitanato da un elegante e etereo Luciano Roman in *total white*, era un consesso pallido d'aspetto e languido di tono, labile ed effimero come presenza scenica, non certo aggressivo, neppure nella famosa parabasi contro i 'nemici della democrazia' che valse a Aristofane l'eccezionale replica delle *Rane*, secondo la tradizione (cf. da ultimo Canfora 2017). L'unica presenza corale significativa erano i due semicori aggiunti da Ronconi all'*agon* tra Eschilo e Euripide, che sostenevano con incitamenti verbali e gestuali i rispettivi 'campioni' nella gara poetica.

Nel 2002 in ogni caso la concomitanza della 'prima' con le elezioni a Siracusa ravvivò le cronache locali e nazionali, riportando Aristofane alla ribalta. Ronconi inizialmente respinse le critiche chiamando in causa l'autorità del commediografo e il carattere onomastico e aggressivo dello *psogos* originario; poi però, considerando i pro e i contro (nonché la pubblicità indiretta della polemica), fece rimuovere dalla scena i tre manifesti, pur tra le proteste di molti, lasciando al loro posto le cornici vuote.

Rivista oggi, la scelta può apparire estrema, eppure emblematica di altre successive, praticate su più vasta scala, anche se in modo meno eclatante e plateale: basti pensare alle 'censure preventive' spesso operate sui testi e sulla scena, che rispondono a lo-

giche occulte di alleggerimento se non totale ‘oscuramento’; o alla soppressione di nomi e fatti scomodi che potrebbero richiamarne altri odierni, e sarebbero meglio còlti e compresi, con opportune strategie di trasposizione testuale, diretta o indiretta, sia pure a livello di spunto o suggerimento, ma anche tramite accorgimenti scenici, musicali, costumi e altri apparati che stimolino nel pubblico una relazione anche intuitiva con equivalenti moderni.

Rispetto a questa strada, certo impervia, sembra invece prevalere a Siracusa la via tracciata da Ronconi: la ‘rimozione’ reale o metaforica di fatti o personaggi oggi dimenticati e dunque ‘scomodi’, o comunque la rinuncia a ‘tradurli’ e adattarli come ben pochi osano fare (tranne rare eccezioni, tra cui il sopra citato Pirrotta nel 2013). Anche le *Rane* del 2017 non traspongono nomi e riferimenti nel presente, non adattano il testo, ma anzi vi si attengono rigorosamente (cf. Treu 2017a e Giovannelli 2017b). Altrettanto vale per i *Cavalieri* del 2018, su cui torneremo. Soltanto in pochi casi più felici, come le *Vespe* del 2014, l’originaria carica aggressiva non si perde del tutto, ma viene ‘sublimata’ nella musica, nel canto e nella danza. E il coro torna ad essere protagonista.

3. Le *Vespe* centenarie

Le *Vespe* del 2014, come già le precedenti (2003), debuttano in concomitanza con processi ed arresti eccellenti di noti politici (e questo contribuisce indirettamente a potenziare l’impatto della commedia). Il regista Avogadro, di concerto col traduttore Grilli, riesce a trovare un buon equilibrio tra fedeltà al testo e attualizzazione, a cominciare dalla caratterizzazione del protagonista e del coro, su cui poggia la commedia: Filocleone (qui reso con “VivaCleone”) e i vecchi giudici sono accomunati sin dall’inizio da caratteristiche evidenti (l’amore dei processi, l’ostinazione e la rissosità), combinate con i temi topici legati alla vecchiaia (debolezza e decadenza fisica, nostalgia del passato).

Tutti questi nodi sono dipanati con grande maestria nella *parodos*, suddivisa in sezioni bene articolate e strutturate: ciascuna contribuisce con variazioni a rafforzare la tonalità di base della commedia, come una chiave musicale a inizio partitura. L’ingresso

del coro di vecchi giudici, annunciato a fine prologo, parte in sordina con un ritmo lento e un tono dolente e nostalgico, consono all'età dei personaggi e alla loro caratterizzazione; ma si sviluppa in crescendo e imprime progressivamente uno slancio irresistibile all'azione comica, soprattutto quando il coro fa trasparire gli stessi vizi e manie del vecchio protagonista (con tempismo comico fondamentale, perché il suo personaggio compare relativamente tardi, rispetto ad altre commedie). Con lui il coro instaura da subito una relazione assolutamente prioritaria, in termini di qualità e quantità delle battute (eccettuati gli attacchi riservati all'antagonista, di cui si è detto sopra). Insieme scandiscono il tempo come un metronomo – in battere e in levare – sostenendo la perfetta macchina della commedia.

Sul piano dell'azione scenica il rapporto privilegiato tra coro e protagonista non viene mai meno, anche quando a livello di vicenda il loro accordo sembra incrinarsi, circa a metà commedia: per primi i vecchi giudici sono persuasi dagli argomenti di Bdelicleone (qui "Abbassocleone") e passano dalla sua parte, condannando l'ostinazione del vecchio giudice (*Vesp.* 728-34, 743-9). Finché Vivacleone non cambia idea sui processi, e si ricongiunge idealmente col coro, la parabasi non può avere inizio (come avviene in tutte le commedie: cf. Treu 1999: 37-8). In questo modo il coro può dare il suo pieno appoggio al vecchio giudice, interpretato dal primo attore, in vista del messaggio che intende trasmettere al pubblico. Nelle *Vespe* la riconciliazione avviene insolitamente tardi, ed è sancita proprio dall'ultima battuta pronunciata dal coro prima della parabasi (*Vesp.* 1008). Nel seguito della commedia il coro, a differenza degli attori, non critica mai le azioni sconsiderate del protagonista, né tantomeno si dissocia dal suo *exploit* finale. In generale il suo ruolo si ridimensiona notevolmente, e questo si ripercuote, a riprova di quanto detto sopra, sulla scena.

Rispetto al testo, l'edizione del 2014 fa qualche concessione all'attualità nel prologo tra i due servi, che 'scalda' il pubblico preparando a dovere l'ingresso di Vivacleone; la vera svolta si ha con la *parodos*: il coro è motore trainante dell'azione grazie alla combinazione efficace di canto, recitazione, musiche, coreografia. Guidati da due corifei avanzano i coreuti: non allievi, ma professionisti affermati e affiatati, per lunga consuetudine (il co-

rifeo Francesco Biscione, ad esempio, nel 2010 recita col regista Avogadro a Siracusa: cf. Treu 2010a); simmetricamente e in perfetta armonia suonano, danzano e cantano i musicisti-attori della Banda Osiris, autori e esecutori dal vivo delle musiche opportunamente composte sul testo aristofaneo. Le singole componenti dello spettacolo in questo modo convergono come forze centripete, mai dispersive né centrifughe, in una linea coerente, grazie a un ottimo *ensemble* di attori e musicisti che insieme concorre al successo dello spettacolo.

4. I Cavalieri

Questo caso esemplare si presta bene al confronto con l'ultima commedia rappresentata al teatro greco di Siracusa (*Cavalieri*, 29 giugno-9 luglio 2018) che presenta notevoli affinità con le *Vespe*, come sopra accennato. Ma qui il bersaglio polemico non è solo evocato, bensì incarnato in scena dal secondo attore (il primo attore a mio avviso interpreta il primo servo in apertura di commedia e poi dopo la parabasi il salsicciaio: per le varie ipotesi sull'attribuzione delle parti cf. Treu 1999: 22). Si spiega così la sovrapposizione nella commedia di due piani diversi, quello allegorico (la casa di Demo/Popolo che rappresenta Atene) e quello reale (la lotta tra Cleone e gli altri uomini pubblici che si nascondono sotto le maschere dei personaggi). A quest'ultimo livello, non allegorico ma reale, fa sempre riferimento il coro di cavalieri, tanto da fornire (al di fuori della finzione scenica) una chiave di lettura esplicita dell'intera allegoria, menzionando direttamente Cleone col suo nome (v. 976).

L'antagonista del coro dunque è eccezionalmente forte e dominante, e l'aggressività si indirizza contro il reale bersaglio, Cleone. Si è visto che nelle *Vespe* il conflitto è a scoppio ritardato, teatralmente parlando, perché preceduto da una *parodos* dall'inizio lento e dal ritmo in crescendo. Qui invece il coro è straordinariamente attivo sin dall'ingresso in scena che innesca immediatamente una reazione a catena, una sequenza serrata e inarrestabile di scontri e canti dove il coro non perde occasione per sferrare colpi, rafforzare la sua autorità, ribadire il suo ruolo-chiave, specialmente quando Aristofane rivendica il suo posto tra i poeti comici e il co-

ro richiama esplicitamente le sue funzioni 'istituzionali': il biasimo e la lode (*Cavalieri*, 498ss., 1264ss.)

Queste sono in sintesi le peculiarità del testo, che trae linfa e forza vitale dall'attualità. In origine il coro doveva animare fortemente l'azione con una mimica aggressiva e scene movimentate, di lotta, di danza, con modalità che oggi purtroppo possiamo solo in parte ricostruire. Per quanto riguarda le rappresentazioni moderne è facile comprendere come proprio queste caratteristiche del coro da un lato rappresentino virtualmente un punto di forza, dall'altro contribuiscano pericolosamente a innalzarne il 'tasso globale di aggressività' e i rischi di un allestimento tanto meno gradito al potere quanto più vicino all'attualità. Non ci stupisce dunque la latitanza dei *Cavalieri* dalle scene italiane del Novecento, a partire dalla prima occasione 'mancata' proprio a Siracusa dove debutta nel 2018: l'ipotesi di rappresentarla al teatro greco è già menzionata nel 1921 dal volantino intitolato "Manifesto futurista per le rappresentazioni classiche al teatro greco di Siracusa" (<http://futurismo.academdiellacrusca.org/scheda.asp?idscheda=97>). Il successivo ciclo (1927) e tutti quelli seguenti sacrificano però i *Cavalieri* in favore di opere meno 'compromettenti' e potenzialmente pericolose per l'*establishment* (cf. Treu 2006): l'ex comitato per gli spettacoli, ormai eretto a baluardo e vessillo della classicità come nuovo "Istituto nazionale del dramma antico" non può certo permettersi di illuminare coi riflettori le zone d'ombra del potere e i possibili parallelismi tra Mussolini e il Paflagone aristofaneo, ben colti da Gadda (in *Eros e Priapo*, non a caso pubblicato postumo: cf. Treu 2011). Cade il regime, ma non le resistenze verso la satira, a giudicare dal fatto che né Siracusa né altri spazi teatrali istituzionali ospitano fino ad ora versioni 'classiche' della commedia. Sporadici anche nel teatro 'di ricerca' gli adattamenti dal testo, anche di buon livello ma riservati a un numero minimo di attori e con un coro non rilevante, quali *I Cavalieri da Aristofane*, di Mario Gonzales (1980), *I Cavalieri. Aristofane Cabaret*, di Mario Perrotta (2011), e il più recente esperimento a Bolzano del maggio 2018 (il teatro stabile locale ha coinvolto gli spettatori nella scelta dello spettacolo da mettere in scena ed è risultata vincitrice la commedia aristofanea nell'adattamento di Roberto Cavosi: <http://www.teatro-bolzano.it/962-debutta-in-prima-nazionale-il-3-5-i-cavalieri-di-aristofane>). L'unico spettacolo au-

tenticamente corale degno di nota si deve a un drammaturgo e regista che da decenni ha eletto Aristofane a suo ‘antenato totem’: *All’inferno. Affresco da Aristofane* di Marco Martinelli (Ravenna Teatro, 1996) è un *collage* di testi liberamente tratti da Aristofane che include un frammento di *agon* tra salsicciaio e Paflagone, interpretato da attori pugliesi del Kismet Opera di Bari in stretto dialetto locale. I due demagoghi sono sospesi, a debita distanza, sui seggiolini di una giostra e si sfidano a colpi di insulti (pressoché incomprensibili alla lettera, ma trasparenti nel suono e nel significato), corroborati da una frenetica mimica gestuale e dal coro di due “donne *manager*” in completo gessato che nella visione satirica di Martinelli sono equivalenti moderni dei cavalieri (cf. Hall-Wrigley 2007: 262-5, Treu 2005c: 93-102, 2010b, 2013c, Martinelli 2016: 47-57, Stefi, 2016).

Rispetto a questi precedenti, i *Cavalieri* siracusani professano anzitutto la loro fedeltà al testo: i nomi dei personaggi non sono tradotti o trasposti nel presente (neppure quelli ‘parlanti’: ad esempio “Demo” viene preferito a “Popolo”), non si fanno riferimenti diretti all’attualità, ma chiunque vi può riconoscere esponenti del populismo locali o nazionali (in particolare a Siracusa dove i due candidati alla carica di Sindaco hanno appena concluso una campagna elettorale senza esclusione di colpi). Questo è evidente sin dal prologo, dove due comici di mestiere (Esposito e Mancinelli) interpretano con un buon ritmo i due servi in un ‘passo a due’ in crescendo che serve a ‘scaldare il pubblico’ e preparare l’entrata dei due contendenti. Il Paflagone e il Salsicciaio, ben contrapposti nel fisico e nelle movenze (equiparabili rispettivamente a Don Chisciotte e Sancho Panza) sono interpretati da attori di collaudata carriera anche in tv e al cinema (come Ficarra e Picone per le precedenti *Rane*, e come del resto il regista Solari e gli ottimi comprimari). Altrettanto vale per il corifeo che apre e chiude la commedia con un prologo e un epilogo aggiunto, di fatto assumendo il ruolo di ‘poeta’: il trombettista Roy Paci suona e recita dal vivo e come *physique du role* è affine al Salsicciaio, di cui appare quasi un ‘doppio’ nel corso della messinscena.

Con la sua tromba è lui a chiamare, dirigere e incitare un coro che in teoria dovrebbe aggredire l’antagonista e sostenere i servi e il loro ‘campione’: nella fattispecie i cavalieri interpretati dagli allievi attori appaiono come un insieme compatto di donne e

uomini in vesti moderne e in apparenza 'borghesi'. L'impressione d'insieme è un quadro 'cubista' in movimento, specialmente per le enormi maschere sovradimensionate che rappresentano tratti facciali scomposti e frammentati. Nella *parodos* avanzano a passo di danza, lento e cadenzato, accompagnati da altri coreuti senza maschera che li seguono come ombre, tenuti al guinzaglio o alla catena: animali, più che servi. Se l'immagine complessiva è potente, almeno sulle prime, purtroppo viene a mancare la spinta propulsiva, la forza motrice dell'aggressività, al punto da smorzare il ritmo avviato dagli attori con il prologo e rallentare il tutto.

Per l'intera commedia il coro canta e balla a intervalli, ma per gran parte del tempo è pressoché immobile e non riesce nemmeno a fare bene la 'controcena', appesantito com'è da costumi e mascheroni. Non entra direttamente in contatto con gli attori, non mima scene di lotta, tanto da far perdere mordente perfino agli attacchi contro il Paflagone che sarebbero, come detto sopra, peculiarità essenziale e nerbo della commedia. Anche il rapporto col primo attore, che in Aristofane è perno dello spettacolo, qui è 'mediato' dal corifeo, a cui il coro fa perlopiù 'da spalla' e cede di fatto le sue prerogative, *in primis* lo *psogos*; in più gli incitamenti al Salsicciaio negli *agones* appaiono armi 'spuntate', sono tagliati senza pietà i canti parabatici e scompare la scena-chiave del ringiovanimento di Demo. Gli interpreti si impegnano al massimo, ma la sofferenza del coro è evidente e si ripercuote sull'intero spettacolo in termini di ritmo e *vis* polemica: ne risulta una commedia musicale brillante, godibile, apprezzata dal grande pubblico, ma certamente depauperata della carica 'eversiva' dell'originale.

5. Conclusioni

L'indagine qui condotta permette di formulare alcune riflessioni conclusive: in teoria il coro aristofaneo, se opportunamente reso, può essere perno e chiave di volta dello spettacolo per la varietà e molteplicità delle sue funzioni: 'segnala' la tonalità della commedia con la *parodos*, interviene incisivamente nell'azione e nel dialogo, agisce persuasivamente sulla scena, cattura le simpatie del pubblico. Può perfino divenire asse portante dell'intero spettacolo,

insieme con il primo attore, o con la coppia comica dei protagonisti; li supporta nel contrastare l'antagonista, e al suo meglio esercita altre prerogative e compiti per così dire 'istituzionali': tenere il pubblico ancorato alla realtà, svelare l'allegoria comica, contribuire allo *psogos* con interventi complessi, articolati, attinenti al contesto, che possono essere adattati e ampliati oggi, anche rimandando all'attualità ove occorre. Quest'ultima strada è però meno praticata, almeno a Siracusa, rispetto all'altra linea sopra evidenziata, dove la componente musicale emerge con maggiore forza: se alcune versioni come le citate *Vespe* (2014) riescono a mantenere un buon equilibrio, in altre il coro ridimensiona il suo ruolo limitandosi perlopiù ad accompagnare attori e musicisti con canti e danze, rinunciando sostanzialmente alle sue 'armi' più efficaci.

Per chiudere possiamo ricordare qui brevemente che fuori dal circuito degli spettacoli classici è possibile trovare modalità più efficaci di rendere il coro aristofaneo, specie nel cosiddetto 'teatro di ricerca'. Alcuni gruppi teatrali negli ultimi decenni hanno puntato sulla coralità anche a livello di struttura, con investimenti a lungo termine tesi a costruire nel tempo un *ensemble* consolidato e affiatato di attori, che all'occorrenza possa formare un coro e raggiungere risultati eccellenti anche in poco tempo e con minori risorse economiche rispetto a Siracusa.

Tra le esperienze più longeve di questo tipo spicca il già citato Teatro delle Albe – Ravenna Teatro, che da trent'anni mantiene vivo il suo spirito comunitario, e attorno ai membri 'stabili' della compagnia riunisce giovani leve (specialmente adolescenti) in un paziente lavoro collettivo di drammaturgia e regia, anche su testi classici, dando vita a progetti encomiabili in zone 'difficili' e di frontiera in Italia (Scampia, Lamezia Terme, Mazara del Vallo), in Europa, negli Stati Uniti, in Africa (come il progetto Takkuligey a Diol Kadd in Senegal). Altri esempi recenti di cori persuasivi e affiatati, di cui ho dato conto altrove (cf. la bibliografia), sono frutto dell'interpretazione 'corale' di compagnie che lavorano insieme, collettivamente, dentro e fuori scena: ad esempio l'Atir di Milano con le *Donne in Parlamento* (2007), o l'Ensemble di Fondazione Teatro Due a Parma, che ha prodotto di recente *Rane* (2012) e *Nuvole* (2014), su cui cf. rispettivamente Treu 2013a e 2014a.

In simili casi, l'antica entità collettiva sembra riscattarsi, ar-

rivando a compensare e perfino soverchiare la componente individuale e attoriale (specialmente grazie alla musica, soprattutto se eseguita dal vivo, e con l'ausilio della danza) come fulcro propulsore e propagatore di emozioni, riflessioni, contenuti validi ancora oggi (sul carattere corale dell'emozione tragica cf. Lanza 2006 e Treu 2007). In questi termini il coro può essere veramente una 'cartina di Tornasole', rivelatore di pregi e difetti dell'intera messinscena, ma anche un ago della bilancia, capace di condizionare, nel bene e nel male, il successo di uno spettacolo, prova somma e ultima della sua riuscita. O del suo fallimento.

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Albini, Umberto (1993), "Come può parlarci il coro greco", *Dioniso* 63.2: 43-52.
- Amoroso, Filippo (1997), "Les représentations d'Aristophane en Italie au XX siècle", in Pascal Thiery e Michel Menu (eds), *Aristophane, la langue, la scène, la cité*, Bari: Levante: 549-73.
- Avezzi, Guido (ed.) (2015), *The Chorus in Drama*, *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, 1.1, <http://www.skenejournal.it/index.php/JTDS/issue/view/7/showToc> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- Barone, Caterina (ed.) (2002), *La violenza nel teatro antico greco e latino*, Atti del XVI Congresso Internazionale di Studi sul Dramma Antico (11-13 settembre 1997), Siracusa: INDA.
- Besana, Angela, Annamaria Esposito e Martina Treu (2018), *The Philanthropy Tree of Community Foundations from Ancient to Contemporary Times. Roots and Branches of US and Italian Foundations*, in Nicholas Tsounis e Aspasia Vlachvei (eds), *Advances in Time Series Data Methods in Applied Economic Research*. International Conference on Applied Economics (ICOAE), Cham: Springer, 103-18.
- Bowie, Angus M. (1982), "The Parabasis in Aristophanes: Prolegomena", *The Classical Quarterly*, n.s. 32: 27-40.
- Calame, Claude (2006), "Il gruppo corale tragico: ruoli drammatici e funzioni sociali", *Dioniso*, n.s. 5: 6-23.
- Canfora, Luciano (2017), *Cleofonte deve morire. Teatro e politica in Aristofane*, Bari: Laterza,
- Caneva, Stefano, Rubén García e Montserrat Reig (eds) (2019, forthcoming), *Choralities in ancient Greece: New Approaches*, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.

- Cornford, Francis M. (1961), *The Origin of Attic Comedy* (Cambridge 1934), second rev. ed., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- De Finis, Lia (ed.) (1989), *Scena e spettacolo nell'antichità*, Firenze: Olschki.
- Degani, Enzo (1960), "Arifrade l'anassagoreo", *Maia* 12: 190-217.
- Flashar, Hellmut (1991), *Inszenierung der Antike. Das griechische Drama auf der Bühne der Neuzeit 1585-1990*, München: Beck.
- Fix, Florence e Frédérique Toudoire-Surlapierre (eds) (2009), *Le chœur dans le théâtre contemporain (1970-2000)*, Dijon: Editions Universitaires de Dijon.
- Foley, Helene P. (2007), "Envisioning the Tragic Chorus on the Modern Stage", in Chris Kraus, Simon Goldhill, Helene P. Foley e Jas Elsner (eds), *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 353-78.
- Gagné, Renaud e Marianne Govers Hopman (eds) (2013), *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giovannelli, Maddalena (2012), "Le Rane", *Dionysus ex Machina*, 1 aprile 2012, <http://dionysusexmachina.it/?cmd=news&id=114> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2013), "Le Donne al parlamento", *Stratagemmi* 19 maggio 2013, <http://www.stratagemmi.it/?p=4588> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2017a), "Dramma antico a Siracusa / Baliani e Binasco: la sfida del coro", <http://www.doppiozero.com/materiali/baliani-e-binasco-la-sfida-del-coro> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (ed.) (2017b), "Umberto Albini e la traduzione di Aristofane", *Stratagemmi. Prospettive teatrali* 36.
- (2018), *Aristofane nostro contemporaneo*, Roma: Carocci.
- Golder, Herbert e Stephen Scully (eds) (1995-1996), *The Chorus in Greek Tragedy and Culture*, *Arion*, 3.1 (1995): 1-154 e 4 (1996): 1-114.
- Hall, Edith e Amanda Wrigley (eds) (2007), *Aristophanes in Performance 421 BC- AD 2007: Peace, Birds and Frogs*, Oxford: Legenda.
- Imperio, Olimpia (2004), *Parabasi di Aristofane. Acarnesi, Cavalieri, Vespe, Uccelli. Studi e commenti*, 13, Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
- Lanza, Diego (2006), "Sull'emozione tragica", *Dioniso*, n.s. 5: 216-23.
- Liotta, Giuseppe (2012), "Fuori dal coro", *Dionysus ex Machina*, 12 luglio 2012, <http://dionysusexmachina.it/?cmd=news&id=94> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2013), "Spettacoli INDA, Siracusa 2013", *Dionysus ex Machina* 18 luglio 2013 <http://dionysusexmachina.it/?cmd=news&id=120m> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2015), "Lontani per dove", *Dionysus ex Machina* 24 luglio 2015, <https://>

- dionysusexmachina.it/?cmd=news&id=168 (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- Martinelli, Marco (2016), *Aristofane a Scampia*, Milano: Ponte alle Grazie.
- Mastromarco, Giuseppe (1987), "La parabasi aristofanea tra realtà e poesia", *Dioniso* 57: 75-93.
- McDonald, Marianne (2004), *L'arte vivente della tragedia greca (The living Art of Greek Tragedy, 2003)*, con il saggio "L'arte vivente della tragedia greca in Italia" di Umberto Albini (225-40), Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Newiger, Hans-Joachim (1987), "L'integrazione delle forme tradizionali nell'azione", *Dioniso* 57: 15-30.
- Olson, Douglas (ed.) (2013), *Ancient Comedy and Reception*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Perusino, Franca e Maria Colantonio (eds) (2007), *Dalla lirica corale alla poesia drammatica. Forme e funzioni del canto corale nella tragedia e nella commedia greca*, introduzione di Bruno Gentili, Pisa: ETS.
- Riemer, Peter e Bernhard Zimmermann (eds) (1998), *Der Chor im antiken und modernen Drama*, Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler.
- Rodighiero, Andrea e Paolo Scattolin (eds) (2011), "... un enorme individuo, dotato di polmoni soprannaturali". *Funzioni, interpretazioni e rinascite del coro drammatico greco*, Verona: Edizioni Fiorini.
- Russo, Carlo Ferdinando (1962), *Aristofane autore di teatro* (seconda ed. 1984), Firenze: Sansoni.
- (1987), "Il prologo in parole ed in atti", *Dioniso* 57: 65-74.
- Sifakis, Gregory Michael (1971), *Parabasis and Animal Choruses. A Contribution to the History of Attic Comedy*, London: Athlone Press.
- Stefi, Anna (2016), "Conversazione con Marco Martinelli", *doppiozero*, <http://www.doppiozero.com/materiali/aristofane-scampia>, 8 novembre 2016 (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- Totaro, Piero (2000), *Le seconde parabasi di Aristofane*, Stuttgart e Weimar: Metzler.
- Treu, Martina (1999), *Undici cori comici. Aggressività, derisione e tecniche drammatiche in Aristofane*. Collana del DARFICLET, Genova: Università degli Studi.
- (2005a), "Antico-classico = Anti-classico?", in *Classicisme i anticlassicisme a necessitats intel·lectuals*, *Ítaca. Quaderns Catalans de Cultura Clàssica, Societat Catalana d'Estudis Clàssics*, 21, Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans: 181-99.
- (2005b), "Aristofane sottosopra", *Quaderni di Storia* 61: 283-302.
- (2005c), *Cosmopolitico. Il teatro greco sulla scena italiana contemporanea*, Milano: Arcipelago Edizioni.

- (2006), “Satira futurista e Satiri siciliani”, *Quaderni di Storia* 63: 345-70.
- (2007), “Coro per voce sola. La coralità antica sulla scena contemporanea”, *Dioniso*, n.s. 6: 286-311, http://stel.uab.edu/literatura-grega/webfm_send/119 (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2009), *Il teatro antico nel Novecento*. Roma: Carocci.
- (2010a), “Largo ai giovani? IL XLVI ciclo di spettacoli classici dell’INDA”, *Stratagemmi. Prospettive teatrali* 14: 97-115.
- (2010b), “La festosa invasione dei Satiri in Sicilia”, *Dionysus ex Machina* 21 luglio 2010, <http://dionysusexmachina.it/pdf/notizie/18.pdf> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2011), “Una frenesia di scimie. Lettura da Carlo Emilio Gadda, *Eros e Priapo*, con un prologo da parti corali di Aristofane, *Cavaliere*”, *Stratagemmi.it* 20 gennaio 2011, <https://www.stratagemmi.it/una-frenesia-di-scimie-lettura-da-carlo-emilio-gadda-eros-e-priapo/> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2012), “Due Accademici in sala prove”, *Stratagemmi. Prospettive teatrali* 21: 33-43.
- (2013a), “*Le Rane* di Aristofane”, *Stratagemmi.it* 20 marzo 2013, <https://www.stratagemmi.it/le-rane/> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2013b), “Una parabasi per le donne”, *Dionysus ex Machina* 4 luglio 2013, <http://dionysusexmachina.it/?cmd=news&id=118> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2013c), “Back to the demos. An anti-classical approach to Classics?”, in Lorna Hardwick e Stephen J. Harrison (eds), *Classics in the Modern World: a ‘Democratic Turn’?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 171-9.
- (2013d), “Who’s Afraid of Aristophanes? The Troubled Life of Ancient Comedy in 20th-century Italy”, in Douglas Olson (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- (2014a), “Aristofane reloaded: le *Nuvole* di Teatro Due”, *Stratagemmi.it* 14 febbraio 2014, <https://www.stratagemmi.it/aristofane-reloaded-le-nuvole-di-teatro-due/> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2014b), “E tutto ad un tratto: il coro!”, *Stratagemmi.it* 20 maggio 2014, <https://www.stratagemmi.it/e-tutto-ad-un-tratto-il-coro/> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2017a), “Tre talenti a Siracusa”, *Classico Contemporaneo* 17 Agosto 2017, <http://www.classicocontemporaneo.eu/index.php/aggiornamenti/eventi/337-tre-talenti-a-siracusa> (ultimo accesso 10 settembre 2018).
- (2017b), “Il laboratorio Albini”, in Giovannelli (ed.) (2017), 225-38.
- (2019, forthcoming), *The tell-tale Chorus*, in Stefano Caneva, Stefano, Rubén García, e Montserrat Reig (eds), *Choralities in ancient Greece: New Approaches*, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.

- Zimmermann, Bernhard (1984), "The *parodoi* of the Aristophanic Comedy",
Studi italiani di filologia classica 57: 13-24
- (1987), "L'organizzazione interna della commedia aristofanea", *Dioniso*
57: 49-64.

Miyagi's *Antigones*

ADELE SCAFURO AND HIROSHI NOTSU

Abstract

Satoshi Miyagi, artistic director of the Shizuoka Performing Arts Center (SPAC) in Shizuoka, Japan since 2007, directed Sophocles *Antigone* in 2004 in Delphi, Tokyo and other Japanese cities; in July 2017 he adapted the play once again for performance at the Festival d'Avignon, choosing as his venue the grand and austere Cour d'Honneur du Palais des Papes. As a run-up to that production, he directed the play at the World Theater Festival at Shizuoka in early May 2017. Connections and similarities are definitely present between the earlier and later productions: the choruses of multiple Ismenes, Creons, Tiresias, and ghosts; the *obon* festival motif with the water glimmering with lanterns; the re-appearance of major actors playing the same roles in 2004 and 2017. Nonetheless, the productions are fundamentally different: the earlier one is political and enamored of the isolationists Antigone and Haemon as paradigms of independent thinking; the later one is religious, communal, joyous and full of dance. Buddhist elements permeate the 2017 production from beginning to end: the importance of becoming buddha and entering Nirvana is set out in the introductory 'prologue' skit; the ever present river Sanzu (like Acheron) separates the living from the hereafter; the dead and their return to earth during *bon* are celebrated throughout the play. While the finale's celebratory dance has been heralded as a show-piece in reviews of the play, yet dance movements and music of the *bon-odori* are not restricted to the ending; they are adumbrated during the play's opening and are present in full timbre during its major songs (*polla ta deina*, *Zeus*, and *Erös* odes). Equally important as the later production's more profound engagement with Buddhist ritual is the director's decision to split the roles of Antigone and Haemon into mover and speaker (in the 2004 production, Antigone and Haemon were each played by one actor who both spoke and moved). The division into speaker and mover is a well-known feature of Miyagi's productions since the 1990s when he directed the Ku Na' uka company. Miyagi, however, has gone a step further in 2017: he has also split the role of the movers in two, between themselves and their shadows. The result is a stunning choreography played out on the palace wall, rendering Greek tragedy into something larger than life and subverting the allegorical meaning of the shadows in Plato's cave for whom they represent a lesser and corrupt vision of what is real and what can only be seen by the light of the sun.

Three Productions: Tokyo 2004, SPAC May 2017, and Avignon July 2017*

The Shizuoka Performing Arts Center (SPAC) in Shizuoka, Japan has become an important showplace for drama over the last two decades and more. SPAC's facilities include the Shizuoka Arts

* The authors are pleased to dedicate this essay to Prof. Guido Avezzi, distinguished scholar of Greek drama in general and especially of Sophocles. They are grateful to the editors of this volume for the invitation to be a part of it, and for their kindness and diligence in prodding us along. Scafuro and Notsu began a collaborative study of the reception of Greek drama in Japan in spring 2017, in preparation for attending a May 2017 performance of Miyagi's *Antigone* at SPAC and for interviewing the director afterwards. Our collaboration continued. For this essay, we are grateful to many for assistance, and so give thanks in first place to Yoshiji Yokoyama, Dramaturge, SPAC-Shizuoka Performing Arts Center, for help along the way, showing us how to get access to this or that person, for replying to our questions swiftly and expertly, always with kindness, and for engaging in stimulating theatre conversation. We extend thanks also to Takako Oishi, also of SPAC, for supplying films and photos of the three productions. Notsu and Scafuro both thank Notsu's wife Aya, who attended the first two productions (Tokyo 2004 and SPAC 2017) and who participated in many discussions. We also thank friends who discussed the play with us and enlightened us with their knowledge of Sophocles, traditional Japanese theatre, music and history: especially Professor Yoshinori Sano (International Christian University), Kaoru Kobayashi (Toho University) and Shinya Ueno (Kyoritsu Women's University); also Professors Akiko Moroo of Chiba University of Commerce, Asako Kurihara of Osaka University, Akiko Kitamura of Shinshu University; and Yumi Uchikawa, graduate student of history at the U. of Tokyo. Scafuro thanks Profs. John Emigh, Spencer Golub, and Rebecca Schneider of the Theatre Arts and Performance Studies Dept. at Brown University for discussion of multiple characters playing the same role. She thanks Brown's Faculty Travel Fund and the Michael Putnam Fund (an internal fund of Brown's Classics Department) for assisting travel to Japan and Japanese language study in 2016-18. Notsu thanks JSPS for supporting "Reception and Diffusion of the Japanese Performance of Ancient Greek Drama" (<https://kak-en.nii.ac.jp/en/grant/KAKENHI-PROJECT-17Ko2590/>), a project of joint researchers from the University of Tokyo and Shinshu University. It should be noted that Japanese names are cited here and throughout this essay in Western style, first name followed by surname (but in 'Works Cited', family name followed by comma and then first name, as is usual in Western publications). Our rationale is that this is a western publication, and is the way Japanese names are presented, for example, in the Avignon Festival Archive and programme (but not in the Shizuoka programme published in Japan).

Theatre (capacity ca. 400) located near the Higashi Shizuoka Station, and the Shizuoka Performing Arts Park. The latter, in view of the ever awesome, ever inspirational Mt. Fuji, consists of the Open Air Theater (capacity ca. 400), an indoor theatre (capacity ca. 400), rehearsal studios, and residences. SPAC is a public institution, with an interest in educating the larger local community about the dramatic arts and in providing 'Theater as a Window to the World' (a catch phrase used by Yamaguchi 2012 *passim*), not only through the production of "world-class works" by its own resident acting company, but also by bringing the world to Shizuoka (Miyagi qtd. in Yamaguchi 2012: 1). Tadashi Suzuki was its first general artistic director, from 1997 through March 2007; and in April 2007, Satoshi Miyagi became its second. Having suspended the activity of Ku Na' uka, the company he had founded in 1990 and directed for eighteen years (his final production with the troupe was *Oshu Adachigahara* in February 2007), Miyagi brought to SPAC some of its actors and certainly its vision and methods (its immersion in music and dance, and its bunraku-like splitting of one acting role into two, a mover and speaker); vision and methods would now be broadened and provided with a larger stage for performance and educational dissemination. In 2010, the then new director changed the 'Shizuoka Spring Festival' into the 'World Theater Festival at Shizuoka under Mt. Fuji'. A global perspective and a profound respect for the power of nature are there from the start of the re-named festival.

As part of that festival in 2017 (28 April – 7 May), the programme included four plays from overseas: "Werther" directed by the German playwright Nicolas Stemann; "While I Was Waiting" by the exiled Syrian playwright Mohammad Al Attar and directed by Omar Abusaada; "The Ventriloquists Convention" by the novelist Dennis Cooper and directed by Gisèle Vienne; and "Tales of June" directed and performed by Pippo Delbono. There were three Japanese productions: "Moon" written and directed by Kuro Tanino; "1940 – Richard Strauss Villa" written by SPAC's Jun Ooka, directed by Miyagi, and with music arranged by Ichiro Nodaira; and Sophocles' "Antigone", also directed by Miyagi (figure 1). In an article in the English language paper *The Japan Times*, dated the day before the Festival's opening, the unnamed author, reporting that

his information came from “a recent news conference”, wrote that it was there that Miyagi “dropped a bombshell of his own with the news he had just been asked to stage a new version of the Greek mythology play ‘Antigone’ that he directed in 2004 in Delphi, its original setting, as the prestigious opening event of the Avignon Festival in France in July” (“All Shizuoka’s a stage”: 27 April 2017: 3).¹ And indeed, the play was performed six times (and ‘sold out’ on each occasion) beginning 6 July at la Cour d’ honneur du Palais des Papes (capacity: ca. 2,000), the premier performance of the 2017 festival in Avignon just eight weeks after the final Shizuoka performance on 7 May. La Cour d’ honneur, a vast courtyard enclosed on all sides by the buildings of the Palace neuf (begun by Pope Clement VI and finished by Pope Innocent VI in 1363) is the premiere venue for the festival’s programme (figures 2 and 3).



Figure 1. Outside the Open Air Theatre in Sumpujo Park at SPAC, Shizuoka, 3 May 2017. Photo by Adele Scafuro.

1 The news conference may perhaps have been held at the French Embassy in Tokyo on 21 April 2017: see the archives of the French Embassy in Japan, <https://jp.ambafrance.org/> for 21 April 2017.

The two authors of this essay, Adele Scafuro and Hiroshi Notsu, attended the Shizuoka production together on 6 May 2017 (performed in Japanese with English subtitles) and also the afternoon workshop led by Jun Ooka; they interviewed Miyagi directly after the performance. Scafuro also attended the Avignon performance on 8 July 2017 (performed in Japanese with French subtitles) and the workshop at the University of Avignon earlier that day, at which Miyagi with the assistance of his dramaturge Yoshiji Yokoyama, translating from Japanese to French and vice versa, fielded questions from the audience about the play. Notsu attended the 17 October 2004 production, performed in front of Tokyo's National Museum of Art in Ueno Park (8-20 October); the play had been performed slightly earlier at Kitakyushu Performing Arts Center (2-3 October) and had had its premiere earlier that same year at Delphi on 1 July (website of Ku Na' uka Theatre Company).² Notsu and Scafuro have watched, alone and together, films of the 2004 performance at the Tokyo Museum, and of the 2017 performances at Shizuoka and Avignon; and both have listened to the video of the 2017 workshop at the University of Avignon (website of the Festival Archives).³ Clearly watching DVDs cannot replace the viewing of an original performance, especially when (and if) the theatre spectator has a full view of the theatrical space – for a camera does not always capture the full extent of a stage: it pans in now here and zooms elsewhere next. This is particularly meaningful, as we shall see, in the case of the Avignon production, where the theatre space was so immense and where so much depended on the interaction not only of the characters on stage, but also on their interaction with the shadows they cast on the twenty-five metre high Palace wall.

Our major focus in this essay is on the Avignon production, but we look back to the 2004 Tokyo production for comparison, to suggest its different conception, and we look to the Shizuoka production in May 2017 as a stepping stone to the grand production

² www.kunauka.or.jp/en/home01.htm, see under 'News'.

³ The link <http://www.festival-avignon.com/en/thought-workshops/2017/dialogues-artists-audience-antigone> will bring one directly to the 'workshop interview'.

two months later in Avignon. It should be said at the outset that the 2017 productions are near but not identical dublettes: while the theatre space of Avignon's 'palace courtyard' called for changes in choreography (including the choreography of the shadows), there are also some changes in dramatic structure: e.g. the opening scene with Antigone and Ismene in Avignon is absent in Shizuoka; and there are also changes in 'performance strategy': e.g., the Zeus ode in Shizuoka is sung by a male and female soloist whereas only a female soloist appears in Avignon; the *Erōs* odes are performed entirely differently in each venue.

A New Production for 2017

We now know that the anonymous reporter for *The Japan Times* was wrong on one crucial point: Miyagi had not been invited to Avignon so recently; the groundwork had been laid in 2016, well ahead of the Shizuoka production, on a visit to the medieval city: it was then that the French festival organizers proposed that he should open the festival with a new production; after visiting a number of venues, Miyagi chose la Cour d'honneur du Palais des Papes and the play *Antigone* (Yokoyama, *per ep.*). The Shizuoka production, in a very real sense, then, was a preparatory step on the road to the masterpiece performance in Avignon. Even so, rehearsals sometimes took place in a huge warehouse at Shizuoka Harbor, "chosen to reproduce the size of the stage space in Avignon, as we have nothing so vast at SPAC" ("choisi pour pouvoir reproduire la taille de la scène d'Avignon car, au SPAC, nous n'avons rien d'aussi vaste", Yokoyama, cited by Mesmer, 3 and 6 July 2017: paragr. 3). Miyagi has, it seems, always been interested in the architectural and topographical venues of his productions so as to capture the energy and spirit of the particular place, as at Delphi in 2004 (unpublished 2017 interview with Scafuro and Notsu) and in Tokyo later that year (Smethurst 2011: 224 and 2014: 845). But this time, in Avignon, the particularities of the three-dimensional space rather than its sheer size would have a profoundly visual and metaphysical impact; as Miyagi put it: "because of the slope [sc. of the amphitheatre seats], more than half the audi-

ence faces the massive wall of the Palais des Papes rather than the stage . . ." (Miyagi, interviewed by Canelas 2017, trans. Schmidt-Cléach). Miyagi's solution we shall see below, was to create a shadow theatre on the wall. We shall return to the wall, the shadows, indeed, the shadow world, in the final segment of this essay. More needs to be said first about the earlier production.

Luckily, we are assisted in this endeavor by Smethurst's 2011 informative essay, "Are we all Creons and Ismenes? Antigone in Japan"; there she beautifully and amply describes the 2004 performance in Tokyo. Of particular note is her detailed discussion of political implications stemming from Miyagi's use of the National Museum of Art as the backdrop for the performance, a museum built "in the 1930s to create a monument to resurgent Japanese nationalism" (224). She also provides detailed discussion (*passim*) of the play's musical instrumentation and its origins, a blending of Asian (Japanese and Chinese) and African sounds, secular and religious, Buddhist and Shinto. And, as her title indicates, she gives great attention to the effects of using multiple Creons and multiple Ismenes.⁴ In the 2004 production, as also in 2017 (to leap ahead once again to the Shizuoka and Avignon performances), there were separate choruses of Ismenes, Creons, Tiresias, and ghosts, as well as blends of all the choruses together (25 choristers in all). A chorus sometimes repeats the speeches of Ismene, Creon, and Tiresias (the Ismenes repeating Ismene, the Creons repeating Creon; the Tiresias repeating Tiresias); or, simultaneously with those characters, a chorus may speak the same speeches; or sometimes it en-

4 The chorus members, by becoming Creons and Ismenes, multiply the number of actors playing the same role. It is difficult to supply theatre parallels for multiple choristers or actors playing the same role simultaneously as that of a lead actor; John Emigh points out (*per ep.*) how appropriate it is that Japanese theatre artists should have a particular interest in this practice: "it is implicit in the way the Noh chorus works to double and echo the lines spoken center stage." Emigh suggests this practice may have inspired Lee Breuer and Bob Telson to cast the 5 Blind Boys of Alabama jointly as 'Oedipus' in their *Gospel at Colonus*. The Breuer and Telson production premiered in NYC in 1983; there have been a number of revivals, and most recently one in Delacourt Theater in early September 2018. Clips of the play are available on youtube.

ters into dialogue with them; and occasionally a chorus will sing an ode on its own, as the chorus of ghosts do, in both 2004 and 2017 (though not at all in the same way). While some choruses do sing the 'original' Sophoclean odes (or some part or facsimile thereof), and while some odes (the fourth stasimon, 'Danae' and the *hyporchēma* at 1115-54) are entirely cut from all three productions, the part of the choruses is nevertheless far more extensive than in Sophocles' play, and more vibrant – dramatically, musically, and emotionally – than in most modern adaptations and re-makings (Mee and Foley 2011: 6-16 for discussion of 'translating', 'adapting', 'remaking', etc.). The choruses of ghosts speak, chant, sing, provide musical accompaniment, and, above all, they dance.

Major actors who appeared in the 2004 production re-appear in 2017: thus, e.g., Mikari is once again Antigone (speaker and mover in 2004, mover alone in 2017); Kazunori Abe is again Creon (speaker); Sōichirō Yoshiue is again Tiresias (speaker). As in the 2004 production, a chorus of ghosts is a feature of the 2017 play, and a rendering of the Japanese *Obon* festival and celebration of the dead as the finale of the 2004 production share features with the more spectacular ending of the later one. Here is Smethurst on the 2004 ending; after first depicting the Creon chorus as turning into a chorus of Tiresiases, and the rebuke of one Tiresias, that dead bodies ought not to be thrown to dogs, she continues:

Creon reacted, but never understood. There was no recognition that he had done wrong. Complete darkness fell upon the scene, accompanied by a shaker and *hichiriki* joining the drum and *yokobue*, here to signal the end of an event. Creon was left alone saying that the dead, wearing death photos of themselves, were moving towards him. There was no messenger who reported the death of Eurydice. Attention instead focused on the large pool in front of the museum. On top of the water floated illuminated lanterns that represented the souls of the dead, as in the Japanese *obon* festival. Then the actors, including Antigone, Ismene, and the Ismenes, no longer dressed as ghosts, and Polynices, Haemon, and the other ghosts came down the aisle and through the audience in a processional to the accompaniment of the Japanese flute and organ-like sound of the *shō*. Hanging by a chain in front of each was a funeral photograph of the face of the actor in contemporary

clothing. These photos are the mark of the dead at the Buddhist altars in Japanese homes, a detail no one in the audience could miss. All was darkness except for the floating lanterns and lit candles carried on the head of each actor to illuminate these photographs. The utterly defeated Creon lay collapsed on the ground, isolated by his failure to express remorse. (Smethurst 2011: 233-4)⁵

The Japanese *Obon* or *bon-matsuri*, or simply ‘*bon*’ (see Ortolani 1995: 9 and 23 for its origins) is a yearly three-day Buddhist festival that falls in July and August, depending on whether the old or new calendar is used. Families celebrate the return of their ancestors with dancing called the *Bon-Odori* (or ‘*bon* dance’) and other festive rituals. Singing and dancing will differ in different regions of Japan, and the songs may sound deeply religious or take on more popular melodies and rhythms known as *min’yō* folk songs or *ondo* without any Buddhist message (see Malm 2000: 76-8). The festival ends with the sending of paper lanterns (the *tōrō nagashi*) or small boats (the *shōrō nagashi*) downriver to celebrate the return of the dead to the afterlife.

The *Obon* suggested in the 2004 Tokyo production by the launch of illuminated lanterns becomes the overwhelming motif, from first to last, in 2017. The pool of water that sits before the museum provided the vehicle for that display in 2004 (see figures 4 and 5), but it did not appear at any earlier point (or so it seemed to us) to resonate with the ghosts in the play. Nonetheless, the pool links the play with the 2017 production, for which an artificial river runs across the stage as a visible symbol of the journey of the dead and a marker of the boundary between them and the living – and not least as a physical entity through which the

5 Miyagi again used the funeral motif of the photographs of the dead carried by live actors onstage, to much different effect (to suggest – and protest – the inferior status of women), in the 2005 *Ku Na’ uka* production of *Medea*; see Anan 2006. The musical instruments named here by Smethurst are Japanese woodwinds. The *yokobue* is a generic name for transverse flutes and includes the *kagurabue*, *ryūteke* and *komabue*. The *hichiriki* is a “short double-reed pipe of lacquered bamboo, with seven (front) and two (back) finger-holes and a comparatively large reed”; the *shō* is more complicated – it is “a free-reed mouth-organ with 17 bamboo pipes (two reedless) inserted into a wind chamber . . .” (Nelson 2008: 49).

movers and speakers must swoosh their wet way throughout the play (especially apparent in the staging of the double fratricide) to the amazement of the audience – it cannot have been easy. Connections and similarities, then, are definitely present – the choruses of Ismenes, Creons, Tiresias, and ghosts; the *obon* festival motif with the water glimmering with lanterns (see figure 6 for the finale of the Avignon production); the re-appearance of major actors playing the same roles in 2004 and 2017 – yet no one who has seen both the 2004 production and either of the 2017 productions will doubt that the later *Antigone* is an entirely new play. The difference between the one and the other is far greater, for example, than that between Mario Martone's production of Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* in Naples' Teatro Nuovo in 1996 and 1997, and Marco Baliani's production twenty years later in the Greek theatre at Syracuse: the earlier production associates the siege of Thebes with that of Sarajevo and the later one associates it with sieges of Damascus and Mosul. The topical references, as Ugolini (2017: 165) points out, are different, but the fundamental stagings of the plays are not. Miyagi's *Antigones*, on the other hand, are fundamentally different: the earlier one is political and enamored of the isolationist – or at least renders the isolated Antigone and Haemon as paradigms of independent thinking; the later one is religious, communal, joyful (though not without piercingly sad moments), and full of dance.



Figure 4. The National Museum of Art (Ueno Park, Tokio), July 2018; this was one site of the 2004 production of *Antigone*. Photo by Yumi Uchikawa.



Figure 5. The finale of the October 2004 production: lit lanterns float in the pool in front of the Museum of Art, Ueno Park, Tokyo, October 2004. ©Takuma Uchida (2004 Ueno).



Figure 6. The finale of the Avignon production is the final ritual of the Bon festival, the sending of paper lanterns downriver (*tōrō nagashi*), to celebrate the return of the dead to the afterlife; the ghosts circle round in the final obon dance. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

The front side of the flyer for the Shizuoka production advertises in its upper margin the still-to-come Avignon production and on its reverse side bears at the top a photo of the 2004 production and in the middle, a smaller photo of the courtyard theatre of the Palace of the Popes, and the range of ticket prices at Shizuoka.

The front carries a large-sized portrait photo of the blonde-wigged Antigone of 2017 (see figure 7); across her spread arms, in blood red katakana letters, the play's title アンティゴネ (*Antigone*) appears and beneath that, a sub-title, 時を超える送り火 (*toki o koeru okuri bi*, "sending fire that transcends time", trans. Notsu); the same words reappear as the subtitle in the DVD of the play. The words refer once again to ritual phenomena at the beginning of the play where the ghosts carry candles and at its end when the lanterns are launched on the river, in both instances with fire that will return the dead to the underworld. Buddhist ritual rings the play.



Figure 7. Front side of flyer advertising the Shizuoka production: portrait photo of the blond wigged Antigone (Mikari). Across her spread arms, in blood red katakana letters, the play's title アンティゴネ (*Antigone*) appears and beneath that, a sub-title, 時を超える送り火 (*toki o koeru okuri bi*, "sending fire that transcends time", trans. Notsu). ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

A Buddhist Antigone in a Mugen Noh in the Courtyard of the Palace of the Popes

An interview conducted by Marion Canelas with Miyagi before the Avignon production and reproduced, both in the programme

and on the website of the Avignon Festival Archives, is most informative (though it comes at the risk of spoiling a potential viewer's opportunity to make his or her own sense of the play). Here Miyagi imagines the stage-set:

We'll cover the entire stage of the Cour d'honneur with shallow water, representing Acheron, the river that marks the border between this world and the hereafter. In Japan, we have the river Sanzu. We're transposing this metaphor to the stage without changing anything. People float on the water for a while, then they sink to the bottom of the river, in the hereafter. In Japan, the realm of the dead is called *yomi*, which means "Yellow Springs", and the hereafter is called *senka*, "What Is Below the Springs". The twenty-five beings that make up the chorus are the residents of this *senka*, that is, the souls of the dead. They are the ones who speak, and they play instruments. In *Antigone's* final scene, all the living depart for the realm of Hades, even Creon and Tiresias. No human being can escape death, and all become *hotoke*, "buddhas." We'll "celebrate" that event. The *Bon-Odori* is a ritual dance whose purpose is to help souls that have become "buddhas" enter the hereafter. In Japanese Buddhism, another ritual, the *Shōrō nagashi*, is performed by sending small candles that represent the souls of the dead out on a river. Those small flames drifting away will appear at the end of the show. That scene isn't part of the original play. We want to present this play not as tragic and sad, but as a celebration to appease the spirits of the dead. (Interview by Canelas 2017, trans. Schmidt-Cléach.)⁶

The presence of the river and its Buddhist and Shinto fullness of meaning signal the new *Weltanschauung*, evident from the start of the 2017 play, as sombre ghosts glide, single-file, onto the stage from two entrances, one at stage centre and the other on stage left – and they glide smoothly, even though ankle-deep in the river that forms the dance floor. Eventually they go round in multiple circles in stunning choreography, carrying small candles

6 The 'river of three crossings' (*Sanzu no kawa*) mentioned by Miyagi, divides this world from the next; it is mentioned by Nichiren (the founder of the Nichiren sect) in a letter to Lord Hakii (quoted by Walter 2008: 259 with n. 57 for references).

in glass 'singing' bowls which, when rubbed round and round the rim by their fingers, yield a high and eerie sound. Here and there in the water are larger and smaller rocks of different shapes – indeed, we have a veritable Buddhist rock garden; a tall rock formation with a stone slab at its top sits in the middle, representing, so it seems, the wooden scaffolding or high wooden stage (矢倉 or 櫓, やぐら or *yagura*, figure 8) around which the *bon* dance (or *bon-odori*) is performed during *Obon*. The stone slab/stage will become Antigone's seat and 'cave' throughout most of the play – but at play's beginning and ending, when it is empty, it is the *yagura* – and likewise during the dances.



Figure 8. A roofed *yagura*, beneath which bon dancers circle round during the Obon festival at the Jindaiji temple site. A large drum is placed on the platform and is struck throughout the dance. Mr. Kazuyuki Ishikawa supplied the photo, courtesy of the Jindaiji Housankai.

The 'ghosts' (for we may not be certain yet that they are ghosts) are dressed in long diaphanous kimono-like robes with wide sleeves covering silken white jackets and leggings with silver markings from top to bottom like the scales of a fish, suggestive, perhaps of their own skeletons. The costumes of some 'ghosts', however, are slightly different: the 'jackets' beneath their robes are frogged or draped fan-like across the chest, suggestive of the 'fish-scale' marking of the jackets of the other players, but perhaps redolent of a life still prominent and a reminder of a death to come: these are the movers, Antigone, Haemon, Creon, Tiresias, Ismene. Soon another set of ghost players with shorter outer kimono-ropes enters from stage left but walks on the rim of the stage rather than wades through the river; they carry large and small gongs – the large ones resembling drums called うちわだいこ (*uchiwa daiko*, drums with a fan-like shape, Malm 2000: 73, plate 22); they strike them with drumsticks called ばち (*bachi*). The men wear comically fragile helmets; the women in the Avignon performance, are 'unhatted', but 'wiggled' in the Shizuoka one. These are comic characters and they are here to provide a summary, in the form of a skit, of the play's preliminary events, namely: the quarrel between Polynices and Eteocles over who should be ruler

of Thebes and the duel between them that ends in their slaying of one another; and then of its major action: Creon's burial of Eteocles and proclamation against the burial of Polynices; Antigone's resistance and burial of her brother against the warnings of Ismene; the support of Haemon, Antigone's fiancé, for her action against his father Creon; Antigone's punishment and the deaths of Antigone and Haemon (note the absence of Eurydice from the play!).

Three items, each having to do with the fratricide, are notable in the 'skit' – counting here as one and (almost) the same the Shizuoka skit performed in Japanese and the Avignon one in French (the 'play proper', of course, is performed in Japanese). First, the depiction of killing onstage (and the fratricides will be repeated subsequently in the 'play proper') transgresses the norms of Greek tragedy where the results, i.e., a corpse, may be shown onstage, but not the killing itself; likewise, the onstage killings transgress the norms of ai-Kyogen, the comic element often added to Noh, but not at all the norms of Kabuki. Secondly, the weapons used by the 'comic' Polynices and Eteocles to kill one another, the drumsticks (*bachi*) mentioned earlier, belong to a particular religious sect, 日蓮宗 (*にちれんしゅう*, *Nichirenshū*) which, incidentally, is particularly widespread in the Shizuoka prefecture (see n. 6). Thirdly and most importantly, the comic prelude introduces a key element for interpreting Miyagi's conception of the 2017 production: the term *jōbutsu* ('becoming buddha') is repeatedly used. The dead Eteocles, after his burial is announced by Creon, says "*jōbutsu shimashita!*" ('I have become buddha') while Polynices shows his dissatisfaction with a gesture. But Polynices will have his turn: he, too says "*jōbutsu shimashita!*" ('I have become buddha') after his burial by Antigone. In the Avignon production *jōbutsu shimashita!* is translated into French with *j'ai atteint le Nirvana*, which is pronounced by both brothers. Clearly in the 2017 productions, Miyagi has re-conceptualized the question of Polynices' burial as that of his *jōbutsu*, of his becoming Buddha and reaching Nirvana. And once again, it is distinctive of the play's *Weltanschauung*, that this should be so clearly articulated in a comic prelude!

The Buddhist element keeps to the fore as the dry-footed comic players scamper off stage while the river-walking 'ghosts' slowly realign themselves, some exiting, some circling, all playing the rims of their glass singing bowls. Now a Buddhist monk slowly sails in from

stage left, using a pole (a staff?) to direct his small craft. He hands long white wigs to select movers, one by one, taking their glass bowls in exchange; to Polynices and Eteocles, however, he gives each a long pole, similar to his own. What are these wigs and what are the poles? The latter, from a distance, have the look of 'staves' and one might think at first of the *yamabushi*, the wandering religious ascetics who carry staves with an origin in Buddhism that is described by a character (Benkei) in the well-known Kabuki play *Kanjincho* (based largely on the Noh *Ataka*): a staff like his own, he says, was originally owned by a certain ancient Indian saint named Arara-Sennin; subsequently, when Buddha trained under him, Arara-Sennin, impressed by Buddha's divinity, gave him his staff; thereafter, the founder of the *yamabushi*, En-no-Syoutaku 役の小角 (えんのしょうかく), carried a similar type of staff wishing to share good luck with Buddha; and finally, other *yamabushi* also carried the same type of staff (Namiki III in Gunji 1965: 183). The *yamabushi*'s staff, however, while it could be used as a weapon, differs from the ones we see onstage: it had interlocking rings at one end and a metal ferrule at the other (Mol 2003: 197). Still, as the Buddhist priest actually hands the 'staves' to Polynices and Eteocles, it is hard not to see a religious significance – and a subversion of purpose when those staves are used as weapons of fratricide (see figure 9); indeed, the subversion mirrors that of the 'religious' drumsticks (*bachi*) used in the fratricides executed in the comic prelude.



Figure 9. The Buddhist priest, after passing out props (wigs and 'staves') from his small boat at the beginning of the play, sails away, over the artificial river that covers the stage; the photo catches him as he is nearly directly behind the 'yagura', the central platform which will serve as Antigone's perch throughout the play. Off to far stage left, Eteocles and Polynices kill one another with their staves. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

Now for the wigs: here we are helped by Miyagi himself, who, when asked about them at the workshop held at the University of Avignon on July 8 (see n. 3), replied as follows:

The actors standing in the water and wearing white clothes represent the dead. Here, a Buddhist priest comes. And this priest invites the dead people to try putting on a little play. Why does he invite them in such a manner? We leave the answer to the spectators' imagination. However, if we superimpose Noh's way of thinking on that, it will be interpreted as follows: in Noh, if anyone among the dead retains strongly in his or her mind an incident or event of his or her lifetime and is very sorry, I believe his or her soul is drifting near this world [i.e. that person has not reached Nirvana]. And, with this spirit who is dead and who has such a very disappointed feeling, the priest will have a dialogue that reminds him or her of the past. While having this dialogue, the dead spirit who died and left behind such a feeling of regret, remembers his or her lifetime and plays again the event that had been most painful for him or her. When he or she has finished playing the most painful event in his or her life, that spirit loses his or her resentment and becomes restful. He or she attains a state of peace. This is the structure of Noh. If I apply this structure to my *Antigone*, it follows that the priest discovers such a spirit, [that is], someone among the dead who has experienced painful experiences while living and invites him or her to try playing that painful event again. If he is giving a wig to him or her, it is his invitation to play a living person for a while. (Japanese transcription and translation by Notsu; square brackets added.)

Miyagi, when he speaks of "Noh's way of thinking" refers to plays of Mugen Noh, a category of dream plays in which the *shite* (protagonist) is often a dead person who meets a monk and disguises his or her true being (the fact of being dead) and then disappears in the first part; he or she reappears, usually in a dream of the monk, in the second part (often after an *ai Kyogen* interlude) and tells his or her story (for different sub-categories, see Ortolani 1995: 132-3).⁷ Miyagi's own interpretation of his work turns his

⁷ Two sub-categories described by Ortolani (133) may be relevant here: (i) *katsura mono* ('wig plays') featuring women in the *shite* role who disguise

Antigone not only into a dream Noh, but also into a 'play within a play' (a device not without allure to him – he directed *Hamlet* as his first Ku Na' uka production in 1990 and also as his first SPAC production in 2008). Miyagi is nothing less than playful (pun intended); he suggests that we might imagine the priest as proposing to the wig-recipients – Antigone, Ismene, Haemon, Creon, and Tiresias, that they should take part in a performance as living actors (see figure 10a). Their wandering ghosts, unhappy with their deaths, are now selected to re-live their most painful experience, one shared amongst them but experienced quite differently by each, and now to be orchestrated as one piece, hardly the stuff for harmonious composition: the aftermath of civil war and a double fratricide. The wigs, then, mark the beginning of the 'internal play' – and it will mark the end as well, when the wig-wearing live actors will remove their headpieces and re-join the dead. Indeed, the sailing-in entrance of the monk with wigs and other props at play's beginning and his sailing in again at play's end when the actors have removed their wigs provide not only a frame for the play, they also serve as mirror images, the first of many such (indeed, the skit itself is a mirror image of the 'play proper') and create, as it were, a non-stopping ring circle: the stone slab, stage left, on which Polynices dies at play's beginning is the very same slab on which Creon collapses, shrieking over Haemon's death at play's end. The simultaneous double fratricide at play's beginning mirrors the simultaneous double suicide near play's end. A wigged Antigone climbs up the platform or *yagura* early on in the play and then removes her wig at the end, slowly and peacefully, as if waking from a dream, and gracefully descends a ladder to re-

their true beings (the fact of their deaths) from a visiting monk (first act) but subsequently tell their stories and the cause of their deaths (second act); the Noh play *Tomoe* is an apposite example. (ii) *Shura mono*, in which a warrior (usually a famous samurai) killed in battle and now wandering restlessly, appears to a monk and asks him for prayers and rituals to assure his salvation (first act); he then reappears in the monk's dream (second act), clad in full samurai costume and recounts the heroic exploits that cost him his life. Miyagi's *Antigone* follows the basic pattern of either one of these, even though the 'invited players' are not warriors. A *shura mono* play might have been written for Eteocles and Polynices – but that is not the case here.

join the circling dead in a play in which circling round is so much a part of the troupe's movements (see figure 10b).



Figure 10a. The Buddhist priest hands Antigone (mover) her wig at the beginning of the play. The ghost troupe looks on. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).



Figure 10b. Antigone, with wig removed at the end of the 'play-within a play', stands on the platform, as if awakened from a dream and stares straight ahead. The troupe of ghosts, which she will soon join, circles round, in their final bon odori. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

Yet Miyagi had also suggested that spectators might want to use their own imaginations. Indeed, some viewers might consider the wigs as similar to the masks worn by tragic and comic ac-

tors in ancient Greek plays – though unlike the wigs in Miyagi's *Antigone*, the actors in Greek plays put on and remove their masks *offstage* (see the famous Pronomos Vase and Wyles 2010: 233–34). The wearing of the Greek mask is thought to have originated in religious ritual by which the wearer becomes imbued with the god whose mask he wears; by analogy, one might consider that, in the theater consecrated to Dionysus in which he, as the god of mask, is invoked with sacrifice and libation at the opening of the Great Dionysia (Csapo and Slater 1995: 107 and cat. 33 and 34), the *wearer* of the mask likewise becomes imbued with the god, hero, or other mythic character whose mask he is wearing (Wiles 2007, esp. 205–36; Calame 2010: 73; Csapo 2010: 113; Griffith 2010: 59; Segal 1995: 201–02; Foley 1980: 107 and n. 1). “The dead heroes”, as a Tokyo colleague suggests, “are revived when the [Greek] actors put on their masks so as to represent them . . . ; by having his actors put on and remove their wigs *onstage*, Miyagi visualizes the process of invoking Dionysus and of reviving the dead heroes” (Kaoru Kobayoshi, *per ep.*; italics added). Re-incarnation is as much a part of the ancient Greek stage as it is of Miyagi's Buddhist one.

A Buddhist Antigone? Once again we turn to the front side of the flyer for the Shizuoka production mentioned earlier (see figure 7). Alongside the image of Mikari, white lettering written vertically appears: “私は憎しみ合うようには生まれついておりません。愛し合うだけです” (“I am not born to engage in [their] mutual hating, but for [our] mutual loving” trans. Notsu). This is Yaginuma's translation of Soph. *Ant.* 523 (οὔτοι συνέχθειν, ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφου), towards the end of the second episode, after Antigone's burial of Polynices has been discovered and almost immediately before the *Erōs* ode is sung (Yaginuma: 1990). The verse is dense in any language; Jebb's exegetical translation (Sophocles 1900: *loc. cit.*), following the scholiast closely, provides Anglo-filling: “Even if my brothers hate each other still, my nature prompts me, not to join Eteocles in hating Polyneices, but to love each brother as he loves me”. Antigone will love both her brothers and inhabits a world in which they love her back. In the context of Miyagi's production, this is not the equivalent of the Christian gnome, ‘Love thy brother’; rather, this is a Buddhist levelling of the playing field: all are worthy of love and redemption, good and bad alike; it makes

no difference – even ‘bad souls’ can find their way to Nirvana – as the opening skit had demonstrated (see, e.g. Harvey 2013: 174).⁸ The Palace of the Popes has been infiltrated. Miyagi, after speaking of a Japanese custom of “calling all the dead, friends and foes alike, ‘*hotoke*,’ which means ‘buddhas’”, continues, “Sophocles’s Antigone wasn’t a Buddhist, but in her speeches, you’ll find ideas that echo today’s Japanese Buddhism, and particularly her desire to ‘love all human beings, without distinction’” (Miyagi, interviewed by Canelas 2017, trans. Schmidt-Cléach).

Song and Dance

Religious ritual and experience permeate the entire play; that is the most important shift from the more politically-centred 2004 production. A consequence of this permeation can be felt, heard, and seen in the presentation of the major Sophoclean odes: the famous ‘*polla ta deina* ode’, ‘the Zeus ode’, and ‘the *Erōs* ode’ (as mentioned earlier, the fourth ode has been cut from the play).⁹ A starting point for this discussion are Miyagi’s words, quoted earlier from his interview with Marion Canelas about the final scene when all the living and the dead depart for Hades. Miyagi there reminded us that “No human being can escape death, and all become *hotoke*, ‘buddhas’. We’ll ‘celebrate’ that event” (Cf. *Ant.* 360-1: ἄπορος ἐπ’ οὐδὲν ἔρχεται τὸ μέλλον· Αἰδα μόνον φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται.). He then mentioned the means of celebration, the *bon-odori*, the “ritual dance whose purpose is to help souls that have become ‘buddhas’ enter the hereafter”. While the finale’s celebra-

8 Indeed, in Miyagi’s words, qtd. in Canelas’ interview, trans. Schmidt-Cléach: “There is good and evil in Buddhism, but it isn’t a permanent distinction . . . Japanese Buddhism doesn’t tell you that the wicked will go to Hell to suffer for all eternity. If someone behaves badly in this world, he might still go to Heaven, if his deeper nature reappears right after his death.”

9 While Miyagi, according to the French program, used the translation of Shigetake Yaginuma as the basis for the play, he used it, so far as we can tell, rather freely, making cuts as well as smaller changes here and there and rendering the odes anew, though with remnants from the original, as pointed out in the text above.

tory dance has been heralded in many reviews of the play, yet dance movements and music of the *bon-odori* are not restricted to the ending; they are adumbrated during the play's opening and are present in full timbre during the odes. In the following depiction of the first and later odes, we follow the movements of the figures on stage at Avignon; while the performance is much the same in Shizuoka, the greater extent of the stage in Avignon causes some necessary differences while aesthetic conceptions may have recommended others.

Directly after Creon has proclaimed that no one shall bury Polynices and has asked his chorus for obedience, the Creon ghosts file toward the back of the stage and join the Ismene ghosts; eventually they form one line across the back of the stage and perform a buddhistic ballet backdrop for the *polla ta deina* ode. The ode itself is displaced from its Sophoclean standing: in the Greek text, it comes after the Guard has announced that someone has buried Polynices and after the chorus has suggested it was perhaps an act of the gods; Creon vehemently denies this, and the chorus apparently tries to make amends by ascribing incredible feats of skill to human beings (see Sano 2014 for a survey of different views of the fit or misfit of the ode in the play). In the 2017 productions (and unlike the 2004 one in Tokyo), the ode is sung *before* Antigone has buried her brother. A male and female solo singer now step forward; the female singer (Fuyuko Moriyama) claps her hands joyfully and the male singer, Sōichirō Yoshiue, before uttering a Japanese rendition of the most famous words in the ode, “While there are many mysteries and wonders in the world, there are none so wonderful as man”,¹⁰ booms out, with interruptions by his singing partner:

さあさ このぼの みなさま方よ — あこりゃ あこりゃ —
 ちょいと出ました 歌い手は — あ どうした — おみみ汚し
 の音頭を ひとふし うなりやしょう — まってました

10 Notsu, translating his transcription of the verses from the Avignon production: 世の中に謎や不思議は数々あれど人間ほどに不思議なものはありません; this differs slightly from Yaginuma's translation; the meaning is essentially the same but the style is different.

[Come out this way, everyone this way! – *a korya a korya* – Here I am, the singer, coming, – *a doushita!* I shall roar a disgraceful *ondo* – we were awaiting it! (trans. Notsu)]¹¹

The words announce the singing of an *ondo* – a song (as already mentioned) that is closely integrated with the *Bon-Odori* dance ritual. Some words in the song are untranslatable: *a* (あ) before *doushita* (どうした) is an interjection and *doushita* itself (from *dou* ‘how’ and *shita* ‘have done’), while frequently used for the greeting ‘how are you doing’, is also a kind of ‘calling out’ or ‘shout’ or ‘cheer’. There are many such musical and rhymical shoutings in Japanese: *hai hai, essassā no yoi yoi yoi, yoisa, korase, wasshoi, yoisho, koryā, arayot-to, dokkoisho*, etc. They are called ‘*hayashi kotoba*’ (‘cheering words’) and are inserted in the course of traditional popular songs (*minyō*) and *ondo* to make them more rhythmical. That analogous examples can readily be found in the lyric songs of Aristophanic Comedy suggests how efficaciously music has contributed to Miyagi’s aim of making “this play not tragic and sad, but a celebration to appease the spirits of the dead” (see figures 11a and b).

The ballet of ghosts (so unlike the ghoulish ghosts in the corresponding ode in 2004) offers another side of the *bon* festival, a sombre and elegant picture of the dead themselves. For behind the *ondo* singers, first in profile and then with backs to the audience, the combined chorus of ghosts perform a *bon* dance (see figure 12); here and elsewhere in the play, the particular dance is the *Kawachi Ondo Bon-Odori* that originated in pre-modern Osaka (Yokoyama, *per ep.* for the identification). In profile, facing stage left, their right arms outstretched as if they are archers holding imaginary bows and their left arms parallel but pulled back to release imaginary arrows, and then switching – with left arms extended and right arms pulled back – then (for we may as well give the instructions!) rock forward then backwards, turn with back to the audience, lower arms with back slightly bowed; then turn and face stage left again while raising both arms, then lower them, raise them, and repeat with slight change of movement: right arm extended as if holding the bow and

¹¹ The dashes represent a change of singer, the female soloist inserting an interjection and then the male singer taking up his song again, and so on.

left arm pulled back, step forward slowly, and so on. The slow motion, trance-like movement of the chorus of dancing Ismenes and Creons contrasts with the happy rhythm of the *ondo* singers of the ode: the two continue joyfully, the one clapping her hands, the other lifting now his left leg, now his right so happily he can't refrain from laughing: this is your *polla ta deina*: a combination of the common and the most solemn of movements: this is mankind, who can accomplish anything but cannot escape death (figure 12).



Figure 11a. A poster advertising the bon festival celebration at Jindaiji Temple, Chofu (near Tokyo) illustrates the joyful side of celebrating the dead. It says (beginning at the top): “Festival for the spirits (of the dead); grand festival of the bon-odori at Jindaiji; 7/23 (Mon.), 24 (Tues.) 6-9 p.m.; place: before Jinjado, the precincts of Jinja.” (*Between the two figures, the female is otahuku, the male is hyottoko*): “There will be souvenirs.” *Beneath the male figure*: “Everyone come!” (*At the bottom of the poster*): “Shusai: Jindaiji Housankai (Jindaiji Support Association)”. Ryotaro Baba designed the poster.



Figure 11b. A different version of the poster with the same message by the same designer. Here we see an obon dancer holding a fan in her right hand and extending her left arm; the man and woman beneath her accompany her dance with music and song. Mr. Kazuyuki Ishikawa supplied the photo, courtesy of the Jindaiji Housankai.



Figure 12. The famous *polla ta deina ode*; the soloists (here, only the male is visible) stand in front of a line of slow moving obon dancers; Antigone sits atop her platform; Ismene, barely visible, sits in profile beneath her. ©Ryota Atarashi (2017 Avignon).

What can they be celebrating? Surely it must be a prelude to the burial of Polynices – the dead, singers and dancers, are preparing for his reception. Indeed, the happy soloists against the backdrop of sombre ghosts make visible antipodal emotions: the happiness of welcome, the solemnity and fearfulness of dying, the ‘contradictory logics’ of Buddhist death rites (Stone and Walter 2008: 3; Horton 2008: 27; Williams 2008: 228). At the end of the song as the stage darkens and the chorus leaves in silence, we see Antigone perform a ritual burial (for Buddhist funeral practice: see Walter 2008: 247-92): she pours water from a hidden source over the edge of her platform, and then uses an elongated ritual ladle – the same as Creon had used to ‘purify’ Eteocles in the ‘prologue’ to the play – to reach another source of water beneath the platform on the far side (see figure 13). As she begins to pour the water, a Buddhist chant rises from the depths of the stage ‘OOOOOOOOO’; the chant is customary after burial and is imported from Tang China (声明 *shōmyō*, or, traditionally, 聲明: see Nakamura and Hunter 2009: 126-7; Hooker 1993: 220, 223; also, *inter alia*, the website for Jōdoshinshū Centre for Instruction of Ceremonies, 勤式指導所

Goshiki Shidōsho).¹² And then a loud おおさま! おおさま! (*ōsama! ōsama!* ‘King! King!’) is heard. The Guard has rushed onstage to announce the illicit burial of Polynices; he is phrenetic – his wild gestures convey intense emotion and also create a significant shadow play on the palace wall (see figures 14a and b). His speech takes on the linguistic traits of 落語 *rakugo*, a comic form of storytelling still performed today (see Sasaki and Heinze 1981: 417-59, esp. 426-8 and 444-54 for traditional *rakugo*).

We leave the ode behind; it ushers in contentious dialogue between Creon and Antigone; Ismene, too, joins the fray. It ends with Creon’s resolve to punish Antigone and with the latter’s piercing shriek, ‘Haemon!’. The Zeus Ode follows, in musical essence like *polla ta deina*, but with one soloist in Avignon (and not two as in Shizuoka), a swaggering and happy female singer who is occasionally interrupted by ‘call-outs’ (*yoisho hup-hup, hai hai, hup-hup-hup-hup, yoisho hup-hup-hup* from a male singer and *iyakorasē no dokkoisho* from female singers). The ghost choruses in the background are scattered on one side of the stage and the other, sometimes joining in a refrain (as with the syllables recorded just now), yet constantly performing movements similar to the *Kawachi Ondo Bon-Odori* we have described for the *polla ta deina* ode. Once again the joyful mood of the soloist contrasts with

12 That *shōmyō* chants are used in Buddhist funeral rites is not often mentioned in English language literature; it is common in Japanese material; thus, e.g., on the website for the Jōdoshinshū Centre, http://gonshiki.hongwanji.or.jp/html/example2_2.html, one finds on the first part of the page on terminology: 導師とは、法要に際し登礼盤をして調声（声明の句頭を始唱すること）する者、および葬儀のときに調声する者をいう（“調声する者をいう、導師 Dōshi (‘Leader’/Conductor) is someone who takes a 礼盤 Raiban (special seat for ceremonies) and attunes a chanting choir by singing the first part of a given *Shōmyō* for 法要 Hōyō (‘ceremonies’) and 葬儀 Sōgi (‘funerals’), trans. Shinya Ueno. Some Tendai *shōmyō* can be heard on the official site of 天台宗 Tendai-shū: <http://www.tendai.or.jp/shoumyou/> (scroll down to the youtube links). To hear *shōmyō* chants that sound much like the one during Antigone’s burial of her brother: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4J-violCiew> (Shingon *Shōmyō* Chant, publ. by Ungern Sternberg) and the Japanese *shōmyō* at <https://www.junkoueda.com/shomyo/>; both accessed last on August 18, 2019. Malm 2000: 70-74 sets out the musical instruments of traditional Buddhist ceremonies.

the rhythmic movements of the ghost dancers, impervious to the ephemeral.



Figure 13. Ritual ladles are still in use today—but their handles are shorter! Here, Professor Yoshinori Sano (ICU) pours purifying water with a ritual ladle from a well at the Jindaiji Temple site. Photo by Adele Scafuro (July 2018).

Figures 14a and b. The Guard, standing atop a stone platform on far stage right, reports Antigone’s burial of Polynices to Creon, standing on far stage left; his shadow hovers menacingly over Antigone (mover).



Figure 14a. “Soudain une tornade souleve des tourbillons de poussière”. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).



Figure 14b. "Cette fille?" ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

We turn now to the remarkable *Erōs* ode as performed in Avignon, much different in tone and performance strategy from the one performed in Shizuoka which is more akin to the preceding songs. In the interval between the Zeus Ode and this one, Haemon has entered the stage (speaker and mover); Haemon mover stands on a rock platform stage right, and Creon mover on a rock platform stage left – a surprising distance over which to carry on an agonistic debate but magically erased by the display of shadows on the palace wall – which locates the antagonists in more proximate positions and shows Creon towering over his son. The latter, we all know, presents the case for supporting Antigone's burial of her brother; Creon is angered. Haemon darts from one side of the extensive stage to the other, sometimes turning his back to the audience, fluttering his outstretched arms like the wings of a bird, leaping (shaman-like?) from one stone platform to another. Creon meets him once halfway and the two nearly brawl. The chorus now and again intervenes in support of Haemon, but to no avail: Creon announces his decision to imprison Antigone; Haemon will not look upon his father again if that happens. The lights dim; the choruses swoosh through the river and realign themselves; a single percussion wood-en bar is struck, again and again.

When the lights come up, Haemon and Creon remain in the dark, stage right and left respectively, while two chorus lines are now illuminated, one to the right of the *yagura*, the other to its left. The voices of both chorus lines now begin to sing; the rattling of their shakers and the drums of the musicians at the rear of the stage provide vigorous accompaniment. The *ondo*-like singing and chanting continually change rhythm; now and again the male and female singers share the same words, but more often they sing different ones and different melodies, not inharmoniously, but alike in urgency. The linguistic style of the ode differs radically from the preceding ones. Here, the remnant of the original Sophoclean text (for the ‘translation’ as such is very loose) is densely interspersed with fragmentary or nonsense syllables so that the ode – cut down to a minimal strophe (corresponding to Soph. *Ant.* 787-90, insofar as it can be discerned at all through the mélange of simultaneously pronounced different sounds!) – acquires an artificially extended life. The ‘nonsense syllables’, however, subsequently become constitutive and recognizable elements of the Japanese ode: for example, the syllable *ha* is repeated over and over again – but *ha* is the first syllable of the word *hametsu*, (‘destruction’) – and *hametsu* becomes the final *literate* word of the ode (for it is followed by ‘call-out’ refrains, *yoiyasa no sa*, *yoiyasa no sa*); *hametsu* itself is difficult to construe, but perhaps is to be understood as in apposition to what precedes. Scattered amidst the syllabic noise, then, the verses can be made out: “Neither the gods who live eternally nor ephemeral human beings have any means to escape (it), the power of invincible love, Erōs, lust, making mad both human beings and the gods – destruction!”¹³

Unlike the choristers in the two previous odes, these do not dance. As the song begins, however, in front of the chorus line and positioned on stage right, Haemon (speaker) and Antigone (speaker), five meters apart, stand absolutely still, arms at their sides, not quite face to face, for twelve seconds; then, slowly, they raise their arms. It is an astonishing moment: the speakers have become movers, and throughout the song, their movements are similar to those of the chorus of the dead in the *polla ta deina* and Zeus odes, a bon odori: right arms outstretched

13とこしえに生きる神々も、はかなき命の人間も、逃れる術なし、無敵なる恋の力エロス、愛欲、人も神世も狂わせる、破滅。Transcription from the Avignon production by Aya and Hiroshi Notsu; translation by Hiroshi Notsu.

as if holding an imaginary bow, and left arm raised as if letting loose an imaginary arrow while stepping forward with the left foot; rocking backward, then bending to the right and dropping arms and now raising them, and then with right arm extended once again and right foot forward, and soon switching with left arm extended and left foot forward, they draw closer to one another, step by step (figure 15a). On the second repetition, their raised left arms are precisely parallel and their movements are in perfect synchrony, but on the third repetition, they have passed each other by (figure 15b). It is breathtakingly beautiful: the 'almost touching', the 'always missing' – the speakers who at this decisive moment in their 'lives' neither speak nor touch.¹⁴ Meanwhile, the song of the choruses drives onward. Once again, just as the ghost dancers of *polla ta deina* and the Zeus ode have done, Haemon and Antigone ('speakers', now mute) dance to a different tune, but this time, the dance is both a sombre and romantic bon-odori, an anticipation of imminent arrival among the dead and heralded by loss of voice. Love and death are conjoined: both are ineluctable.

At ode's end, the choruses disperse. Creon speaks from his perch on stage left: he will not save the girl's life but shall drag her away and shut her alive in a cave (the words correspond to Soph. *Ant.* 769 and 773-4, spoken *before* the ode; there is some displacement of verses here.) All is now in darkness, except for Antigone who is brilliantly illuminated in white standing atop the *yaguri*, and, with her shadow towering gloriously on the palace wall behind her, she speaks her farewell. The *kommos* has begun. It is a true lament, shared between the protagonist and the chorus of men and women who are eerily illuminated in blue light beneath Antigone. They respond in song, sometimes the men, sometimes the women, sometimes combined –

¹⁴ The French surtitle for figure 15a is: *tu attaques les demeures des riches* ("you attack the homes of the rich") does not correspond to the Sophoclean ode, which (at l. 786) mentions ἀγρονόμοι ἀύλαί ("homesteads in the wilds"). The surtitle for figure 15b is more interesting: *tu rends fous tous ceux qui te prennent dans leurs bras* ("you drive crazy all those who take you into their arms"); the verse corresponds to the Sophoclean text at 790, ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμηνεν ("and the one who embraces you goes mad") and to "狂わせる (*kuruwaseru*) 'making mad' human beings and gods" in the Japanese song sung at Avignon; there is no mention of 'arms' in the Greek or Japanese texts and it may be fortuitously ironic that at this moment, the two lovers have passed each other by without touching at all!

but as for their movements, these are performed individually, as if each ghost perceives the pain of Antigone's imminent departure from life in his or her own way, depicting it with the jerking movements of someone receiving an electric shock, using *butoh*-like dance gestures as they bend their arms or drop their heads and lean forward. The crescendo comes when Antigone raises both arms aloft, shrieking out "ah, my brothers, after dying yourselves, you destroy me also, who am alive!" (trans. Notsu: ああ、お兄様方、ご自分が亡くなって 生きている私までも滅ぼしておしまいとは; the words loosely correspond to Soph. *Ant.* 870-71). The apostrophe to a *plural* number of 'brothers' is significant – for it is the *singular* that appears in the text of Sophocles and in the Japanese translation by Yaginuma. Scholars have usually understood it as referring to Polynices alone, whose marriage to the daughter of Adrastus led to the latter's support of Polynices' armed fight for the throne in Thebes. But in the Avignon production, reference to Polynices' 'wretched marriage' is excised (869-70), and so too, reference to the incestuous marriage of Jocasta and Oedipus (863-65). The word used for the plural brothers, お兄様方 (*onīsamagata*) is not used elsewhere in the play and is here used as a vocative plural of *onīsama* (brother). The brothers alike are causing Antigone's death, not one without the other – a recognition of the painful consequence of togetherness.



Figure 15a. Erōs Ode: Antigone (speaker) and Haemon (speaker) dance in silence; arms outstretched, they approach one another.

"Tu attaques les demeures des riches". ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).



Figure 15b. Erōs Ode: Antigone (speaker) and Haemon (speaker) dance a bon odori in silence; arms outstretched, they have now passed each other by. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

“Tu rends fous tous ceux qui te prennent dans leurs bras”.

More lamentation follows; the chorus members make *butoh*-like movements, tortured with pain, until the singing comes to an end with the gruff voice of Creon, urging that Antigone be led to her death.

The Movers, the Shadows, the Wall, and the Shadow World

Another shift away from the 2004 production is perhaps as equally important as the later production’s more profound engagement with Buddhist ritual. In 2004, Miyagi used multiple *Ismenes*, multiple *Creons*, and multiple *Tiresiases*; this appears to have been a great experiment – for he did not divide each individual role into speaker and mover as he had done in so many earlier productions and as had been a characteristic hallmark of his *Ku Na’ uka* company. Moreover, apart from the multiple characters voicing the same role, quite exceptionally, Antigone and Haemon spoke their own parts. In an interview with Smethurst about that production, Miyagi expressed the view that the multiplicity of voiced actors allows the Japanese audi-

ence to generalize about the Ismenes and Creons – basically, it entices the audience to dislike them, and to embrace the individualism of Antigone and Haemon (Smethurst 2011). The use of one actor for Antigone and one actor for Haemon, voice and movement coalescing in each, focused that individualism and emphasized all the more their political isolation, however much the audience was expected to sympathize with it. In 2017, the choruses of multiple Ismenes and Creons are still present, but now the major roles are split between a speaker and a mover: thus there are two Antigones, two Ismenes, two Creons, two Guards, two Haemons, two Tiresiases.

Elsewhere (as in the case of *Medea*), Miyagi has said that splitting an acting role into speaker and mover is “suitable for pre-modern fantastic plays” because it allows the audience to see how fantastical and unreal the character is (Miyagi qtd. in Anan 2006); and subsequently he has said that such splitting is useful for going beyond language barriers (Eglinton 2011) – so that voice becomes music for the actor to dance to. There is no reason to think these views mutually exclusive – even though it may be that, on the global stage (e.g. in the courtyard of the Palace of the Popes in Avignon), the movement of the actors and musical messaging take primary place – indeed, a row of some dozen percussionists sometimes stands against the back wall of the palace setting the pace.

Not surprisingly, Miyagi has commented on his split actors and multiple choruses in the 2017 productions, comparing his choruses to those in Noh:

Each character – Antigone, Creon, Haemon, or Ismene – has a dedicated actor saying his or her lines. But sometimes, their lines are also said by a chorus made up of several actors. In Japanese *Noh*, you have what we call *jiutai*, which resembles the Greek chorus. It’s as if the words of the *shite*, the protagonist, slowly spread to the entire *jiutai* (which comprises about eight actors). We’re exploring a way to stage the “collective voice” of all the people who felt and thought the same thing but didn’t express it. It’s a way to adapt our methods to plays written before the advent of the modern ego. (Interview by Canelas 2017, trans. Schmidt-Cléach.)

The Noh ‘chorus’ that narrates the action often picks up the first-person speech of the (speaking) *shite* (while there are many

words expressing 'I' or 'moi' in Japanese – there is no simple and single 'first person pronoun' that is equivalent, for example, to 'I' in English or 'je' in French),¹⁵ so that not only the speech of *shite* and 'chorus' seem shared, but also the mind. The multiple choruses of the 2017 production, then, function in a way similar to the way they functioned in 2004 – but the splitting of the major acting roles into two, one for a speaker and the other for the mover, makes an immense difference in the 2017 productions.

Miyagi, however, has gone a step further: he has also split the role of the movers in two, between themselves and their shadows. Once again, he offers an explanation:

The part of the audience that's near the stage sees the actors as well as the shadows projected onto the wall, in the back. And those who see the stage from up high, who make up more than half of the audience, see the shadows first, but their eyes are also attracted by the actors who create those shadows. The goal is for them to pay attention to the human body through the abstraction of the body. When an actor plays with his facial expressions, ironically, the audience has trouble perceiving his body because, before they can focus on what's within the body, their gaze is absorbed by this superficial change. The actors who perform with their shadows don't speak. Their lines are said by the chorus that surrounds them. (Interview by Canelas 2017, trans. Schmidt-Cléach).¹⁶

Miyagi describes his grand shadow theatre as the solution to a practical problem: those whose seating prevents them from easily seeing the movers and speakers onstage are encouraged to engage with the motion of the human body as adumbrated by the shadowy activity on the palace wall; this in turn will direct their gaze to the moving figures of the actors beneath them and away

15 Haemon uses *watakushi* and Creon *washi* when they converse with each other; Antigone and Ismene use *watashi*; the Guard *washi*, Creon *yo*, and the *ondo* singers *watakushi*.

16 In the same interview, he compares a similar problem in *wayang kulit*, Indonesian shadow theatre, where "the audience will sometimes be not on the same side of the theatre where shadows are visible, but on the other one, the side of the torches". Another inversion of the allegory of the cave?

from the facial features that cannot reveal half so much. Miyagi accomplishes this magician's feat by rendering the correspondence between mover and shadow inextricable and yet making the movement of the shadow a more accurate conveyer of the ongoing dramatic action than the movers who produce it, and finally, by conveying, with the shadows, a grandeur that mere human figures onstage could hardly produce. In a way, the staging reverses the message of the 'shadows on the wall' in that Ur-text of Western literature, Plato's *Republic*; there, in book 7, 514a2 to 517a7, the shadows in the allegorical cave represent a lesser and corrupt vision of what is real and of what can only be seen by the light of the sun.

Examples in *Antigone* 2017 are easy to adduce. The Guard (mover) who announces the burial of Polynices to Creon stands on far stage right and Creon (mover) on far stage left – the gulf between them is vast; but the Guard's shadow extends more than halfway across the stage toward Creon and hovers threateningly over Antigone; the shadow itself 'acts out' the seizing of the young woman rather than the corporeal Guard who rages frenetically onstage (see figures 14a and b). The shadows of Antigone (mover) and Creon (mover) act out their quarrel on the palace wall and the distance between the two disappears. Similarly, Haemon (mover) and Creon (mover), as we have already mentioned, cast huge shadows on the palace wall during their grand agon; those shadows erase the distance and show Creon towering over Haemon, even though audience members will see Haemon (mover) dart across the expanse of stage to threaten his father. The shadow play of the wide sleeves of robes draped from arms that are held out straight on one side and the other (as in many shadow images of Antigone) or flapped up and down (as in shadow images of Haemon as he leaps from one stone to another) are dramatically effective conveyers of intense emotion. The shadow play of hands also can tell tales: Tiresias' prophetic hands provide the shadow play of a bird of prey about to seize its victim – indeed, it is destiny itself that is about to tear Creon apart.

But surely the most dramatic of all shadow plays is the one portraying the simultaneous deaths of Antigone and Creon. This is the show stealer. Creon, when the *kommos* had ended, ordered

Antigone to be led away. The stage is almost completely dark; all cast members appear in an eerie blue light, except for the white illuminated Antigone. Sitting atop her platform, her back to the audience and her shadow cast on the wall before her, she now gives her final speech in muted voice, an abbreviation of the farewell in Sophocles' play, corresponding to 925-8: "If the gods want it this way, after a great deal of suffering, I will realize my faults, but if these people are to blame, may their suffering be not so great as mine" (trans. Notsu).¹⁷ As she finishes, the ghostly troupe begins to leave the stage, and with the departure of Antigone (speaker), we know that the end is near. Antigone (mover) now bends and turns toward stage right, where Haemon, like Antigone, is now illuminated in bright light. Each stretches an arm across the expanse of stage. The shadows in motion tell a love story (see figures 16a and b) and bring closure to the narrative begun by the mute speakers (Haemon and Antigone) who had danced slowly past one another with arms outstretched, never touching, in the Erōs ode. Now, still slowly but nevertheless surely, their hands, that is, the hands of the shadows, Haemon's reaching out for Antigone's, touch. It is poignant, beautifully romantic, and executed with incredible artistry. And once having touched, their arms drop slowly and the lovers die, shadows and movers as one. Tiresias leaps up and the final scene begins.

The *Kawachi Ondo Bon-Odori*: the actors will remove their wigs and join the dead; Antigone will descend from the platform (figure 10b); the ghosts, arms outstretched, right arm, then left arm, moving slowly, will circle round the *yagura* once again (figure 6).

17もし神さまがこれでよしとお思いならさんざん苦しんだはてに、私は私の過ちを 思い知りましょう。もしこの人たちに罪があるなら私以上にひどい目にはあいませんように。The text transcribed and translated from the Avignon performance departs slightly from Yaginuma's translation; it also departs from a strict translation of the Greek text, "But if these men are wrongdoing, may they suffer no more troubles than they inflict on me unjustly" (926-7: εἰ δ' οἷδ' ἄμαρτάνουσι, μὴ πλείω κακᾶ/ πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρώσιν ἐκδικῶς ἐμέ). In the 'Avignon text', Antigone is more philanthropic, wishing her enemies better treatment than she has received.

The priest will return and launch the lanterns downstream (the *tōrō nagashi*, figure 6). We have seen that the *Bon Odori* is not just the finale of the play; the dead have been celebrated throughout; or rather, they have performed the celebration themselves, singing and dancing the bon dance during the three major songs (the *polla ta deina*, Zeus, and Erōs odes: figures 12, 15a and b), and while the living have suffered, they, too, have suffered in sympathy, expressing their grief individually but nevertheless as a group in *butoh*-like dance movements. The meticulous artistry of scenographer, choreographer, composer/arranger, musicians, lighting expert, costumers, dancers, singers, movers, and speakers has been orchestrated magisterially under the direction of Satoshi Miyagi: a Buddhist celebration in the courtyard of the Palace of the Popes in 2017 CE.

Figure 16a and b. Deaths of Antigone (mover) and Haemon (mover).



Figure 16a. The hands of the shadows of Antigone and Haemon reach out across the palace wall. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).



Figure 16b. Slowly, the hands of the shadows touch; and the corporeal Antigone and Haemon die. ©SPAC (2017 Shizuoka Sunpujo).

Works Cited

- “All Shizuoka’s a stage”, *The Japan Times*, 27 April 2017: 3, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/culture/2017/04/27/stage/shizuokas-stage-spacs-theater-festival/#.WQKZ50jyjIU> (last access 11 August 2018).
- Anan, Nobuko (2006), Review of “*Medea* Aadapted by Miyagi Satoshi from the original play by Euripides. Directed by Miyagi Satoshi. Ku Na’uka at Biwako Hall, Shiga, Japan 7 August 2005”, *Asian Theatre Journal* 23 (2): 407-11.
- Calame, Claude (2010), “Aetiological Performance and Consecration in the Sanctuary of Dionysos”, in Oliver Taplin and Rosie Wyles (eds), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*: Oxford: Oxford University Press, 65-78.
- Canelas, Marion (2017, in French), “Interview with Satoshi Miyagi”, Eng. trans. by Gaël Schmidt-Cléach, <http://www.festival-avignon.com/en/shows/2017/antigone> (click on ‘Presentation’ and scroll to ‘leaf-let’; last access 11 August 2018).
- Csapo, Eric (2010), “The Context of Choregic Dedications”, in Oliver Taplin and Rosie Wyles (eds), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 79-130.
- Csapo, Eric and William J. Slater (1995), *The Context of Ancient Drama*,

- Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Griffith, Mark (2010), "Satyr Play and Tragedy, Face to Face", in Oliver Taplin and Rosie Wyles (eds) *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 47-64.
- Harvey, Peter (2013), *An Introduction to Buddhism. Teachings, History, and Practices*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooker, Floyd B. (1993), "A Bibliography of Buddhist Materials in the Recorded Sound Collection of the Library of Congress", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 16 (1): 209-242.
- Horton, Sarah Johanna (2008), "Mukaekō: Practice for the deathbed", in Jacqueline Stone and Mariko Namba Walter (eds), *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 27-60.
- Jōdoshinshū Centre for Instruction of Ceremonies, 勤式指導所 Goshiki Shidōsho, http://gonshiki.hongwanji.or.jp/html/example2_2.html (last access 21 August 2018).
- Malm, William P. (2000), *Traditional Japanese Music and Musical Instruments*, new ed., Tokyo, New York: Kodansha International.
- Mee, Erin B. and Helene P. Foley (2011), "Mobilizing Antigone", in Erin B. Mee and Helene P. Foley (eds), *Antigone on the Contemporary World Stage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-47.
- Mesmer, Philippe (2017), "Satoshi Miyagi: 'La parole et le mouvement sont deux éléments séparés pour l'acteur'", *Le Monde*, 3 July.
- Mol, Serge (2003), *Classical Weaponry of Japan, Special Weapons and Tactics of the Martial Arts*, Tokyo, New York, and London: Kodansha International.
- Nakamura, Masayuki and Jeffrey Hunter (2009), *A Bilingual Guide to Japanese Traditional Performing Arts*, Tokyo: Tankasha.
- Namiki, Gohei III (1965), in *Kabuki Jūhachiban Syū (The Eighteen Best Kabuki Plays)*, ed. by Masakatsu Gunji, Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Nelson, Steven G. (2008), "Court and religious music (1): history of *gagaku* and *shōmyō*", and "Court and religious music (2): music of *gagaku* and *shōmyō*", in Alison Tokita and David W. Hughes (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Japanese Music*, SOAS Musicology Series, Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 35-48 and 49-76.
- Ortolani, Benito (1995), *The Japanese Theatre: from Shaministic Ritual to Contemporary Pluralism*, 2nd ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sano, Yoshinori (2014), "The First Stasimon of Sophocles' *Antigone* (332-

- 75): Comparison with Texts on Cultural Progress”, *Japan Studies in Classical Antiquity* 2: 31-46.
- Sasaki, Miyoko and Morioka Heinze (1981), “Rakugo: Popular Narrative Art of the Grotesque”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 41 (2): 417-59.
- Segal, Charles (1995), “Spectator and Listener”, in J-P Vernant (ed.), *The Greeks* (trans. Charles Lambert and Teresa Lavander Fagan), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 184-217.
- Smethurst, Mae J. (2011), “Are We All Creons and Ismenes?: Antigone in Japan”, in Erin B. Mee and Helene P. Foley, *Antigone on the Contemporary World Stage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 221-34.
- (2014), “Interview with Miyagi Satoshi”, *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 129 (4): 843-6.
- Sophocles (1900), *The Plays and Fragments. Part III. The Antigone*, ed. by Sir Richard Jebb, 3rd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sophocles (1990), *Antigone* 『アンティゴネー』 trans. and comments by 柳沼重剛訳 (Shigetake Yaginuma) in 松平千秋 (Chiaki Matsudaira), 久保正彰 (Masaaki Kubo), 岡道男 (Michio Oka) (eds), 『ギリシア悲劇全集3』 (Girisha Higeiki Zenshū 3, *Complete Works of Greek Tragedy* vol. 3), Tokyo: 岩波書店 (Iwanami Shoten): 229-324.
- Stone, Jacqueline and Mariko Namba Walter (2008), “Introduction”, in Stone and Walter *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1-26.
- Stone, Jacqueline and Mariko Namba Walter (eds) (2008), *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Taplin, Oliver and Rosie Wyles (eds) (2010), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walter, Mariko Namba (2008), “The Structure of Japanese Funerals”, in Jacqueline Stone and Mariko Namba Walter (eds), *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 247-92.
- Williams, Duncan Ryūken (2008), “Funerary Zen. Sōtō Zen Death Management in Tokugawa Japan”, in Jacqueline Stone and Mariko Namba Walter (eds), *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 207-46.
- Wyles, Rosie (2010), “The Tragic Costumes”, in Oliver Taplin and Rosie Wyles (eds), *The Pronomos Vase and its Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 231-53.
- Yamaguchi, Hiroko (2012) “Artist Interview. Theater as a Window to the

World”, Performing Arts Network Japan, The Japan Foundation, 29 October 2012, https://www.performingarts.jp/E/art_interview/1209/1.html (for 2012.10.29, accessed 11 August 2018).

Websites

<http://www.festival-avignon.com/en/thought-workshops/2017/dialogues-artists-audience-antigone> (Accessed 11 August 2011).

<https://jp.ambafrance.org/Theatre-Festival-Shizuoka-2017-Antigone-de-Satoshi-Miyagi> (Accessed 11 August 2018).

<https://www.kunauka.or.jp/en/home01.htm>, see under ‘News’ (Accessed 11 August 2018).

Tendaishū Official Site: <http://www.tendai.or.jp/shoumyou/> (Accessed 21 August 2018).

Part 4
Ἐξω τοῦ θεάτρου / Theatre and Beyond

***Symmachos* esso: Theatrical Role-Playing and Mimesis in Sappho fr. 1 V. (with a Glance on the *Symmachos*-Motif in Tragedy)**

ANTON BIERL

Abstract

The paper offers a new reading of Sappho's controversial and almost obscure fr. 1. It focuses on its structure, rhetorical strategies, and cultural implications for the primary and secondary recipients in a metapoetic perspective. The poem therefore emphasizes the concerns of Sappho as a poet and performer of love songs that have their 'Sitz im Leben' in the *hic et nunc* of the circle of maidens, but also aims at later receptions and the poet's afterlife. Through linguistic 'trickery', mimetic impersonation, and a final call on Aphrodite to become her fellow-fighter, Sappho reasserts her strength after self-humiliation. The song is theatre *in nuce*, theatricality in a completely different context from that of tragedy, where, according to a Dionysian perspective, the protagonists' behaviour is always problematic. Whereas the involvement in a dramatic role and plot can make it necessary to deploy the *symmachos*-metaphor in connection with a specific god in a situation of crisis, in Sappho it seems to be the occasion for the song itself. The article argues that fr. 1 does not reflect so much a single story about one girl as one single instance of unreciprocated love, an emotional cry for help. But Sappho sings about an endless chain of very personal visits that culminate in her last very intimate meeting with Aphrodite, when the goddess becomes her real ally, providing her with poetic inspiration and the poem with its performative essence (from the setting to the atmosphere, from the form to the content), deeply ingrained with an erotic aesthetics. By re-enacting this divine fellow-fighter in the very performance, the song makes Sappho merge with Aphrodite.

The thought and structure of Sappho's fragment 1 V. seems to be obvious and clear.¹ Sappho is in a situation of erotic distress, pre-

1 The jubilee is a connoisseur and aficionado of theatre, music, and opera. This piece about Sappho, that at a first glance does not have to do with his interests, but will address them in a different way. May the *honorandus* find pleasure in this modest offering, a gift of admiration and affection. I owe my thanks to Silvia Bigliuzzi, the other great unfatiguing soul of the

sumably because of a girl who does not reciprocate Sappho's feelings. However, it is probable that the situation is not real but based on an "implicit fiction" (Burnett 1983: 243). Sappho calls on Aphrodite to come help so that she can be relieved from her sorrows and have her desires fulfilled. Surprisingly, she ends her prayer by asking the goddess to be her fellow-fighter (σύμμαχος ἔσσο, 28). But at a closer look the logic and the sense of this song are rather obscure (Schlesier 2011: 418-19); the erotic goals remain very abstract, general, and depersonalized (Schlesier 2011: 421-3). Sappho uses the traditional form of a *hymnos kletikos* ('a hymn calling a god to come') (Burnett 1983: 247-8; Ritoók 1995; Schlesier 2011: 417-19), but starts – in the invocation (1-5a) – formulating her wish already in lines 3-5a, first by giving a negative order, then by very succinctly inviting Aphrodite to appear to her. Then the ἔλθε ('come!') in line 5a is resumed very late in line 25 at the beginning of the last strophe (25-8), the so-called prayer. The long in-between passage comprised between lines 5b and 24 talks about past epiphanies.² The reason why Aphrodite should appear in person, though, and what she should perform remain rather vague: the song culminates in Sappho's poetic persona's final radical demand that she shows up, stays with her on earth, somewhere on Lesbos, and be a warrior on her side. Yet, in the central section of the poem, the so-called praise or *pars epica* (5b-24), Cypris is described as a rather delicate lady. Moreover, we know from the Homeric tradition, from *Iliad* 5, that she is all but a proficient fighter. Only a tiny scratch on her hand inflicted by Diomedes makes her leave the battlefield of Troy and come back to the bosom of her mother to find some consolation on Mount Olympus. Just the sight of some blood makes her almost faint (Hom. *Il.* 5.330-417). Thus Athena, a real female war-goddess, pokes fun at her (5.420-5) and Zeus gives

Veronese circle, for improving and correcting my English. The secondary literature on Sappho's fr. 1 is vast; I used among others Schadewaldt 1950: 85-91; Page 1955: 3-18; Bowra 1961: 198-205; Krischer 1968; Privitera 1974: 27-83; Svenbro 1975; Burnett 1983: 243-59; Rissman 1983: 1-29; Lasserre 1989: 201-14; Schadewaldt 1989: 175-8; Ritoók 1995; Tzamali 1996: 36-90; Nagy 1996: 87-103; Stehle 1997: 296-9; Thomas 1999: 3-10; Hutchinson 2001: 149-60; Tsomis 2001: 38-44; Schlesier 2011; Nagy 2013, 122-9.

² Page (1955: 18) regards it as a long and deviating digression.

his fine daughter the advice that in the future she should not care about war but about weddings (5.426-30).

In her oriental parallel forms as Astarte or Ishtar, the goddess' war-like aspect is much stronger. Ishtar indeed appears as a goddess of war with a beard. Greek cults that venerate Aphrodite as a goddess with weapons are rare. Much seems to be derived from Aphrodite's universal and cosmic dimension as well as from her union with Ares (Burkert 1985: 153; Breitenberger 2007: 14-15). Sappho on Lesbos is situated between East and West, but she, in allusion to the Homeric tradition, particularly helps establishing a view of Aphrodite as a delicate and sensuous young woman, the emblem of absolute beauty and love. However, war and love strangely intersect in the ancient poetic traditions (Rissman 1983). Achilles can be an ideal and eternal bridegroom who, as he dies on the battlefield to become a hero of *kleos aphthiton* ('undying fame'), will never marry (Nagy 2013: 98-108, 136-8). Ares can function as a model for grooms as well (Nagy 2013: 118-19). Death in epics has to do with beauty and aesthetics. Aphrodite's doings associated with beauty and aesthetics are thus also linked with war and fighting. Love and weddings can be assimilated to death in a figurative sense (Nagy 2013: 133-45). As a fundamental passion of both men and gods, love is invincible. Nobody can defeat it. Therefore, one epithet for Aphrodite is *amachos* ('invincible') (Soph. *Ant.* 799). She is like a warrior against whom you cannot win. *Eros* as "discourse of absence" (Barthes 1979: 13-17), eternal deferral, means suffering, *pathos*. Love enters through the eyes, hits one like a weapon. That is why *Eros* is typically represented with arrows. Separated by a never bridgeable distance from the desired person, lovers feel an eternal lack (Bierl 2006: 86-92). Thus, love hurts, tears one apart, and affects one with all sorts of bodily injuries (Bierl 2016b). Both the warrior in the moment of death and the bride together with her groom in the very moment of getting married at their wedding can be stylized as being equal to the gods (Nagy 2013: 109-45). Especially the maiden on the brink of womanhood being exposed to the all-encompassing passion of love can be viewed as being close to figurative death or to a god-like existence. Total love means Aphrodite's epiphany (Nagy 2013: 132-5), so to speak. Thus, when Aphrodite, the divine personification of love, is envisioned to appear, the woman experiencing her di-

vine presence is assimilated to the goddess. Jean-Pierre Vernant emphasized the complementary ideological functions of war and wedding in a gendered perspective. What war means for the ephebes is equivalent to marriage in the case of young maidens (Vernant 1980: 34). Both war and weddings embody the *telos*, the goal of their rites of passages to adulthood. We know that the girls in the Sapphic circle are educated to experience beauty, *kallos*, in a multimodal manner and in performances that appeal to all senses. The highest value of an overall *bellezza* (frs 16 and 58.23-6) is further supported by homoerotic tensions and relationships among the girls and also between Sappho, the leader of the group or chorus, and single members of the chorus (Bierl 2003; 2016c). They leave the circle to get married, the ultimate goal of the activities in the ritualized life of the group that stands under the auspices of Aphrodite (Calame 1977: 1.127, 369-70; Bierl 2016a: 302-3 with literature in n. 1).

Coming back to the final prayer that Aphrodite should appear as a fellow-fighter (28), I would like to focus on the surprising use of this word. *Symmachos* is a military term not yet attested in Homer.³ In the Homeric tradition, an ally is an *epikouros*, a *doryxenos*, or an *arogos*. In epics, heroes are often linked to a god, an ally in war. Gods often have a special relation to a hero. Some are allies, other are antagonists. Whereas in mythic narration specific gods fight against heroes, in cultic terms the same gods are closely associated with them (Nagy 2013: 333-4). *Symmachos* is first attested in Archilochus' fr. 108 W. Hephaestus, Aphrodite's husband, shall be an ally in war and support Archilochus with fire in the battle, for example by burning down villages. According to the conceptual and cultural overlap of male and female domains, war and love/marriage, warrior and poet, the real and the figurative, Sappho as a female poet now wants Aphrodite to be her *symmachos*. As we will see, this term is often used for a god's military support of a human warrior. In an anthropomorphic view, gods are conceived to fight concretely together with their favourites. In a pair relation, the god is often viewed as the leading figure. But pairs of fighters also exist among Homeric heroes, especially in the case of charioteer and warrior. Despite the fact that

3 On *symmachiai* before the fifth century BCE, see Baltrusch 1994: 3-15.

sym-machos principally denotes a relation of equals, in fact often the *symmachos*, the fellow-fighter, is slightly superior or inferior. In most cases, a *symmachos* only helps the main figure (Hsch. s.v. σύμμαχος· βοηθός). Thus, we could say that Sappho's diction implies that Aphrodite should indeed only support Sappho or the poetic 'I' as the main figure, reversing the hierarchy between god and man. Later on, as may be found in numerous inscriptions, *symmachos* becomes a military and judicial term for any ally. In a legal sense, as the *symmachos* helps the main combatant he must not necessarily be at war with the third party (Baltrusch 1994: 3). Almost in all instances we encounter a concrete military support in a battle. But the *symmachos* can be transferred to other figurative contexts where war is always partially implied. The use of Aphrodite is surprising but also implies a partial appropriation of the male fighting activity.

In the following, I will argue that Sappho neither composes a purely cultic song about epiphanic experiences (Bowra 1936: 193-4; 1961: 202-3) or an "expression of a personal religious faith" (Burnett 1983: 246), nor follows a specific erotic goal – in the sense of a biographical approach to win back a specific girl (see Burnett 1983: 243 with n35), woo her in a veiled form (Schadewaldt 1950: 85-91), or provide a humoured self-criticism to not take love too seriously (Page 1955: 15-16) at a certain period of her life by means of a hymnic appeal to Aphrodite. Instead, Sappho pursues a poetic and self-referential agenda as a female singer and *choragos* of her female circle.⁴ Appropriating the existing discourses in Lesbos' society and culture – the hymnic form, poetic performativity and its mimetic function, the concept of epiphany, the ritual and festive setting, choral, erotic, and aesthetic *paideia*, the polytheistic religion and the features of Aphrodite, the complementary overlap of war and marriage –, she creates an innovative song to assert and define her function as the woman leader of the female group and as a poetess totally dedicated to the realm of beauty, love, and Aphrodite. Appropriating and innovatively playing with different discourses that she uses dialogically, Sappho exploits the expe-

4 This dimension is only alluded to by Schlesier 2011: 426. On metapoetic concerns in the Cologne Papyrus (fr. 58A-D), see Bierl 2016c.

dient of divine epiphany to become equal to the goddess and play a performative trick of mimetic role-playing in narration so as to briefly turn into Aphrodite.⁵ Thus, I will argue that by drastically reversing her initial feeling of emotional devastation and depression, she eventually can reassert herself as a self-confident *choragos* ('chorus leader') and poetic singer. The so-called pragmatic approach to lyric song focused on its actual performance broadened the discussion to the occasion, the here and now, that originated it (literature in Bierl 2003: 98n29). Perhaps, as some critics believe, the occasion for fr. 1 is the annual Pan-Lesbian festival of Messon, linked to the Kallisteia (Nagy 2013: 124-5 with 116-18). Sappho, or the poetic 'I' as *choragos*, performs a ritual pattern that can be annually re-performed. The chorus leader thus officially calls upon Aphrodite to appear so that she can become god-like and fulfil her function in aesthetic *paideia*. If so, τῦιδε ('hither', 5) is the location in the 'here and now', and Aphrodite's sudden arrival from the sky through the air διὰ μέσσω (12) is perhaps an allusion to the site of Messon, the 'middle place'. But reception is a relevant issue from the start, so that the ritual setting, endowed with a general meaning for its annual re-enactment, may be re-used and re-interpreted also on new occasions, for example for personal addresses to the circle of maidens, or even the male symposium. Thus, the composition contains the poetic potential for later performances and re-signifying practices in other contexts. The "*prima donna*" as the *choragos* (Nagy 2013: 125) must be outstanding, merging with the persona of the female composer, who in this case is addressed by her own name. In the primary context of ritual, Sappho, by mentioning her speaking name – according to Greg Nagy, meaning little 'sister' (Nagy 2016: 489-92; Bierl 2016a: 306-7) – asserts her authority and momentarily transforms into Aphrodite, merging as a "diva" (Nagy 2013: 125) with the goddess as the ultimate *choragos*. At a later stage, the song, especially its mimetic address to 'Psappho', can be interpreted as a poetic self-assertion and a "*sphragis*" (Schlesier 2011: 421) through which Sappho defends her au-

5 Burnett (1983: 253) speaks about "the poem's own trickery" in a different sense, in respect to memorizing past epiphanies and condensing them in the last one.

thorship. This reading focused on her personal poetic agenda, on a diachronic level, again assumes a different meaning depending on whether we locate it in classical or hellenistic times. Yet, all potential meanings are already enclosed in Sappho's highly original and innovative song, that, as a ritual script, is also an interdiscursive text (Yatromanolakis 2007) referring to the poet's own poetry and religion. Archaic poetry, so to speak, prefigures the future.

1. A Closer View on Fr. 1

Let us first present the text in Voigt's edition and Rayor's slightly adapted translation (Sappho 2014):

- ⊗ Ποικιλόθρονον ἄθανάτ' Ἀφρόδιτα,
 παῖδι Διίῳ δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε,
 μή μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα,
 πότνια, θυμῶν,
 ἀλλὰ τυῖδ' ἔλιθ', αἶ ποτα κατέρωτα 5
 τὰς ἔμας αὐῖδας αἰοῖσα πῆλοι
 ἔκλυες, πάτροις δὲ δόμον λίποισα
 χιρῦσιον ἦλθεις
 ἄρμ' ὑπασδεύξαισα· κάλοι δέ σ' ἄγον
 ὤκεες στρουῖθοι περὶ γὰς μελαίνας 10
 πύκνα δίνινεντες πτέρ' ἀπ' ὠράνω αἴθε-
 ροῖς διὰ μέσσω·
 αἶψα δ' ἐξίκοιντο· σὺ δ', ὦ μάκαιρα,
 μειδιαισισ' ἄθανάτῳ προσώπῳ
 ἦρε' ὅττι δηῖτε πέπονθα κῶττι 15
 δηῖτε κιάλημιμι
 κῶττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι
 μαινόλαι ἰθύμῳ· τίνα δηῖτε πείθω
 ἰσάγην ἔς σὰν φιλότατα; τίς σ', ὦ
 Ψάπφ', ἰαδίκησι; 20
 καὶ γὰρ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει,
 αἰ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ', ἀλλὰ δώσει,
 αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει
 κῶκ ἐθέλοισα.
 ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον 25

ἐκ μερίμναν, ὅσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι
 θῦμος ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, σὺ δ' αὔτα
 σύμμαχος ἔσσο.

⊗

[You with varied embroidered flowers, Immortal
 Aphrodite,
 child of Zeus, weaving wiles: I beg you,
 do not break my spirit, O Queen,
 with pain or sorrow

but come – if ever before from far away
 you heard my voice and listened,
 and leaving your father's
 golden home you came,

5

your chariot yoked with lovely sparrows
 drawing you quickly over the dark earth
 in a whirling cloud of wings down
 the sky through midair,

10

suddenly here. Blessed One, with a smile
 on your ageless face, you ask
 what have I suffered again
 and why do I call again

15

and what in my wild heart do I most wish
 would happen: "Once again who must I
 persuade to turn back to your love?
 Sappho, who wrongs you?"

20

If now she flees, soon she'll chase.
 If rejecting gifts, then she'll give.
 If not loving, soon she'll love
 even against her will."

Come to me now – release me from these
 troubles, everything my heart longs
 to have fulfilled, fulfil, and you
 be my ally.]

25

As said, Sappho uses the traditional tripartite structure of the *hymnos kletikos* (Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.50-63) according to the

ritual or a personal aesthetic agenda appropriating it for the specific needs of the ritual or her own needs. The first very short address to capture the attention has very specific tones that have to do with Sappho's own poetry, especially with this poem that plays a performative trick on the audience and goes beyond the traditional form of the genre. Sappho addresses Aphrodite as a goddess 'with a varied embroidered cloth' or 'who has varied embroidered flowers on her mantle' (ποικιλόθρον', 1), 'immortal' (ἀθανάτ', 1), 'child of Zeus' (παῖ Δίος, 2), 'weaver of wiles' (δολόπλοκε, 2). As a weaver she invents frauds, deceits, and tricks, but weaving is also a feature of the artful poet who devises clever strategies to go beyond formal and generic conventions. *Poikilia* means variety, the specifically varied manner to insert patterns into a garment and a text (Nagy 1996: 39). The flowers weaved into her mantle are a typical symbol of Aphrodite's beauty, fragrance, attractiveness, and sexuality. The cloth implies her outfit, her dress, as well as the texture of the poem as weaved text. Weaving (lat. *texere*) is a widely used image for textual poetic production (Scheid and Svenbro 1996: 131-55, 209-16; Nagy 1996: 64-5). The use of the first epithet *poikilothronos* is probably her first trickery of ambiguity. The first, and obvious meaning is 'on the coloured seat', 'on the throne of many hues', but it evokes the homonym derived from *throna*, flowers, with the more remote meaning 'with varied embroidered flowers' (Lasserre 1989: 205-14; Scheid and Svenbro 1996: 53-82; Nagy 1996: 101 with n40). The seated figure makes way to an active female weaver (from *plekein*) who also wears a richly decorated mantle fitting to her artistry. Whereas the actual prayer is usually deferred until the third part, the end of the hymn, in this case Sappho needs to utter her actual concern right at the beginning of the poem (2-5a), even before the *hypomnesia* or *pars epica* (5b-24). Fully in love, the poetic 'I' prays to the goddess ('You', λίσσομαί σε, 2) not to devastate and subdue her heart, not to overpower her spirit (θῦμον, 4) with pain or sorrow, with feelings of nausea, weariness, satiation as well as discomfort, distress, and anguish (μή μ' ἄσασι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα, 3), but to come 'hither' (*tuide*) (τυιδ' ἔλθ', 5). The emphasis on despair and subjugation – wherefore Aphrodite is called 'mistress' (πότνια, 4) – is particularly strong. She feels totally overpowered, weak and almost subjugated. The

preces are normally formulated in positive terms, but Sappho's distress is so overwhelming that she first pleads in negative terms to prevent her emotional enslavement. However, it can be expected that, had her 'mistress' Aphrodite appeared, the hierarchical gulf between god and cultic worshipper would exactly entail subjugation on the level of proxemics.

In poetry, as in real life, people usually seek relief from troubles caused by external forces by invoking a god to appear and bring help against these negative powers. Yet, in this case, it is Aphrodite who is called upon, although she is also the one who causes the pain. It sounds ironic that the originator, the goddess responsible for the distress, is summoned to come for rescue, not someone else. To solve this inherent paradox we could only imagine the goddess to stop her negative influence and change into a benign force. However, to our surprise, we hear much later, in the sixth strophe (21-4), that in this case of possibly unreciprocated love she will cause a radical reversal of the situation. Love will not cease, but the erotic hierarchy will be reversed, so that the beloved girl will be the one to suffer in the future. Yet, when Aphrodite is first invoked to come (5) we are unaware of this. The prayer focuses entirely on her epiphany. In most instances epiphanies are extremely dangerous, since the god in his unveiled appearance can even destroy the human adorant through light and sound. The direct encounter between man and god is doomed to have a deadly outcome. Therefore, the gods tend to assume a different persona, a human-like nature, to avoid killing the person to whom they manifest themselves. But in this case, Aphrodite does not change at all in her epiphanies.

In the *hypomnesia* or *pars epica*, Sappho does not talk about a single past instance of Aphrodite's appearance that could motivate her intervention also this time, but reports that Aphrodite had already appeared many times. The logical motivation of her urgent appeal with an 'if ever in the past' (αἶ ποτα κατέρωτα, 5) – perhaps once (Hutchinson 2001: 152) – is soon turned into a chain of innumerable cases. The temporal expression 'this time again' repeated three times (δηῦτε, 15, 16, 18) is striking, suggesting a countless and almost ritualistic repetition of similar events (Nagy 1996: 100-1). Aphrodite is reminded that she had heard

(ἔκλυες, 7) time and again Sappho's voice of lament (τὰς ἔμας αὐδᾶς αἰοῖσα, 6), that is, her poetry in performance, urging her to come from afar (πήλοι, 6). She had left Olympus, the house of her father, and harnessed her chariot to come (ἤλθε, 8) over and over again. She is viewed as a young *pais* (cf. 2, 7), just like the maidens in the chorus. As the bride leaves the house of the father, so she must leave it too (λίποισα, 7). In a patriarchal society, the focus is on the father, Zeus, who is still present in an all-female scene. Just like a warrior and charioteer, the *symmachos* in the Homeric tradition, she yokes her chariot (9), which technically allows her to travel and fight. But it is golden and delicate just as Zeus' palace – χρύσιον standing *apo koinou*. Beautiful and swift sparrows (κάλοι δέ . . . ὤκεες στρουθοί, 9-10) swirling fast-beating wings (πύκνα δίννευτες πτέρ', 11), brought her (σ' ἄγον, 9) above the earth from heaven through mid-air (ἀπ' ὠράνω αἶθε - / ρος διὰ μέσσω, 11-12). The word δηῦτε ('this time again') could also indicate the repetition of the annual re-performance of the original ritual at Messon where the goddess is conceptualized as present coming through the cosmic middle realm, διὰ μέσσω (12). Straightaway the birds arrived (αἰψα δ' ἐξίκοντο, 13). It is as if Sappho's poetry, in the sacred time and space at Messon, the intermediate place, could mediate, through her appeal and hymn, between far and near, then and now, cosmos and earth. In holy time, differences are effaced in the abrupt event of epiphany. Suddenness (13) is a very important feature of all epiphanies and their poetic perception (Bohrer 1981; 2015: esp. 53-85). As in a flash of lightning, the divine manifests itself. In that very moment, just as in the fleeting seconds of death or marriage, mortals become god-like and gods and mortals converge (Nagy 2013: 109-38).

Repeatedly in the past, the goddess had suddenly stood in front of her female singer, her alter-ego. Time and again Aphrodite, the holy and blessed 'You', had smiled and asked what the matter was this time, why Sappho called on her and what it was that she wished for in her maddened heart (14-18). Aphrodite is addressed as μάκαιρα, 'blessed one' (13). This qualification excludes the usual reaction of terror to an epiphany. It implies a positive experience after death, a mystery cult, or a life after death (Bierl 2016a: 317n31). In each epiphanic instance that extends to

the actual call now Aphrodite is not frightful, but mild, competent, and friendly. Thus assuming the mood of her traditional epithet *philommeides* (Hom. *Il.* 3.424; *h.Hom.* 5.155), she now smiles with an immortal expression (μειδιαίσαισ' ἀθανάτωι προσώπωι, 14) (cf. *h.Hom.* 10.2-3), beyond human death. *Prosopon* is the face that one looks straight at. The confrontation is direct – one can stand her smile without getting destroyed – and through her smile Aphrodite makes her partner in the dialogue self-confident and happy. Although one would expect the worst from her unfiltered glance, the immortal goddess reacts very much as a human. Nonetheless, Sappho comes close to self-denigration and self-humiliation, annoying the goddess with her repeated calls for help and endless laments. It is no surprise that Aphrodite enquires about the reasons for such invocations each time she visits Sappho, this time too (ἦρε' ὅττι δηῦτε πέπονθα κῶττι / δηῦτε κάλημμι, 15-16), and she will probably do the same in the future. Love is suffering. Therefore πέπονθα (15) is a marked verb that signals this quintessential feeling of *pathos*. The verb κάλημμι ('call', 16) self-referentially highlights the actual speech-act of the *hymnos kletikos* itself, the prayer for Aphrodite's appearance. This repetition embodies the nature of the ritual. But in later receptions it can be understood as referring to a case study of numerous love stories happening in the Sapphic circle. This could be one reason why the Alexandrian philologists already set fr. 1 at the beginning of the collection arranged in nine books. The mention of Sappho's name (Ψάπφ', 20), despite the poem's different intention, was perhaps also read as a sort of *sphragis* that supported this view. Sappho's plea to Aphrodite to become her *symmachos* may also originally refer to Sappho's and thus Aphrodite's support of the maidens in their rite of passage to become mature women. Or it may imply both Sappho's and Aphrodite's involvement in stimulating the maidens' aesthetic sensibility in choral activity and making them win the beauty contest, the *kallisteia*, once they will be women in the future. But Sappho's prayer to Aphrodite to become an ally could also be understood with regard to many actual love affairs.

Sappho speaks about the lovelorn *mania* that sickens the heart (μαινόλαι θύμωι, 18) that craves for relieve. This erotic fren-

zy dangerously aligns the poetic ‘I’ with a maenad in the sphere of Dionysus (Nagy 2007: 256-8). In respect to wild suffering, lust, and ecstasy for the desired object that cannot be reached, within a discursive context where love rests upon absence, Aphrodite and Dionysus go together. Aphrodite insinuates that she could close the gap that separates Sappho from a beloved girl. Sappho’s radical desire for fulfilment tears her heart apart with *pathos*, suffering.

This situation resembles much the first part of the recently found Cypris Song (1-6):⁶

πῶς κε δὴ τις οὐ θαμέως ἄσαιτο,
 Κύπρι, δέσποιν’, ὅττινά [δ]ὴ φίλ[ησι,
 [κωὺ] θέλοῖ μάλιστα πάθαι· χάλ[ατται;
 [ταῖς] ὀνέχῃσθαι;
 [κὺν] κάλοισί μ’ ἀλεμάτωσ δαίτδ[ησ
 [ἰμέ]ρω(ι) λύ(ι)καντι γόν’ ὦμε-[x
 ...

[How could someone not be hurt over and over again,
 Mistress Kypris, by anybody, whomever one really loves,
 and not, above all, want release from the passions
 that you sustain?

With shakes you pointlessly [brutally] tear me apart
 through desire that loosens my knees? . . .]

In a rhetorical question Sappho laments love’s corollary, and reproaches Cypris for her cruelty. Her bodily affliction is expressed in the strongest terms: the speaking ‘I’ feels like a Trojan hero hit, transfixed, and pierced on the battlefield, her flesh torn apart. In her suffering, Sappho prays for relief.⁷ The typical attribute of love and its personification, Eros, is λυσιμελής, ‘loosening the limbs’. Aphrodite’s presence with respect to the beloved person seems to trigger extreme agony and *pathos* (see πάθαι, 3 and πάθην, 10). ἄσαιτο in line 1 recalls μή μ’ ἄσαισι μηδ’ ὀνίαισι δάμνα, πότνια θῦμον, fr. 1.3-4.

6 The Greek texts follows the recent reading by Lardinois 2018 (my translation), which is rather close to Bierl 2016b.

7 This passage reproduces almost verbatim Bierl 2016b: 343.

In another article (Bierl 2016b) I argued that Sappho stylizes herself as Aphrodite's heroine attaining immortality through heroic death,⁸ which entails the Homeric 'unwithering fame' (κλέος ἄφθιτον). In a notional death of love, that is, of a death that does not actually happen, the images of the epic hero and Sappho merge through the performance of *kleos* and love.⁹ Manic passion and the feeling of being overpowered are responsible for the production of a poetic song in compensation for suffering, and aimed at Sappho's survival through poetic fame. While in the Cypris Song the lyrical 'I' becomes self-aware of the conditions that love entails (ἔγω δ' ἐμ' αὐταί / τοῦτο κύνοιδα, 'this I know for myself', 11-12) and communalizes the experience of suffering for the group, her strategy in fr. 1 is to express closeness to the goddess in a hymn that integrates a narrated epiphany. In the Cypris Song, god-likeness is achieved by appropriating the model of the heroic death of the warrior; in fr. 1 the same effect is achieved by appropriating the model of the god's epiphany and then gliding into the discourse of heroic war (cf. Nagy 2013: 109-45).

To come back to fr. 1, with the question in line 18b the narrative abruptly shifts into direct speech not framed by introductory and concluding formulas (18b-24); the 'I' and the 'You' switch places so that in her song Sappho takes on Aphrodite's persona. During the performance, the poetic persona, or Sappho, even as an idealized and generalized persona as 'sister' for any re-performance, becomes Aphrodite. Through dramatic mimesis Sappho re-enacts the goddess, moving like her as well as assuming Aphrodite's own voice and uttering her own words: "Whom am I to persuade this time to lead you back to her love?" (τίνα δηῖτε πείθω / ..σάγην ἐς σὰν φιλότατα; 18-19). Aphrodite has the power to make unreciprocated love happy through speech: it is her rhetoric, her entire charming appearance, in short, her *peitho* that can persuade one to return somebody's love. Peitho is a divine female fellow figure in the entourage of Aphrodite, and since Sappho enacts Aphrodite as Peitho during the performance of these words,

8 On the feeling and wish of death due to overwhelming passion and suffering caused by love, see Sappho frs 31.15-16, 94.1, 95.11-12.

9 See Nagy 2013: 55-69.

she is Aphrodite-Peitho. This is especially due to Sappho's rhetoric (Thomas 1999). And each chorus leader, the outstanding "*prima donna*" or "*diva*" (Nagy 2013: 125) who outshines the rest of her choral group, can also become Cypris-Peitho in an ongoing chain of new performances of Sappho's own poem. Mimesis and performance, therefore, have the effect of mediating between man and god. Thus, Sappho becomes god-like and becomes one with her divine model in a theatrical act (Nagy 1996: 87-103; 2013: 123-9). By doing so also the girls in the chorus or in the audience of the circle assume some of the charm, brilliance, and inner beauty, of their model. Having this capacity, one can magically manipulate anybody in the game of love. Then, the goddess, impersonated by Sappho, who is now playing both roles, asks her: "Who wrongs you, Sappho?" (τίς σ', ὦ / Ψάπφ', ἀδίκησι, 19-20). Sappho-as-Aphrodite thus ironically addresses herself by her own name, and in so doing she becomes a very close partner in her dialogue with the almighty goddess. While Sappho had called Aphrodite a tricking goddess (2), Aphrodite addresses her in intimate tones. But the main trickery of the poem consists in Sappho's sophisticated use of narration qua mimesis. Closely following her model, Sappho becomes a poetic 'weaver of wiles' (2). The magical lines (Petropoulos 1993) of the sixth strophe – "if she runs away soon she will pursue . . ." (21-4) – reverse all wrongdoing as well as the hierarchical role of lover and beloved. It culminates in the sentence that "if she does not love, soon she shall love even against her will" (trans. by Campbell in Sappho 1982) (αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει / κωὺκ ἐθέλοισα, 24). In performing the enchanting lines composed by "Sappho the sorceress" (Petropoulos 1993), but put in the mouth of Aphrodite, Sappho, suffering from love, gets respite from it. Emotional devastation cedes to both self-confidence and strength. Love involves a power struggle, almost a fight for life just like the Trojan war for the Homeric heroes. Someone does an injustice (ἀδίκησι, 20), but things may be repaired and vengeance plotted. The girl who now refuses to love her will desperately be in love with her, and at first she will not be loved in return. Only in the end will perhaps love become a mutual affection between two more or less equal female lovers.

By telling a story that happens time and again, and mimet-

ically playing the part of Aphrodite, Sappho becomes equal to the goddess and takes relief through her own enchanting words. Divine speech possesses great power and authority. In this case, the words are invented and performed by Sappho, herself a woman of craftiness, artfulness, and poetic stratagems. The trick she devises to overcome her own pain consists in projecting herself into her sacred idol. She explains how she has met her particularly close goddess. The relationship assumes a very personal note as Sappho designs her own, very personal image of Aphrodite. While epiphanies usually tend to be deadly, threatening, and frightful, Sappho moulds the repeated direct encounters with Aphrodite into highly personalized and artful scenes endowed with a 'miniature-like quality'. Whereas in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* the goddess as a superhuman, large divine figure reaches the roof of the house in her famous epiphany in front of Anchises (*h.Hom.* 5.170-5), in this Sapphic song she is downsized to miniature measures when she repeatedly manifests herself. The chariot (9) is drawn not by mighty horses, but, surprisingly, by erotic sparrows (10) (Erbse 1997; Hutchinson 2001: 153-4). The goddess sitting on such a chariot is almost reduced to her voice only. Her figure is pure magic, suggesting a refined aesthetics of delicacy, *abrosyna*.¹⁰ While the *pars epica* usually relates a previous incident of help to incite the god to come again, in this case by adjusting the chain of precedents to the actual situation it becomes something completely new: a series of innumerable intimate conversations, reported utterances of the goddess invented and enacted by Sappho. Thus, the mimetic report about numerous instances of performed dialogues that promised reversal and relief becomes a self-assuring monologue. By speaking in Aphrodite's voice, Sappho impersonates this sophisticated female figure, while the goddess in her theatrical role performs her words in direct speech. In reciting those magical lines, Sappho becomes confident to possess this transcendental power herself as she appropriates the enchanting quality of the goddess.

10 See Sappho fr. 58.23-6; on ἄβροος, see Sappho frs 2.14 (Aphrodite), 128 (Charites), 44.7 (Andromache as bride), 140.1 (Adonis), 100 (cloth). See also Kurke 1992: 93-9 and Ferrari 2010: 66-71.

After this rearranged *hypomnesia*, Sappho moves on to a more traditional third part, the genuine prayer or appeal to the goddess (25-8). Aphrodite should come also now to deliver her from her anxieties and fulfil all that her heart desires (ὄσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι / θυμός ἰμέρρει, τέλεσον, 26-7). The double use of *telein* conveys a very general attitude towards accomplishment, but it also gives the phrase an almost mystic colouring, as this verb connotes the performance as a sacred rite. It communicates *telos*, a goal or a concrete object of desire in abstract terms. Like *telete*, it even serves as the *terminus technicus* for ritual, a service due to the gods; here it could imply erotic fulfilment, almost a *contradictio in adiecto*. But it also means the final point of a *rite de passage*, the marriage condensed in the wedding rite that Sappho probably wishes for her maidens. Due to her excessive desire, her heart has been torn apart and subjugated. Now the poetic 'I' formulates a prayer that Aphrodite should grant to her, Sappho (μοι, 26), everything her heart longs for. In performing this speech-act, Sappho seems to reach her goal. We remember that the prayer had already been uttered very early in the first part of the song; her present call on her to manifest herself (ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, 'come to me also now', 25) takes up the short appeal ἀλλὰ τυῖδ' ἔλθ' ('come hither') in line 5. Her negative order not to overwhelm her heart with anguishes, however, does not need to be repeated, since Sappho has gained confidence through her song and theatrical trick. Thus, she puts her request in positive terms, asking to be released from these oppressive troubles (χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον / ἐκ μερίμνων, 25-6). Encouraged by the power of her magic speech-acts, Sappho eventually gains the upper hand over her beloved girl and Aphrodite. Love and war imply justice, the right balance, flight and pursuit (21), a material gift-exchange in taking and giving (22), just as a person who has done wrong to someone 'gives justice', *dike* (20) – in Greek δίκην δίδωμι – to someone who takes revenge for this. Receiving gifts of love or being rejected is a matter of honour. The reversal from heavy depression to deliverance from distress looks very close. The imperative λῦσον ('release', 25) resumes the Dionysian dimension of the *mania* (12) from which Dionysus as Lysios can successfully deliver people. The change of ἄσσαι and ὀνίαι ('pain and sorrow', 3) into the general and neu-

tral *μερίμναι* ('troubles', 26), suggests a more general idea of anxiety, trouble or concern. Her actual sense of subjugation gives way to psychological problems difficult to bear, but easy to forget. By singing and performing in Aphrodite's role, Sappho has brought about a change in the hierarchical constellation of love. Finally, she prays that the goddess herself (*αὐτᾶ*, 27) should become a *symmachos*, a fellow-fighter (28). This is a very strong and unusual expression of self-assertion. As an ally, Aphrodite is set at an equal level, while Sappho now seems to be in the lead. She is the warrior while Aphrodite is the charioteer, just like Achilles who is accompanied by his companion Patroclus (Krischer 1992). Therefore, Cypris is described as arriving on a golden chariot, seated (9-10). Love is war with different means, the lover-warrior metaphor is ubiquitous. Sappho uses this metaphorical overlap to compete at an intertextual level with the Homeric tradition (Rissman 1983). As a real Trojan fighter, Aphrodite is rather weak and almost hilarious in *Iliad* 5 (Winkler 1996: 92-6). Hit on the hand, she must retreat. Reshaping the Homeric Aphrodite, Sappho casts the goddess as a more efficient fighter metaphorically. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, perhaps composed around the same time or shortly before Sappho's poems – the myth might have circulated long before –, the goddess stands entirely above the love affairs between men and gods before she too experiences that quintessential passion, herself falling in love with Anchises. As the embodiment of love, she, as Sappho's ally, should therefore fight against herself. But we know that nobody, not even Aphrodite, can defeat the terrible pain of love when one falls prey to it. Obviously, the battle does not aim at a total defeat but at a reversal of the emotional relation, and, perhaps, at reciprocal union. In order to reach this goal, it is vital to deploy *doloi*, frauds, and stratagems. Aphrodite is notorious for them. Sappho, as her alter-ego, has found the right device to cope with a situation of crisis through poetry and rhetoric (Thomas 1999).

The multifarious variations on the passion of love make fr. 1 a very apt song for the beginning of a collection in which love is the common thread. Sappho and Aphrodite as a sacred pair of *symmachoi* find poetic strategies to deal with love and to communalize the feelings for the purpose of *paideia* in the Sapphic circle. Thus, after

all fr. 1 is not about a real event and a real girl, but is a fictional construct endowed with a metaphorical content that uses cultic and religious language as vehicle. This is corroborated by the fact that the numerous epiphanies of her idol, with whom Sappho speaks about her own erotic sufferings on an equal footing, are condensed into one instance of a dialogue with the divine (Burnett 1983: 253). Yet, its tenor has less to do with politics, as Stehle (1997: 298) believes, than with the art of composing poetry itself and Sappho's self-assertion as a poetess qua lover in a context involving Aphrodite, aesthetic education, and a chorus of maidens with whom Sappho as *choragos* can fall in love. Initially, and primarily, the composition of the song is anchored in the *hic et nunc* of the Sapphic circle or even in ritual festivals, but it possesses the potential for detachment from the occasion and for ever new performances over time. Therefore, its metapoetic quality does not depend on a new textual dimension of Sapphic poetry (Stehle 1997: 262-318, esp. 288-311), compared to other early lyric songs, but is inherent in the intrinsically performative nature of its origin.

2. *Symmachos* in Greek Tragedy

It is striking that the constellation of gods and men as fellow-fighters occur more often in tragedy. In most cases, it is just a military alliance, but especially in Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* we also find a metaphorical treatment of this topic derived from the original context of divine help in the sense of an intense collaboration.

A rather close parallel to Sappho's use of the term *symmachos* can be found at the beginning of *Choephoroi*. Orestes is at the tomb of Agamemnon and would like to resuscitate the body of the murdered king as Erinys to take revenge on Clytemnestra. Therefore, he addresses the chthonian Hermes for direct help:

Ἑρμῆ χθόνιε, πατρῶι' ἐποπτεύων κράτη,	1
σωτήρ γενοῦ μοι σύμμαχος τ' αἰτουμένωι·	
ἦκω γὰρ ἐς γῆν τήνδε καὶ κατέρχομαι	
... (3, bis)	
τύμβου δ' ἐπ' ὄχθωι τῶιδε κηρύσσω πατρι	5
κλύειν, ἀκοῦσαι·	

[Hermes of the nether world, you who guard the powers 1
 that are your father's,
 prove yourself my saviour and ally, I entreat you
 now that I have come to this land and returned from exile.

...

On this mounded grave I cry out to my father
 to hearken, to hear me. (Trans. Smyth in Aeschylus 1926)] 5

Orestes calls on the chthonian Hermes as *psychopompos* and guard of the threshold between the lower and the upper worlds to become his saviour and fellow-fighter in order to bring back Agamemnon as a terrible force to requite murder with murder (Lloyd-Jones 1979: 132 *ad* 2). It is a paradoxical relationship involving a double *symmachia*, one with the god, who is responsible for releasing the dead king from Hades, and one with the dead king, openly invoked to become his *symmachos*. But at first Orestes does not seem to be aware of it, since he only wants to have contact with the dead father for whom the divine revenge must be performed. Moreover, he appeals to Hermes as *patros* for help, since he is interested in the well-being and success of the house of Atreus. Later on, as he realizes that the chorus of girls is carrying *meiligmata* for the chthonian gods and his father, he prays that Zeus becomes his 'willing *symmachos*' (γενού δὲ σύμμαχος θέλων ἐμοί, Aesch. *Ch.* 19) in his revenge plot. He shifts from the chthonian Hermes to the Olympian Zeus, who should finally be responsible for divine *dike* and punishment, since some strange ritual of appeasement of the nether powers, to prevent the chthonian gods from striking back, seems to be taking place through libations. As the highest principle of justice, Zeus should be a fellow-fighter stepping in to give Orestes justice. After the recognition scene with Electra at the end of the ensuing *kommos* that aims at arousing Agamemnon from the dead as a military helper of the rather weak and young siblings, Orestes calls on his father "to send either *dike* as *symmachos* to them as dear ones" (ἦτοι Δίκην ἴαλλε σύμμαχον φίλοις) or to "grant [them] in turn to get a similar grip on [his murderers], if indeed after defeat [he] would in turn win victory" (trans. Smyth in Aeschylus 1926) (ἦ τὰς ὁμοίας ἀντίδος λαβὰς λαβεῖν / εἴπερ κρατηθεῖς γ' ἀντινικῆσαι θέλεις, 497-9).

There is no possible alternative since *dike* in the *Oresteia* often means just revenge. At this point, Agamemnon is very clearly imagined as a fellow-fighter, as a king representing Zeus, the highest *symmachos*, who like a wrestler takes a grip on Clytemnestra and Aegisthus to seize and kill them. The conditional sentence is almost ironical: although now dead, defeated and murdered by his wife, his 'resurrected body' will turn him into a real *symmachos*, soon to become victorious in a counter-offensive. In *Eumenides* (289-91, 669-73, 762-4) we then encounter the real *symmachia* in the making between Athens, Athena's city par excellence, and Argos. Thus, Orestes presents a charter-myth for corroborating the existing military alliance of Athens, the city of the actual performance, with Argos against Sparta.

Preferably, the goddess best suited to a *symmachia*-relation with human beings is Justice (*Dike*). In Aeschylus' *Suppliants* (342-3), King Pelasgus rightly regards the chorus' request to give them asylum in Argos against their pursuing cousins as a possible reason for war. The maidens reply that Justice protects her allies (ἀλλ' ἡ Δίκη γε συμμαχῶν ὑπερστατεῖ, Aesch. *Suppl.* 343). Later the chorus utter an appeal to the King "to take Justice as his ally and render judgment for the cause deemed righteous by the gods" (395-6; trans. Smyth in Aeschylus 1926). He will comply with their ritual supplication, but despite the just case, by defending the Danaids he will fall in the battle against the assailants, the sons of Aegyptus. In Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannos* (273-5), Oedipus also appropriates Justice as his personal ally. In that situation of crisis, the political leader, who in the past had saved the city of Thebes, prays that "to all you, the loyal Cadmeans who are satisfied by these things" (trans. Jebb in Sophocles 1887) – i.e. his measures against the threatening plague about which he sent Creon to Delphi to interrogate Apollo – "may justice, our ally, and all the gods be gracious always" (ὑμῖν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοισι Καδμείοις, ὅσοις / τάδ' ἔστ' ἀρέσκονθ', ἢ τε σύμμαχος Δίκη / χοῖ πάντες εὖ ξυνεῖεν εἰσαεῖ θεοί). As we know, Oedipus initially seems to be a very positive ruler, pursuing justice and striving for the well-being of his people, but he will turn out to be the murderer and the cause of the defilement announced by the Delphic oracle. In the end, Justice will stand by the people against their ruler and the

royal household. Only some lines earlier had Oedipus reversed the order of a *symmachos*-relation between gods and men by boasting that he would prove to be the fellow-fighter of the god, Apollo, as well as of the dead man Laius through his providential measures (ἐγὼ μὲν οὔν τοιόσδε τῷ τε δαίμονι τῷ τ' ἀνδρὶ τῷ θανόντι σύμμαχος πέλω, Soph. *OT* 244-5). This amounts to hubris and arrogance in respect to the god (against Finglass 2018: 251 *ad* 244-5). Apparently, his statement already unveils one of Oedipus' many negative features in the first part of the play, anticipating his downfall. Moreover, it comes close to tragic irony that Oedipus as *miasma* is certain to have Apollo on his side, not even praying for the god's help, while the putative divine ally does everything to entangle him in the net of catastrophe.

Another rather close parallel for such a *symmachos*-relation between men and gods can be found at the beginning of Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*. In terrible fear of the attackers, Polynices and his Argive allies, the desperate maidens of the chorus crouch in front of the statues in a gesture of supplication, almost to force the gods to become allies in the defence of the city (Aesch. *Sept.* 130-4, 145-50, 214-15, 255). In his rational view as well as fierce and aggressive criticism against this ritual and excessive behaviour, that, according to him, threatens the military discipline of the soldiers, Eteocles would rather like the gods to be not metaphorical but actual allies in the upcoming battle (*Sept.* 266).¹¹ This would equal to making the gods subject to the polis and human concerns. He wishes them to literally form the phalanx and reinforce the defence line, the wall, the towers, and the gates that give shelter to the people inside the city. Just like Oedipus' problematic attitude towards the gods, also his son Eteocles pursues a hubristic and impious design. His behaviour is especially questionable, since both brothers, focused on quarrels over who should be the legitimate ruler of Thebes, have been doomed to death by their father

¹¹ On the sharp discrepancies between the king and the Chorus showing a deep divide in matters of religion and religious practices and ceremonies, see Brown 1977 against Hutchinson 1985: 73; for a broader discussion see Torrance 2007: 51-3 and Bierl 2019.

Oedipus.¹²

Conclusion

Yet, at least to some extent, Eteocles' wish parallels Sappho's example. As a matter of fact, the gods should be allies in both war and love affairs. However, Sappho merges with Aphrodite, since, in a bond of piety, Sappho is particularly linked to this single goddess who stands emblematically for *eros* and thus the female singer's absolute idol in matters of love. On the contrary, Eteocles – just like his questionable father Oedipus – would like to exploit the Olympian city gods for his own political and military agenda driven by an ideology that sets the concerns of the polis above anything else, even the gods. Through linguistic strategies and theatrical mimesis Sappho reasserts her strength after total self-humiliation. With Aphrodite, standing on her side, she now manages to become a master of love, magically reversing erotic hierarchies and relations. Suffering and despair cede to sovereignty and female empowerment. Sappho needs this self-assertion in order to manage the erotic affairs in her circle, which stands under the auspices of Aphrodite. Through her speech acts and by mimetically re-enacting Aphrodite, she, as it were, becomes Aphrodite, accomplishing the ultimate goal of all her pedagogical activity as chorus leader in her circle of maidens. And by doing so she may more effectively prompt the girls to pursue beauty. All this is theatre *in nuce*, theatricality in a completely different context from that of tragedy. Whereas the involvement in a dramatic role and plot can make it necessary to deploy the *symmachos*-metaphor in connection with a specific god in a situation of crisis, in Sappho that metaphor seems to be the occasion of the song itself. As we have seen, Sappho performs songs with the intent of aesthetically educating the young maidens in an all-encompassing and multimodal manner. Moreover, they are assembled in a female chorus with whose individual members Sappho as *choragos* is linked through erotic relations. Thus, Aphrodite is the ideal *symmachos* for any performance in this specific cultural con-

¹² On this play in greater detail, see Bierl 2018.

text. Therefore, fr. 1 is not so much a single story about one girl as one single instance of unreciprocated love, an emotional cry for help. But Sappho sings about an endless chain of very personal visits that culminate in her last very intimate meeting with Aphrodite, when the goddess becomes her real ally, that is, her poetic inspiration and the essence of a performance deeply reflecting an erotic aesthetics in its atmosphere, setting, form, and content. Re-enacting this divine fellow-fighter in the very performance, the song makes Sappho merge with Aphrodite. Thus, in any performance Sappho becomes Aphrodite as the perfect singer full of poetic and erotic enchantment.¹³

Works Cited

- Aeschylus (1926), *Aeschylus*. With an English Translation by Herbert Weir Smyth, 2 vols, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Baltrusch, Ernst (1994), *Symmachie und Spondai. Untersuchungen zum griechischen Völkerrecht der archaischen und klassischen Zeit (8.-5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Barthes, Roland (1979), *A Lover's Discourse. Fragments*, trans. by Richard Howard, London: Hill and Wang.
- Bierl, Anton (2003), "'Ich aber (sage), das Schönste ist, was einer liebt!' Eine pragmatische Deutung von Sappho Fr. 16 LP/V", *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 103: 91-124; see also the revised version under <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/42?menuId=223>.
- (2006), "Räume im Anderen und der griechische Liebesroman des Xenophon von Ephesos. Träume?", in Antonio Loprieno (ed.), *Mensch und Raum von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich and Leipzig: Saur, 71-103.
- (2016a), "'All you Need is Love': Some Thoughts on the Structure, Texture, and Meaning of the Brothers Song as well as on Its Relation to the Kypris Song (P. Sapph. Obbink)", in Bierl and Lardinois 2016: 302-36.
- (2016b), "Sappho as Aphrodite's Singer, Poet, and Hero(ine): The

¹³ I can only end by greeting Guido Avezzù, a good colleague, a great friend, and *choragos* in Verona over many years, with whom I am connected by close ties via drama, theatre, *Thespiis*, and *Skenè*: be our fellow-fighter and continue doing so also in the future!

- Reconstruction of Context and Sense of the Kypris Song”, in Bierl and Lardinois 2016: 339-52.
- (2016c), “Visualizing the Cologne Sappho: Mental Imagery Through Chorality, the Sun, and Orpheus”, in Vanessa Cazzato and André Lardinois (eds), *The Look of Lyric. Greek Song and the Visual*, Leiden: Brill: 307-42; open access: <http://www.brill.com/products/book/look-lyric-greek-song-and-visual> (Accessed 30 July 2018).
 - (2018), “The *mise en scène* of Kingship and Power in Aeschylus’ *Seven against Thebes*: Ritual Performativity or Goos, Cledonomanicy and Catharsis”, *Skenè* 4 (2): 19-54.
- Bierl, Anton and André Lardinois (eds) (2016), *The Newest Sappho (P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105, Frs. 1-4)*, Leiden: Brill; open access online: <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/books/9789004314832> (Accessed 30 July 2018).
- Bohrer, Karl Heinz (1981), *Plötzlichkeit. Zum Augenblick des ästhetischen Scheins*, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- (2015), *Das Erscheinen des Dionysos. Antike Mythologie und moderne Metapher*, Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Bowra, Cecil M. (1936) *Greek Lyric Poetry. From Alcman to Simonides*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- (1961, 2nd rev. ed.), *Greek Lyric Poetry. From Alcman to Simonides*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Breitenberger, Barbara (2007), *Aphrodite and Eros. The Development of Greek Erotic Mythology*, New York and London: Routledge.
- Brown, A.L. (1977), “Eteocles and the Chorus in the *Seven against Thebes*”, *Phoenix* 31: 300-18.
- Burkert, Walter (1985), *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, trans. by John Raffan, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burnett, Anne Pippin (1983), *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London: Duckworth.
- Calame, Claude (1977), *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols, Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo and Bizzarri.
- Erbse, Hartmut (1997), “Sapphos Sperlinge”, *Hermes* 125: 232-4.
- Ferrari, Franco (2010), *Sappho’s Gift. The Poet and Her Community*, trans. by Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Lucia Prauscello, Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.
- Finglass, Patrick J. (2018), *Sophocles. Oedipus the King*. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Furley, William D. and Jan Maarten Bremer (eds) (2001), *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols,

- Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hutchinson, Gregory O. (1985), *Aeschylus. Septem contra Thebas*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford: Clarendon.
- (2001), *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces: Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krischer, Tilman (1968), “Sapphos Ode an Aprodite”, *Hermes* 96: 1-14.
- (1992), “Patroklos, der Wagenlenker Achills”, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 135: 97-103.
- Kurke, Leslie (1992), “The Politics of ἀβροσύνη in Archaic Greece”, *Classical Antiquity* 11: 91-120.
- Lardinois, André (2018), “Sufferings which Aphrodite Sustains: A New Reconstruction of the First Strophe of Sappho’s Kypris Poem”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 205: 1-5.
- Lasserre, François (1989), *Sappho. Une autre lecture*, Padova: Editrice Antenore.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh (1979), *Aeschylus. The Oresteia*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nagy, Gregory (1996), *Poetry as Performance. Homer and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_Nagy.Poetry_as_Performance.1996 (Accessed 30 July 2018).
- (2007), “Did Sappho and Alcaeus Ever Meet? Symmetries of Myth and Ritual in Performing the Songs of Ancient Lesbos”, in Anton Bierl, Rebecca Lämmle, and Katharina Wesselmann (eds), *Literatur und Religion. Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen*, vol. 1, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 211-69.
- (2013), *The Ancient Greek Hero in 24 Hours*, Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_NagyG.The_Ancient_Greek_Hero_in_24_Hours.2013 (Accessed 30 July 2018).
- Page, Denys (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Petropoulos, John C. B. (1993), “Sappho the Sorceress – Another Look at Fr. 1 (LP)”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97: 43-56.
- Privitera, G. Aurelio (1974), *La rete di Afrodite. Studi su Saffo*, Palermo: Aracne.
- Rissman, Leah (1983), *Love as War. Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho*, Königstein: Hain.
- Ritoók, Zsigmond (1995), “Tradition and Innovation in Sappho’s Ode to Aphrodite”, in Giovanni Tarditi, Luigi Belloni, Guido Milanese, and Antonietta Porro (eds), *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*,

- vol. 1, Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Sappho (1982), *Greek Lyric*, vol. 1, *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Edited and translated by David A. Campbell, Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Sappho (2014), *Sappho. A New Translation of the Complete Works*. Translated by Diane J. Rayor, Introduction and Notes by André P.M.H. Lardinois, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge, University Press.
- Schadewaldt, Wolfgang (1950), *Sappho. Welt und Dichtung, Dasein in der Liebe*, Potsdam: Stichtnote.
- (1989), *Die frühgriechische Lyrik. Tübinger Vorlesungen*, vol. 3, ed. by Ingeborg Schudoma in collaboration with Maria Schadewaldt, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Scheid, John and Jesper Svenbro (1996), *The Craft of Zeus. Myths of Weaving and Fabric*, trans. by Carol Volk, Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Schlesier, Renate (2011), “Aphrodite reflétée. À propos du fragment 1 (LP/V) de Sappho”, in Francesca Prescendi and Youri Volokhine (eds), *Dans le laboratoire de l'historien des religions. Mélanges offerts à Philippe Borgeaud*, Geneva: Labor et Fides, 416-29.
- Sophocles (1887), *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Richard Jebb, Richard, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stehle, Eva (1997), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece. Nondramatic Poetry in Its Setting*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Svenbro, Jesper (1975), “Sappho and Diomedes”, *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 1: 37-49.
- Thomas, Bridget M. (1999), “The Rhetoric of Prayer in Sappho’s *Hymn to Aphrodite*”, *Helios* 26 (1): 3-10.
- Torrance, Isabelle (2007), *Aeschylus. Seven Against Thebes*, London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Tsomis, Georgios (2001), *Zusammenschau der frühgriechischen monodischen Melik (Alkaios, Sappho, Anakreon)*, Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Tzamali, Ekaterini (1996), *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho*, Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre (1980), *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, trans. by Janet Lloyd, Brighton and Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Winkler, Jack (1996), “Gardens of Nymphs: Public and Private in Sappho’s Lyrics”, in Ellen Greene (ed.), *Reading Sappho. Contemporary Approaches*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 89-109.
- Yatromanolakis, Dimitrios (2007), *Sappho in the Making. The Early Reception*, Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

La casa dei belli (Asclepiade AP 5.153)

WALTER LAPINI

Abstract

This article discusses the epigram 3 Gow-Page of Asclepiades (AP 5.153 = 3 Sens). In contrast to the current interpretation, the author asserts that the verb *μαραίνειν* in line 3 means “to obscure” in the sense of “surpassing in beauty”. Asclepiades admires the beauty of Nicarete, but then sees the youthful Cleophon, and expresses his preference for him.

Asclepiade AP 5.153 = 3 GP = 3 Sens:

Νικαρέτης τὸ πόθοισι βεβλημένον ἦδὺ πρόσωπον,
 πυκνὰ δι' ὑψηλῶν φαινόμενον θυρίδων,
 αἱ χαροπαὶ Κλεοφῶντος ἐπὶ προθύροις ἐμάραναν,
 Κύπρι φίλη, γλυκεροῦ βλέμματος ἀστεροπαί.

[Il dolce viso di Nicarete, oggetto di desiderio,
 scòrto tante volte da dietro le finestre del piano di sopra,
 lo fecero avvizzire (?) le saette fulgide del dolce sguardo,
 o Cipride, di Cleofonte che stava davanti all'entrata.]¹

Il tema dell'epigramma sembra quello del 'lamento presso la porta chiusa' (il *paraklausithyron*): da dietro le sue alte finestre (θυρίδες), la bella Nicarete ha fatto innamorare Cleofonte, che si apposta presso la casa di lei o vi conduce un *komos*.² Ma la ragazza per qualche

¹ Ringrazio Francesca Gazzano per la lettura attenta e intelligente che ha dato di queste pagine, la cui responsabilità (non si sfugge al *topos*) è solo mia. Come mia è la traduzione. Per i dubbi sulla resa di *μαραίνειν* si veda sotto. Testualmente discusse le lezioni *πόθοισι βεβλημένον* del v. 1, *ὑψηλῶν* del v. 2 ed *ἐπὶ προθύροις ἐμάραναν* del v. 3 (a cui alcuni preferiscono *ἐπὶ προθύροισι μάραναν* di Kaibel). Si vedano Guichard e Sens *ad l.*, e inoltre Ludwig 1966: 22-3; Arnott 1969: 8; Tammaro 2012.

² Cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 132; Cairns 1998: 185. I confini fra tema del *komos* e tema del *paraklausithyron* sono labili, ma esistono. Comunque entrambi sono ambientati di notte, e di notte lo sfavillare dei volti e degli occhi non si coglie,

ragione si sottrae, cosicché a Cleofonte non resta che struggersi inconsolabilmente davanti all'entrata (πρόθυρα),³ il posto degli spasmanti delusi. Questo è quanto uno si aspetta di trovare leggendo il primo distico. Poi però ai vv. 3-4 si scopre che la situazione è più complessa: Cleofonte non è l'innamorato, ma l'innamoratore. La persona che si strugge non è lui, ma lei. È lei che appassisce e si sciupa sotto gli sguardi cocenti del giovane. La chiave di tutto è ἐμάραναν, che è stato via via tradotto e/o parafrasato con 'flétrir' (Waltz 1928: 73), 'devastate' (Cameron 1995: 498), 'drain' (Gutzwiller 1998: 132), 'wither' (Gutzwiller 2007: 318), 'dim' (Sens 2011: 12; Tueller 2014: 303), 'consumare' (Gualtieri 1973: 156; Paduano 1989: 131), 'marchitar' (Guichard 2004: 55), 'far sfiorire' (Conca-Marzi-Zanetto 2005: 281) eccetera, e su cui mette conto riportare qui di séguito alcune 'schede', scelte fra le più vecchie e le più nuove:

Ἐμάραναν. Dicere videtur, jam pueri illius desiderio puellam pallescere et consumi. (Jacobs 1794 = 1871: 144)

Μαραίνω indica la decomposición de flores y frutas; en el epigrama se aplica a menudo de la belleza. El verbo introduce otro oxímoron del texto: paradójicamente, los rajos marchitan. (Guichard 2004: 161)

Although the verb [μαραίνειν] sometimes appears in the generic metaphorical sense 'wither, diminish' . . . its primary association with light and fire makes ἐμάραναν . . . ἀστεροπαί an artful paradox, and the application of the verb to Nicarete's face especially appropriate: while her countenance once had its own erotic gleam, now it has no longer. . . . Cleophon occupies the physical position normally occupied by the excluded lovers. But here he is the inspirer rather than the victim. (Sens 2011: 13)

Ἐμάραναν è il termine chiave che ci consente di comprendere correttamente la situazione che Asclepiade ci prospetta. Il verbo, atteso sin dall'inizio, non compare prima della fine del secondo esa-

fa notare Di Marco 2013: 36.

3 Non πρόθυροι (inesistente) come scrive Sens 2011: 18.

metro ed è studiatamente collocato in posizione intermedia tra αἰ χάροπαί e ἄστεροπαί, cioè tra parti del discorso che dovrebbero saldarsi in un'unica *iunctura* e invece appaiono dislocate, con una *Sperrung* davvero eccezionale, rispettivamente all'inizio e in chiusura del distico. Un così ricercato *ordo verborum* è, con ogni evidenza, funzionale alla *palintonos harmonia* che sembra improntare di sé l'intero componimento. . . . In riferimento a persone o a parti del corpo e soprattutto in contesti erotici, il verbo [sc. μαράνειν] risulta impiegato per indicare . . . un processo di 'prosciugamento' o 'disseccamento' che presuppone l'assimilazione della bellezza muliebre o del *pais* a un virgulto o a un fiore: un processo che ci viene presentato talora come fisiologicamente legato all'avanzare dell'età, altre volte invece – il nostro epigramma ne è un esempio – come precocemente determinato da gravi sofferenze d'amore. Proprio ἐμάραναν ci dice che gli sfolgoranti sguardi di Cleofonte, pur ricercati da Nicarete, hanno fatto avvizzire il suo dolce volto. Il piacere che da quegli sguardi la fanciulla trae è un piacere effimero: svanito il quale, resta unicamente il logorio del tormento. Il suo viso, prima carico di dolcezza, appare – così suggerisce il poeta – come un fiore appassito, a causa della passione: una passione che gli sguardi di Cleofonte riescono solo ad attizzare, senza che Nicarete abbia alcuna possibilità di estinguere l'ardore del desiderio che sente crescere in sé. (Di Marco 2013: 34-5)

Potrei continuare, ma sarebbe inutile, perché su questo “reversal of expectations”, come lo chiama Sens, la critica è concorde; e concorde, direi, in una misura insolita nel caso di testi poetici così elaborati, allusivi, densi. L'interpretazione corrente lascia comunque inspiegate molte cose:

(1) se il viso di Nicarete è avvizzito (μαράνθέν), esso evidentemente non potrà essere tuttora oggetto di desideri (πόθοισι βεβλημένον), a meno che i desideri non siano (però il testo non lo dice) quelli di Cleofonte, il quale, da innamorato, ha tutto il diritto di trovare desiderabile anche colei che non è più tale, o che lo è meno di prima.⁴

4 Intendo πόθοισι βεβλημένον 'oggetto dei *pothoi*, oggetto di amore', e non 'reso sofferente dai *pothoi*, innamorato', come nell'esegesi vulgata. Il sintetico ποθόβλητος, *Lieblingswort* nonniano, e forse di diretta derivazione asclepiadea, ha entrambi i significati.

(2) Se l'amore è a senso unico (di Nicarete verso Cleofonte ma non di Cleofonte verso Nicarete),⁵ ne segue di necessità che l'epigramma è ironico, e il tema diventa quello del frutto non còlto ovvero dello zitellaggio volontario, dovuto a ubbie, *choosiness*, eccesso di ritrosia o altro simile. Tutte cose di cui ai vv. 1-2 non c'è traccia.⁶ Se poi i giovani sono entrambi innamorati,⁷ l'epigramma è serio, triste. Ma allora dovremmo pur rilevare, ai vv. 3-4, qualche segno di sofferenza anche da parte di Cleofonte, il cui aspetto invece non sembra né deperito né afflitto. (3) Se l'amore non riguarda la *persona loquens* ma persone terze, cioè Nicarete e Cleofonte, o la sola Nicarete, non si capisce il perché dell'appello a Cipride all'inizio del v. 4. Secondo Sens, Κύπρι φίλη (o Cipride) "makes an emotional statement about his own experience". Di qui l'ipotesi che l'io-parlante sia anch'egli "an interested party, perhaps even Cleophon himself" (2011: 13), che è però un'ipotesi impressionistica.⁸ Giochi di prestigio, raffinatezze, combinazioni ingegnose, non dispiacciono ad Asclepiade. Si pensi solo all'epigramma 209 (posto che sia suo), da cui emerge una propensione *plus quam Alexandrina* per il paradosso e l'artificio. Ma una cosa sono i virtuosismi di un "exquisite miniaturist", come lo chiama Arnott, un'altra le immagini barocche e infantili, come sarebbe appunto questa specie di raggio prosciugante da supereroe Marvel.

Secondo me il tema del tetrastico potrebbe essere il confronto fra una bellezza femminile e una maschile. Bella Nicarete, ma ancora più bello Cleofonte. La luce di lui (evidente già dal nome) supera la luce di lei, la indebolisce, la fa sbiadire, la spegne. È vero che per il viso di Nicarete non si parla *espressamente* di luminosità, ma è anche vero che le cose belle sono *ipso facto* lumino-

5 Così fra gli altri Cameron 1995: 498.

6 Intenso il dibattito 'biografico' su Nicarete: una vergine tenuta in casa da genitori severi? Una moglie sorvegliata dal marito? Oppure un'etera, come pensano fra gli altri Gow-Page 1965: 120? Ampia discussione in Di Marco 2013: 28-30.

7 Così Zumbo 1978: 1047-8; Guichard 2004: 155; Gutzwiller 2007: 318; Zanker 2007: 246. Possibilista Tammaro 2012: 804 e n4.

8 Anche Zanker (2007: 246) rileva con una certa insistenza l'elemento soggettivo, pur senza andare così lontano.

se.⁹ Tale interpretazione consente di restituire a μαραίνειν il significato di eclissare, oscurare e simili, che con un soggetto come αἱ χαροπαὶ ἀστεροπαὶ (le saette fulgide) è senza dubbio il più adatto, per non dire l'unico possibile. Giustamente Alex Sens parla di una "primary association with light and fire" del verbo μαραίνειν: "μαραίνω is literally 'extinguish (light or fire)' (cf. *Il.* 9.212 φλόξ ἐμαράνθη; 23.228: *H. Merc.* 140 ἀνθρακίην δ' ἐμάρανε, and is used in this sense of the dimming of sunlight, celestial bodies (*Arat.* 814 . . . with Kidd ad loc.), and other shining objects" (2011: 18). L'accezione figurata è frequente nel romanzo: *Ach. Tat.* 2.36.1 τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς χρῆσιν χρονωώτερον . . . μαραίνει τὸ τερπνόν ("ciò che si può usare più a lungo . . . spegne il piacere"); 5.8.2 τὸ πολὺ τοῦ πένθους ἤρχετο μαραίνεσθαι ("il grosso del dolore cominciava a spegnersi"); 5.24.3 ὁ ἔρωσ ἐμάρανε τὴν ὀργήν ("l'amore spegneva la furia"), e soprattutto 6.17.4 παλαιὸν γὰρ ἔρωτα μαραίνει νέος ἔρωσ ("un nuovo amore spegne il vecchio amore"). Anche in Nonno, che stando a certi indizi potrebbe aver tenuto materialmente presente l'epigramma asclepiadeo,¹⁰ l'accezione figurata compare più di una volta: cf. *D.* 24.205 οὐ μὰ σὲ καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα, τὸν οὐ χρόνος οἶδε μαραίνειν ("per te e per l'amore su cui il tempo non può prevalere"), e soprattutto 11.362, dove il dio Eros, assunte le fattezze di Sileno, invita il piangente Dioniso a prendersi un fanciullo più bello in luogo del morto Ampelo: *pothos* scaccia *pothos* (φέρτερον ἄμφεπε παῖδα· πόθος πόθον οἶδε μαραίνειν, "cerca un fanciullo più piacente; una passione ha la meglio sull'altra"). Per il motivo della luce che sovrasta un'altra luce cf. e.g. Meleagro *AP*

9 Le guance di Ampelo risplendono anche dopo morto: καὶ νέκυός περ ἐόντος ἔτι στίλβουσι παρειαί, "benché tu sia morto, risplendono ancora le tue guance", Nonn. *D.* 11.282). L'esempio non è scelto a caso, vista l'importanza di alcuni passi nonniani per l'esegesi del nostro epigramma (si vedano le nn 4 e 10). Un corpo bello può essere indicato con perifrasi come "lampo delle membra" (*Rufino AP* 5.35.2 ἀστεροπὴν μελέων), "raggio delle membra" (Nonn. *D.* 16.115 μελέων ἀκτῖνα), ecc. L'adespoto *AP* 12.39.1 esordisce dicendo ἐσβέσθη Νίκανδρος; il *pais* si è riempito di peli e dunque si è *spento*: bellezza e luce sono inseparabili.

10 Così Di Marco (2013: 32), che richiama l'attenzione su ποθοβλήτιο προσώπου (viso colpito da amore) di *D.* 5.202 e di 34.77; ma soprattutto di 16.113, dove è usato anche il verbo μαραίνειν (v. 115).

12.59.1-2 Μυῖσκος / ἔσβεσεν ἐκλάμπας ἀστέρας ἠέλιος (“Miisco è il sole che splendendo spegne le stelle”); Stratone *AP* 12.178.1-2 Θεῦδις ἐλάμπητο παισὶν ἐν ἄλλοις / οἶος ἐπαντέλλων ἀστράσιν ἠέλιος (“Teudi splendeva tra gli altri ragazzi, come il sole tra gli astri quando sorge”); Aristaen. *Epist.* 1.7 ἠρρυθρίασε μετ’ ὀργῆς, καὶ γέγονε τὸ πρόσωπον θυμουμένη καλλιῶν, τὸ δὲ ὄμμα καίπερ ἀγανακτοῦσης ἠδύ, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀστρῶν πῦρ φῶς μᾶλλον ἔστιν ἢ πῦρ (“arrossi per la collera e mentre era infuriata il viso divenne più bello; lo sguardo benché acceso di sdegno era dolce come anche la fiamma delle stelle è luce piuttosto che fiamma”), e ancora Leonida Tarantino *AP* 9.24: Omero supera gli altri poeti come il sole offusca (ἠμαύρωσε) la luna e le stelle. Nella letteratura scientifica è ben noto il principio (lo ripete più volte Teofrasto nel *De igne*) per cui il fuoco più grande estingue il più piccolo.

Un accostamento finora mai preso in considerazione può venire in soccorso di questa lettura. Si tratta di Meleagro *AP* 5.143 ὁ στέφανος περὶ κρατὶ μαραίνεται Ἥλιοδώρας / αὐτὴ δ’ ἐκλάμπει τοῦ στεφάνου στέφανος (“la corona appassisce sul capo di Eliodora, ma lei stessa risplende, corona della corona”). Gow-Page 1965: 632 così commentano: “μαραίνεται: it is a commonplace to say that the girl outshines the wreath; it seems much less complimentary to say that this is so at a time when the wreath is fading. The point, here so allusive so as to be obscure, is explicit in Philostr. *Ep.* 9 – the roses sent to the beloved immediately wither and die, ἐλθόντα εὐθὺς ἐμαράνθη καὶ ἀπέπνευσε; the cause (the writer continues) is easy to guess; it is because the roses ‘cannot bear to be surpassed, nor could they endure the rivalry with you; as soon as they touched a more fragrant skin, they perished’ (οὐκ ἤνεγκε παρευδοκιοῦμενα οὐδὲ ἠνέσχετο τῆς πρὸς σὲ ἀμίλλης κτλ.)”. La spiegazione filostratea non è sufficiente a superare l’obiezione che gli stessi Gow-Page giustamente sollevano. Non importa se i fiori sono appassiti per mortificazione, vergogna, senso di inferiorità o altro; fatto sta che sono appassiti. E una donna, appunto, non ha nulla di cui lusingarsi nell’essere definita corona di una corona vizza. Tutto va a posto invece se intendiamo μαραίνεσθαι nel senso di ἀμαυροῦσθαι (oscurarsi): Eliodora è talmente più bella e più fulgida dei fiori, che i ruoli

si scambiano: è lei che rende bello lo *stephanos*, non viceversa.¹¹ Una situazione non lontana da quella dell'epigramma di Asclepiade di cui discutiamo.

Con *μαράναιεν* = 'offuscare' anche il quadro generale migliora e si normalizza, perdendo quel profilo "eccentrico", "bold and difficult", di cui non a torto hanno parlato Di Marco (2013: 33n29), Garrison (1978: 38) e altri. Se gli effetti delle *ἀστεροπαί* di Cleofonte sul viso di Nicarete sono violenti, violento sarà lo sguardo che questi effetti produce.¹² Insieme alla bellezza il poeta dovrebbe dunque mettere in rilievo la forza d'urto di questo sguardo, il suo potere distruttivo. Invece ne mette in rilievo la dolcezza (*γλυκεροῦ*), la luminosità (*ἀστεροπαί*), il colore (*χαροπαί*). Agli interpreti non è naturalmente sfuggita l'illogica direzione dei fulmini, che qui andrebbero dal basso in alto invece che dall'alto in basso, come natura vuole (Sens 2011: 20; Di Marco 2013: 33n29). Potrebbe essere un elemento del "reversal", ma anche, semplicemente, un'assurdità. Con la mia lettura neppure questo problema sussisterebbe più. Lo stesso *Κύπρι φίλη* del v. 4 acquisterebbe una riconoscibile funzione: sottolineare lo sbigottimento, il rapimento

¹¹ La situazione è grosso modo la stessa dell'adespoto *AP* 5.91 (ti mando il profumo, ma tu sei più profumata del profumo e sarai tu a profumare lui e non lui te), anche questo un distico, anche questo con *αὐτή* in *incipit* del v. 2.

¹² È evidentemente per questo che Spatafora (2006: 126) cerca di dedurre da *χαροπός* (dallo sguardo scintillante) un riferimento alla ferocia: "l'aggettivo tanto in periodo arcaico quanto in quello classico era impiegato soprattutto per qualificare i leoni e le belve in genere; un elemento che senz'altro concorre a dare una maggiore forza all'immagine, quasi violenta, come sottolinea anche l'occorrenza di *μάραναν*". Ma *χαροπός* non è solo epiteto coloristico (Romagnoli 1940: 71 "folgori azzurre"; Gualtieri 1973: 156 "occhi blu"; Pontani 1978: 195 "lampi di celeste"; Conca-Marzi-Zanetto 2005: 281 "l'azzurro lampo"; Waltz 1928: 73 "yeux bleus"), bensì indica anche il risplendere (Gow-Page 1965: 119 "bright"; Beckby 1966: 319 "funkelnd"); per i corpi celesti cf. *Arat.* 594; *Ap. Rh.* 1.1280 (detto dell'alba, quindi del sole). E questo è certamente il valore dell'epiteto qui: cf. anche Sistakou 2007: 396. 'Violento' è parola che i critici usano spesso per questo secondo distico dell'epigramma, e nei modi più vari, per il contenuto e per lo stile: cf. Clack 1999: 33; Conca-Marzi-Zanetto 2005: 280, e la stessa Sistakou 2007: 396: "this Homeric *hapax*, found as an adjective used to describe lions . . . probably implies something about the ferocity of the animal", ecc.

estetico dell'autore, e al contempo 'rabbonire' Afrodite, la dea che presiede alla *charis* femminile. Parafrasi: Nicarete è bella, e me ne sono innamorato vedendola attraverso le imposte della sua finestra; ma poi ho visto Cleofonte sulla porta (ἐπὶ προθύροις) e, perdonami o Cipride,¹³ preferisco lui.¹⁴

Tendo personalmente a diffidare di chi vede dovunque allusioni e simboli, ma nel nostro caso è in effetti possibile che la posizione dei due giovani rispetto all'edificio abbia un significato 'programmatico'. La ragazza è al piano di sopra, in alto; si mostra spesso, ma solo da dietro le θυρίδες. Cleofonte invece si trova ἐπὶ προθύροις, davanti all'entrata,¹⁵ offrendo allo sguardo tutta la sua fulgida freschezza. È la contrapposizione fra due tipi di splendore (lunare e solare?)¹⁶ e fra due tipi di *philia*, complicata e faticosa quella per le *parthenoi*,¹⁷ schietta e diretta quella per i *paides*.¹⁸

13 Il modo tipico di chiedere scusa è l'augurio di felicità. Si veda ad esempio Nonn. *D.* 16.45, dove Dioniso, nel definire Nicea una seconda Aurora, cioè più bella dell'Aurora, si scusa con l'isola di Cerne con le parole ἴλαθι, Κέρνη ("perdonami, Cerne"); e cf. Colluth. 252-3 ἰλήκοις, Διόνυσε· καὶ εἰ Διὸς ἔσσι γενέθλης, / καλὸς ἔην καὶ κείνος ("perdonami, Dioniso, benché tu sia figlio di Zeus, anche lui era bello"); Rufino *AP* 5.73.3 ἰλήκοις, δέσποινά (Afrodite); Agazia *AP* 6.74.5 ἰλήκοις, Διόνυσε.

14 Così Meleagro *AP* 12.86.1-2 distribuisce i ruoli: ἄ Κύπρις θήλεια γυναικομανῆ φλόγα βάλλει, / ἄρσενά δ' αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἴμερον ἀνιοχεῖ ("Cipride in quanto femmina ispira passioni per le donne, mentre Amore stesso governa il desiderio dei maschi").

15 Guichard (2004: 161), che non crede né a una scena di *komos* né a una scena di *paraklausithyron*, fa notare, forse con eccessiva sottigliezza ma non infondatamente, che ἐπὶ προθύροις non è la stessa cosa di παρὰ προθύροις ο ἔν προθύροις.

16 Alcuni elementi del nostro quadro (il φαίνειν, il βάλλειν, le θυρίδες) si ritrovano in un epigramma di Filodemo rivolto appunto a Selene: νυκτερινή, δίκερως, φιλοπάννουχε, φαίνε, Σελήνη, / φαῖνε δι' εὐτρήτων βαλλομένη θυρίδων κτλ., "notturna luna a due corni, amante delle veglie, illumina attraverso le finestre dalle grandi aperture" (*AP* 5.123.1-2).

17 Così anche Di Marco (2013: 36): "la posizione in alto della donna è la metafora della sua irraggiungibilità"; solo che il Di Marco non vede contrasto con Cleofonte.

18 Inutile dire quanto siano diffuse queste comparazioni omo/etero, con alterne preferenze. Per Eratostene *AP* 5.277, per Agazia *AP* 5.278 e per Meleagro *AP* 5.208 sono meglio le femmine dei maschi; per Stratone *AP* 12.7 e

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Arnott, W. Geoffrey (1969), "Callimachean Subtlety in Asclepiades of Samos", *Classical Review* 19: 6-8.
- Beckby, Hermann (ed.) (1966), *Anthologia Graeca*, Griechisch-Deutsch ed. Hermann Beckby, München: Heimeran.
- Bing, Peter e Jon Steffen Bruss (eds) (2007), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden: Brill.
- Cairns, Francis (1998), "Asclepiades and the Hetairai", *Eikasmos* 9: 165-93.
- Cameron, Alan (1981), "Asclepiades' Girl Friends", in Helene Peet Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, New York: Gordon & Breach, 275-302 = Id. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 494-519.
- Clack, Jerry (ed.) (1999), *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum. The Poems*, ed. Jerry Clack, Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Conca, Fabrizio, Mario Marzi e Giuseppe Zanetto (eds) (2005), *Antologia Palatina*, libri I-VII, vol. 1, Torino: UTET.
- Di Marco, Massimo (2013), *Studi su Asclepiade di Samo*, Roma: Aracne.
- Garrison, Daniel H. (1978), *Mild Frenzy. A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*, Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Gow, Andrew S.F. e Denys Page (eds) (1965), *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, ed. by Andrew S.F. Gow and Denys Page, vol. 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gualtieri, Giuseppe (ed.) (1973), *Antologia Palatina. I libri dell'amore*, Firenze: Vallecchi.
- Guichard, Luis Arturo (ed.) (2004), *Asclepiades de Samos. Epigramas y fragmentos*, ed. Luis Arturo Guichard, Bern: Lang.
- Gutzwiller, Kathryn (1998), *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (2007), "The Paradox of Amatory Epigram", in Peter Bing e Jon Steffen Bruss (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden: Brill, 313-32.
- Jacobs, Friedrich (ed.) (1871), *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum, annotatione inedita Boissonadii, Chardonis de La Rochette, Bothii, partim inedita Jacobsii, metrica versione Hugonis Grotii, et apparatu critico instruxit Fredericus Dübner: Graece et Latine*, vol. 1, Paris: Didot.

12.245, per Meleagro AP 12.87 e per lo sconosciuto autore di AP 12.17 sono meglio i maschi delle femmine. Si veda anche Stratone AP 12.192.5-6, in cui viene contrapposto l' ἀκαλλώπιστος πόθος (desiderio senza belletti) degli uni alla γοητικὴ μορφή (bellezza incantatrice) delle altre.

- Ludwig, Walther (1966), Rec. a Gow-Page (1965), *Gnomon* 38: 20-5.
- Paduano, Guido (ed.) (1989), *Antologia Palatina. Epigrammi erotici*, introduzione, traduzione e note di Guido Paduano, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Pontani, Filippo Maria (ed.) (1978), *Antologia Palatina*, a cura di Filippo Maria Pontani, vol. 1, Torino: Einaudi.
- Romagnoli, Ettore (ed.) (1940), *I poeti della Antologia Palatina*, vol. 1, Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Sens, Alexander (ed.) (2011), *Asclepiades of Samos. Epigrams and Fragments*, ed. with translation and commentary by Alexander Sens, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sistakou, Evina (2007), "Glossing Homer: Homeric Exegesis in Early Third Century Epigram", in Peter Bing e Jon Steffen Bruss (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden: Brill, 391-408.
- Spatafora, Giuseppe (2006), "Il fuoco d'amore", *Orpheus* 27: 119-39.
- Tammaro, Vinicio (2012), "Su Asclepiade, Ep. 3 S. (AP 5.153)", in Guido Bastianini, Walter Lapini e Mauro Tulli (eds), *Harmonia. Scritti di filologia classica in onore di Angelo Casanova*, Firenze: Firenze University Press, vol. 2, 803-7.
- Tueller, Michael A. (ed.) (2014), *The Greek Anthology*, with an English translation revised, translated by William Roger Paton; revised by Michael A. Tueller, vol. 1, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, Pierre (ed.) (1928), *Anthologie Grecque*, première partie: *Anthologie Palatine*, texte établi et traduit par Pierre Waltz, vol. 2, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Zanker, Graham (2007), "Characterization in Hellenistic Epigram", in Peter Bing e Jon Steffen Bruss (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden: Brill, 233-49.
- Zumbo, Antonio (1978), "Asclepiade, A.P. 5, 153 (= III Gow-Page)", in Enrico Livrea e G. Aurelio Privitera (eds), *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, vol. 2, 1045-54.

Plato's κάλλιστον δρᾶμα in Greek Biography

MAURO TULLI

Abstract

In the vast repertoire on Plato's *Nachleben* in the ancient world conceived by Dörrie, several passages, which derive from Greek biography, include a judgement of great value and sharp originality on Plato's corpus. This judgement, mainly handed down through the code of Greek biography, on the basis of his Peripatetic origin, has as its main feature the fruitful commitment to project details from the work of an author on to his personal life experiences. The paper will give a critical assessment of the testimonies of Hermippus on Demosthenes as Plato's pupil, of Dicaearchus on Socrates, of Alexander Polyhistor on the burning of the tragedies, of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Plato's troubles, of Euphoriion of Chalcis and Panaitius on the incipit of the *Politeia*, and of the author of the commentary in the Berlin Papyrus on the incipit of the *Theaetetus*. The principal aim is to reconstruct in Greek biography the roots of the modern interpretation of Plato's corpus as being the outcome of an extremely important and thoroughly cognizant literary engagement, as, in Plato's own words, a κάλλιστον δρᾶμα.

It has long been argued that a major concern of Greek biography is to recall individual experience in the life of an author, something which is often almost impossible to retrieve, through his works. This results in a close intermingling of the reconstruction of the one and the subjective interpretation of the other. It is a truly fruitful commitment, of Peripatetic origin, already detectable in Aristotle's thought, which in turn derives from Plato's conception of μίμησις ("imitation"). However, it is not difficult to retrieve successfully from Greek biography distinguishing traits of the genre, favoured topics of an author, style or crucial issues in his production.¹ In this way, the conventions of Greek biography reveal a

¹ Cf. Arrighetti 1987: 141-59. In particular, Schorn (2004: 56-63) examines Greek biography of Peripatetic origin after Chamaeleon.

contribution of literary criticism, either through the objective record of a remote past or through the details of an anecdote. The vast repertoire on Plato's corpus in the ancient world derives often from Greek biography and offers a very valuable judgement on Plato's style.² This last, however, is mainly handed down through the basic principles of Greek biography and is either revealed by the recounting of personal experiences (γενόμενα) or indicates the meaning of an anecdote.

For example, Hermippus (fr. 49 Bollansée), Aristotle's pupil, who emphasizes the dependence of Demosthenes on Plato's style maintains, on the basis of ὑπομνήματα ("memoirs") by an unknown author, ἀδέσποτα, that Demosthenes is Plato's pupil. This constitutes a double jump into the past:³ in Plutarch's Demosthenes there is a judgement on Plato's style that derives from Hermippus, but was born earlier, in ὑπομνήματα of an unknown author, ἀδέσποτα. This reconstruction gives rise to doubt. If Plutarch's relationship with the Peripatetic production is plausible, its connection to the ὑπομνήματα, of an unknown author, ἀδέσποτα, is out of the question. First of all, is it possible to consider the diffusion of ὑπομνήματα as early as the IV century? Moreover, were these ὑπομνήματα on Demosthenes or on Plato's corpus? In any case this judgement is in the form of a story: an unknown author, possibly Hermippus himself, recognises Demosthenes as Plato's pupil to prove that Demosthenes has adopted Plato's style. Certainly, Hermippus developed his argument in the form of a story, because Aulus Gellius (3.13) recalls a passage from Hermippus which tells how Demosthenes was distracted, during his habitual practice of listening to Plato's lessons, by the noisy enthusiasm of the crowd due to the impending event of Callistratus' speech, the famous Περὶ Ὀρωποῦ (*About Oropous*). According to the Peripatetic perspective, Demosthenes

2 In the third section of the second volume edited by Dörrie and Baltes 1990: 110-51 between *Baustein* 51 and *Baustein* 57.

3 Ἑρμιππος δὲ φησιν ἀδεσπότης ὑπομνήμασιν ἐντυχεῖν, ἐν οἷς ἐγγράπτο τὸν Δημοσθένη συνεσχολακέναι Πλάτωνι καὶ πλείστον εἰς τοὺς λόγους ὠφελῆσθαι ("Hermippus says that he once came upon some anonymous memoirs in which it was recorded that Demosthenes was Plato's pupil and found his speeches of great help"). Cf. Bollansée 1999: 398-405.

has a sudden flash of inspiration, giving rise to inevitable anguish, as he finds himself at a life and career crossroads and he decides he will no longer attend Plato's lessons at the Academy. In other words, from now on, Demosthenes, *motus*, *demultus*, *captus* ("moved, charmed, captivated") will be Callistratus' pupil. The relationship that Demosthenes has with the Academy is immediately apparent in Ammianus Marcellinus (30.4.5) and culminates in Philostratus (1.18). It is a question that interests Cicero, for example in *De Oratore* (1.89), when distinguishing between *ingenium* and *ars*. Diogenes Laertius (3.46-7) confirms this point and indicates Sabinus as the source, who in turn uses Mnesistratus of Thasus as the source.⁴ The tradition is handed down over a long period of time, but its evident need to depict a contribution of literary criticism, with the semblance of an objective record of a remote past, demonstrates that it certainly originates from the Peripatetic School. According to their version, Demosthenes is influenced by Plato's style and his dependence takes the form of a discipleship. But his own style does not show any real debt to the conventions of dialogue because he is an orator, which is why, from the Peripatetic standpoint, his change of heart must be caused by Callistratus' famous *Περὶ Ὀρωποῦ* (*About Oropous*).

As for Plato's literary production, Greek biography offers a model for this shift through the tradition from which Diogenes Laertius (3.4-5) conveys details on Plato's youth and in particular on his encounter with Socrates. This tradition has a Peripatetic imprint and constantly emerges in a new form.⁵ Diogenes Laertius attributes to Plato's youth a literary production consisting of dithyrambs, lyric production, and tragedies. He indicates the source, Dicaearchus (47 Mirhady), Aristotele's pupil, perhaps the greatest together with Theophrastus.⁶ This is nothing but a contribu-

4 Cf. Worthington 2013: 38-41. The scheme that Erbi (2011: 157-90) offers on the relationship between the Peripatetic production and the theatrical production on Demosthenes is very useful.

5 Cf. Regali 2016: 275-308.

6 καθὰ καὶ Δικαίαρχος ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ βίων, καὶ γραφικῆς ἐπιμεληθῆναι καὶ ποιήματα γράψαι, πρῶτον μὲν διθυράμβους, ἔπειτα καὶ μέλη καὶ τραγωδίας. ("It is stated also by Dicaearchus in the first book of *Lives* that he applied himself to painting as well as writing poems, first dithyrambs, then

tion of literary criticism. Already in the fourth-century Peripatetic reasoning indicates the relationship of Plato's corpus with dithyrambs, lyric production and tragedies, but this is embedded in the conventions of Greek biography and takes the form of *γενόμενα*, of personal experiences. An author of dialogues, who becomes the convinced heir of the poetic tradition both from the point of view of style and that of general structure, is one who, before writing the dialogues, develops surrounded by dithyrambs, lyric production, and tragedies. From the Peripatetic perspective, he offers outstanding evidence of this, even though it has been lost in the course of time. In the same way, Diogenes Laertius offers the image of Plato's first meeting with Socrates, who recognises in Plato's profile the young swan of his dream, the young swan which landed in his lap and shortly after flew away, singing sweetly. Here, once again, Dicaearchus is a possible source.⁷ The metaphor of the young swan reveals the strength behind Plato's subsequent creation of dialogues: certainly, its function here is made clear through Socrates, who indicates the juxtaposition, τοῦτον εἰπεῖν εἶναι τὸν ὄρνιν ("said that he was the bird"). It is the best interpretation of Plato's corpus: the sweet song of a young swan, the harmony of the *Phaedo*, the *Symposium* or the *Phaedrus*, mellowed through his meeting with Socrates, on the lap of his elenchus and maieutics.⁸

The anecdote of the young swan has a long *Nachleben*, which is not worth pursuing any further here. Diogenes Laertius includes it in the pages on Plato's life, after Herodicus of Babylon via Athenaeus (11.507c), after Apuleius in *De Platone* (1.1), Tertullian's *De Anima* (46.9) and Origen's *Celso* (6.8). It is already quoted by Pausanias (1.30.3) as a gloss to the description of Plato's

lyric production and tragedies"). Cf. Mirhady 2001: 218-28.

7 λέγεται δ' ὅτι Σωκράτης ὄναρ εἶδε κύκνου νεοττὸν ἐν τοῖς γόνασιν ἔχειν, ὃν καὶ παραχρῆμα πτεροφυήσαντα ἀναπτῆναι ἠδὲ κλάγγαντα· καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν Πλάτωνα αὐτῷ συστήναι, τὸν δὲ τοῦτον εἰπεῖν εἶναι τὸν ὄρνιν. ("It is stated that Socrates in a dream saw a cygnet on his knees, which all at once put forth plumage, and flew away after uttering a loud sweet note. And the next day Plato came to him, and Socrates said that he was the bird which he had seen."). Cf. Nünlist 1998: 39-67.

8 Gaiser 1984: 103-23 = 2004: 43-55.

gravestone. Here emerges the relationship of the young swan with μουσική which has its root in the myth of the King of the Ligures and the will of Apollo, and which certainly derives from a Peripatetic reflection on the pages of the *Phaedo* (60e-61c), that is on philosophy as μουσική, the greatest, μεγίστη.⁹ Greek biography derives a feature from the literary production of an author and weaves it into his life, together with the distinctive quality of the record of a far distant past, as it does both with philosophy as the μουσική for Socrates, and with the image of the young swan which represents an apt metaphor of the sweet music of the dialogues.¹⁰ As far as Plato's dithyrambs, lyric production, and tragedies is concerned, Diogenes Laertius is immediately confirmed by Alexander Polyhistor (273 F 89 Jacoby). Plato's encounter with Socrates is described as a flash of inspiration and the result is the burning of his tragedies, despite his intention to compete, μέλλων ἀγωνεῖσθαι, not far from Dionysus' theatre.¹¹ Greek biography makes a contribution to literary criticism: the comparison of Plato's corpus with his dramatic production, in particular of the dialogues, the *Phaedo*, the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus*, with tragedies, takes shape. Without any actual evidence to corroborate this story, Plato's sudden decision to burn his tragedies represents the separation between his dramatic works, and his subsequent production, which finds its highest form in the dialogues and which is the unquestionable consequence of his previous dramatic works. It is a contribution of literary criticism, which here too, through the

9 Cf. Giuliano 2005: 80-100.

10 Lasserre (1986: 49-66) illustrates Plato's image of the swan in the *Phaedo* (84e-85b). Cf. Erler 2003: 107-16.

11 ἐφιλοσόφει δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐν Ἀκαδημαίᾳ, εἶτα ἐν τῷ κήπῳ τῷ παρὰ τὸν Κολωνόν, ὡς φησιν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν Διαδοχαῖς, καθ' Ἡράκλειτον. ἔπειτα μέντοι μέλλων ἀγωνεῖσθαι τραγωδίᾳ πρὸ τοῦ Διονυσιακοῦ θεάτρου Σωκράτους ἀκούσας κατέφλεξε τὰ ποιήματα εἰπών. Ἥφαιστε, πρόμολ' ὦδε· Πλάτων νύ τι σεῖο χατίζει. ("At first he used to study philosophy in the Academy, and afterwards in the garden at Colonus – as Alexander states in his *Successions* – as a follower of Heraclitus. Afterwards, when he was about to participate in a competition with a tragedy, he listened to Socrates in front of the theatre of Dionysus, and then consigned his poems to the flames, with the words: "Come hither, Hephaestus, Plato now has need of thee"). Cf. Erler 2007: 35-60.

Peripatetic imprint, finds comfort in Plato's corpus, through the profitable commitment towards projecting details from the works of an author on to episodes from his life. A famous passage in the VII book of *Laws* (816d-817d) offers a persuasive interpretation of the dialogues as the most noble, κάλλιστον, paradigm for dramatic writing and makes the inevitable comparison between the *Phaedo*, the *Symposium* and the *Phaedrus* with the tragedies, indeed with the greatest, ἀρίστη, on the basis of research.¹² If this is Plato's opinion, why not depict, following the code of Greek biography, a young man, who is standing not far from Dionysus' theatre after his encounter with Socrates, and burning his tragedies?

Diogenes Laertius (3.9-17) has the same point of view in the general analysis of Plato's relationship with Epicharmus. It is difficult to retrieve the source of the anecdote on Plato's relationship with Sophron's works, which Diogenes introduces at the end (3.18): it is a claim of Plato's role in the diffusion of the μῖμοι ("mimes") in Attica, a claim that culminates in the image of Sophron's book discovered under Plato's head, immediately after the latter's death.¹³ However, the meaning of the anecdote is clear. Through the code of Greek biography, the Peripatetic tradition indicates Plato's dependence on Sophron's production and more in general on the production of μῖμοι. Certainly, the production of μῖμοι is still a mystery for us.¹⁴ However, it is possible to postulate a gripping dramatic feature in the production of μῖμοι, and therefore, using the code of Greek biography, the Peripatetic tradition offers here, once again, a contribution of literary criticism, by stressing, for example, the same feature for the *Protagoras*, the *Symposium* or the *Gorgias*.

If Diogenes Laertius derives this reflection on Plato's corpus from Dicaearchus and Alexander Polyhistor, it is not difficult

¹² Cf. Tulli 2015: 41-51.

¹³ δοκεῖ δὲ Πλάτων καὶ τὰ Σώφρονος τοῦ μιμογράφου βιβλία ἡμελημένα πρῶτος εἰς Ἀθήνας διακομίσει καὶ ἠθοποιῆσαι πρὸς αὐτόν· ἃ καὶ εὔρεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῆ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ ("Plato, it seems, was the first to bring to Athens the mimes of Sophron which had been neglected, and to draw characters in the style of that writer: a copy of the mimes, they say, was actually found under his pillow"). Cf. Haslam 1972: 17-38.

¹⁴ Cf. Hordern 2008: 4-10.

to recognize a contribution of literary criticism, adopting the typical guise of Greek biography, in the pages of an author far-removed from the Peripatetic perspective, who generally rejects the code of Greek biography and offers us a well-founded analysis of Plato's corpus, both in its form and in its content. As to Plato's style, Dionysius of Halicarnassus in *De Compositione* (25.31-3) suggests the image that frequently comes as a surprise, Plato's image, who in his eighties intervenes in every section of his works κτενίζων καὶ βοστρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀναπλέκων, combing, curling, and intertwining.¹⁵ Hence derives the story, which Dionysius of Halicarnassus indicates as an extremely widespread one, and of course useful for literary criticism on Plato's style, πᾶσι γὰρ δήπου τοῖς φιλολόγοις γνώριμα ("of course every scholar is familiar with"), the story about the small wooden tablet, discovered immediately after Plato's death, with the changed incipit of the *Politeia*, filled with trouble, ποικίλως ("in various ways").¹⁶ The shifting of words, a process of refining and polishing, the torment of an author who in the dialogues recognises the opportunity for his elaborate style, born from a great commitment. It is the story for which Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in actual fact, found the title: περὶ τῆς φιλοπονίας τάνδρὸς ("about the industry of the man"). Objectively – and inevitably – the doubt remains, concerning the small wooden tablet itself. This image is not compatible with the mass of the *Politeia* and with what is known of the art of writing in the IV century.¹⁷ It is senseless to invoke a possible metaphorical interpretation of the story. Obviously, this interpretation offers the solution for the expression ἐν κηρῷ ("on wax") which

15 Cf. Berti 2011: 17-32.

16 πᾶσι γὰρ δήπου τοῖς φιλολόγοις γνώριμα τὰ περὶ τῆς φιλοπονίας τάνδρὸς ἱστορούμενα τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν δέλτον, ἣν τελευτήσαντος αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν εὑρεθῆναι ποικίλως μετακαεμένην τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Πολιτείας ἔχουσιν τήνδε Ἐκατέβην χθὲς εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος. ("Of course every scholar is familiar with the stories told about Plato's industry, especially the one about the writing tablet which they say was found after his death, with the opening words of the *Republic* arranged in various ways, that is: 'I went down yesterday to the Piraeus with Glaucon the son of Ariston'"). Cf. Thesleff 1997: 149-74 = 2009: 519-40.

17 Cf. Dorandi 2007: 13-24.

Diogenes Laertius (3.37-8) introduces for the *Laws*, as a fruitful area of activity for Philip of Opus, just after Plato's death: the expression ἐν κηρῶ signifies a quick sketch for the general scheme of the *Laws*, perhaps for the last section on the nocturnal council.¹⁸ But what about the story on the changed incipit of the *Politeia*? Of course, it does not refer to the above-mentioned sketch. Instead, it conceals a contribution of literary criticism through the code of Greek biography: the story of the changed incipit of the *Politeia*, with many an afterthought, ποικίλως, is a sign of the reflection on the *Politeia* or perhaps more in general on Plato's corpus, which stands out for its elaborate style and culminates in the *Politeia* itself.

Diogenes Laertius (3.37-8) confirms the story of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and recalls its source, through key figures such as Euphorion of Chalcis (187 Van Groningen), who is famous for his poetry, but not less so for his literary criticism, and Panaetius (130 Van Groningen), the Stoic of the second century whose tradition links to the reflection on Plato's corpus. The story about the changed incipit of the *Politeia* may be seen as an invitation to a correct analysis of details in Plato's corpus, for example the κατέβην ("I went down") which in the opening words of the *Politeia* refers to relationship of Socrates with politics.¹⁹ However, it is not really possible to believe in the story of the small wooden tablet discovered immediately after Plato's death containing the changed incipit of the *Politeia*. The story has no basis in fact: through the conventions of Greek biography it demonstrates the inevitability of projecting various details from the works of an author on to episodes from his life. Both for Euphorion of Chalcis and for Panaetius it is not difficult to prove their relationship with the basic tenets of the Peripatetic tradition. Euphorion of Chalcis could be seen to publish a *Hesiod* (130 Van Groningen) following the code of Greek biography in relationship with the tradition of the *Certamen*, and of course Panaetius is the Stoic most receptive of Aristotle's system.²⁰ The dependence is plausible: Euphorion of

18 Cf. Aronadio 2009: 9-14.

19 Cf. Vegetti 1998: 93-104.

20 Cf. Alesse 1997: 289-90.

Chalcis developed the story in the III century, Panaetius finds the story among his works, and very soon Dionysius of Halicarnassus includes it in the reflection on Plato's corpus, before Diogenes Laertius, who is the last link in the chain. Between Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diogenes Laertius the story, according to Quintilian (8.6.64), demonstrates the strength that the *ordo verborum* possesses. What then is the origin of the story? Perhaps the famous passage of the *Phaedrus* (278d-e) on writing, which is Plato's reflection on the myth of Thamus and Theuth.²¹ Certainly, the fruitful effort of the research on the dialogues with the master is in conflict with the writing of an author who spends his time on possible alternative words, on refining and polishing, ἄνω κάτω στρέφων ("turning up and down"), spinning them to and fro, who goes ahead pasting and cutting, κολλῶν τε καὶ ἀφαιρῶν ("adding and taking away"). According to the code of Greek biography, the image of writing becomes an objective record of a remote past and the technique of writing, presented in a negative light in Plato's reflection on the myth of Thamus and Theuth, is actually nothing but his own style. If Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes Plato's style with κτενίζων καὶ βοστρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀναπλέκων in a plastic dimension on the basis of the scheme of ἄνω κάτω στρέφων or κολλῶν τε καὶ ἀφαιρῶν, the Peripatetic tradition gives the input to the story of the small wooden tablet with the changed incipit of the *Politeia*.

But perhaps it is possible to go a step further. What is striking in the opening words of the *Theaetetus* (142a-143c) is Plato's programme. If the story of the research that Theaetetus developed with Socrates is to be excluded ἀπὸ στόματος, that is by means of the memory, a faithful record is not missing. The plot of the *Theaetetus* offers it and it is the faithful record of Euclid, who almost immediately indicates the phases of his reconstruction, that is a short scheme jotted down straight after the end of the research, εὐθύς οἴκαδ' ἔλθῶν ("as soon as I reached home"), the draft developed more slowly, κατὰ σχολήν ("at leisure"), and the monitoring, ἐπανάρθωσις, through Socrates, while being interrogat-

21 The reconstruction by Swift Riginos (1976: 185-6) is here convincing, despite the rapid juxtaposition of her cards.

ed by Euclid.²² Both for the slower draft, κατὰ σχολήν, and for the monitoring, ἐπανόρθωσις, through Socrates, it is not difficult to assume the choice of different words, a refining and polishing process, which is a useful hypothesis, using the code of Greek biography, for the small wooden tablet with the changed incipit of the *Politeia*. However, here Plato's image of the faithful record of Euclid lays the foundation not for a story, but for a forgery. The commentary preserved by the Berlin Papyrus 9782 (3.28-37) quotes the words ἄρά γε, ὦ παῖ ("Well, boy"), as the opening words of the *Theaetetus*, a fake, because the commentary sees in the opening words ἄρτι, ὦ Τερψίων ("recently, Terpsion"), which the medieval tradition offers us, with B, with T, and with W, the true text, γνήσιον.²³ During the Imperial era, not later than 150, *terminus ante quem* for the commentary preserved by the Berlin Papyrus 9782, both a fake and the true text were being circulated with the opening words of the *Theaetetus*. The commentary preserved by the Berlin Papyrus 9782 recognises them as very similar, if not identical, in size, σχεδὸν τῶν ἴσων στίχων ("more or less the same number of lines"). However, according to the commentary it is not difficult to make the right choice because Plato's style suggests the canon which needs to be met, Plato's style, which is not compatible with the words ἄρά γε, ὦ παῖ, a cold, ὑπόψυχρον, text. With the choice of different words, and a process of refining and polishing, the Peripatetic reflection derives from the *Phaedrus* and from the *Theaetetus* the details for the story about the small wooden tablet with the changed incipit of the *Politeia* and the tradition offers a modified text for the incipit of the *Theaetetus*, the incipit which recalls the more slowly developed draft, κατὰ σχολήν, and indicates the monitoring, ἐπανόρθωσις, through Socrates.²⁴ The

22 It is possible to notice here the requirement of a faithful mirroring in the general production of dialogues in the the 4th century. Cf. Clay 1994: 23-47.

23 φέρ[ε-][[τ]αι δὲ καὶ ἄλλο προοίμιον ὑπόψ[υ]χρον | σχεδὸν τῶν ἴσων | στίχων. οὗ ἄρχή· | "ἄρά γε, ὦ παῖ, φέρεις τὸν | [π]ε[ρ]ι Θε[α]ιτήτου λόγον;" | τὸ δὲ γνήσιόν ἐστιν, | οὗ ἄρχή· "ἄρτι, ὦ Τερψίῳν" ("Another foreword has been handed down, quite cold in tone, of about the same number of lines, which begins, 'Well, boy, have you the speech that concerns Theaetetus?' The authentic one, on the other hand, begins, 'Recently, Terpsion'.") Cf. Regali 2005: 83-97.

24 Cf. Ferrari 2011: 10-39.

text is a fake: the commentary preserved by the Berlin Papyrus 9782 rejects the tradition because the text is not compatible with Plato's style. So, the question remains. Does the tradition conceal a Peripatetic origin? Or does the text come from the Academy in relation to the creation of Plato's corpus? It is difficult to say. But, as for the story on the small wooden tablet with the changed incipit of the *Politeia* as well as for the reflection the commentary offers, the cornerstone is Plato's style, the most well developed style, the style that derives from a great commitment, the style that Dionysius of Halicarnassus recalls with his metaphorical language, through a contribution of literary criticism free from the code of Greek biography, from the Peripatetic tradition: by combing, curling and intertwining.

English translation by Jennifer Battiglia

Works Cited

- Alesse, Francesca (ed.) (1997), *Panezio di Rodi, Testimonianze*, a cura di Francesca Alesse, Napoli: Bibliopolis.
- Aronadio, Francesco (ed.) (2009), *Platone. Dialoghi spuri*, a cura di Francesco Aronadio, Torino: UTET.
- Arrighetti, Graziano (1987), *Poeti, eruditi e biografati*, Pisa: Giardini.
- Berti, Emanuele (2011), "Platone, Demostene e l'umbratilis oratio: a proposito di Dion. Hal. Dem. 32", *La Parola del Passato* 66: 17-32.
- Bollansée, Jan (1999), *Hermippos of Smyrna and his Biographical Writings*, Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.
- Clay, Diskin (1994), "The Origins of the Socratic Dialogue", in Paul A. Van der Waerdt (ed.), *The Socratic Movement*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 23-47.
- Dorandi, Tiziano (2007), *Nell'officina dei classici*, Roma: Carocci.
- Dörrie, Heinrich and Matthias Baltes (1990), *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Erbì, Margherita (2011), "Demostene nella commedia di mezzo", in Mauro Tulli (ed.), *L'autore pensoso*, Pisa: Serra, 157-90.
- Erler, Michael (2003), "Das Bild vom 'Kind im Menschen' bei Platon und der Adressat von Lukrez' De Rerum Natura", *Cronache Ercolanesi* 33: 107-16.
- (2007), *Platon*, Basel: Schwabe.

- Ferrari, Franco (ed.) (2011), *Platone. Teeteto*, Introduzione, traduzione e commento di Franco Ferrari, Milano: Rizzoli.
- Gaiser, Konrad (1984), *Platone come scrittore filosofico*, Napoli: Bibliopolis (Germ. ed. in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 2004).
- Giuliano, Fabio Massimo (2005), *Platone e la poesia*, Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.
- Haslam, Michael (1972), "Plato, Sophron, and the Dramatic Dialogue", *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 19: 17-38.
- Hordern, James H. (ed.) (2008), *Sophron's Mimes*, Text, Translation, and Commentary by James H. Hordern, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasserre, François (1986), "Le chant du cygne", *Études de Lettres* 3: 49-66.
- Mirhady, David C. (2001), "Dicaearchus of Messana", in William Fortenbaugh and Eckart Schütrumpf (eds), *Dicaearchus of Messana*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 218-28.
- Nünlist, René (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart-Leipzig: de Gruyter.
- Regali, Mario (2005), "Una metafora fra filosofia e filologia: gnesios e nothos", *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 29: 83-97.
- (2016), "Katharsis e protrettica nel Bios dei Prolegomena alla filosofia di Platone", in Mauro Bonazzi and Stefan Schorn (eds), *Bios philosophos*, Turnhout: Brepols, 275-308.
- Schorn, Stefan (ed.) (2004), *Satyros aus Kallatis*. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar, Basel: Schwabe.
- Swift Riginos, Alice (1976), *Platonica*, Leiden: Brill.
- Thesleff, Holger (1997), "The Early Version of Plato's Republic", *Arctos* 3: 149-74, repr. in *Platonic Patterns*, Las Vegas 2009: Parmenides Publishing, 519-40.
- Tulli, Mauro (2015), "Plato and the Variety of Literary Production", in Debra Nails and Harold Tarrant (eds), *Second Sailing: Alternative Perspectives on Plato*, Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 41-51.
- Vegetti, Mario (1998), "Katabasis", in Mario Vegetti (ed.), *Platone. La Repubblica*, I, Napoli: Bibliopolis, 93-104.
- Worthington, Ian (2013), *Demosthenes of Athens and the Fall of Classical Greece*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Il coraggio di tradire per poter tramandare: un allestimento contemporaneo del *Gysbregh* van Aemstel di Joost van den Vondel

SIMONA BRUNETTI

Abstract

This article explores the latest *mise en scène* of *Gysbregh van Aemstel* by Joost van den Vondel staged by Het Toneel Speelt at the Stadsschouwburg of Amsterdam on New Year's Day 2012. It discusses the three new choir poems composed by Willem Jan Otten specifically for this event and the acting technique used to perform them. Through a short analysis of the historical and theatrical contexts of the tragedy and of the spectacular issues that allowed its long-lasting staging fortune, the article aims at demonstrating that the representability of *Gysbregh van Aemstel* on contemporary stages does not depend only on the play's aesthetic beauty, but also on its potentiality to respond to the religious, emotional and cultural needs of our present society.

Una tragedia 'irrappresentabile' dalla longevità scenica di più di tre secoli

Come può una tragedia storica del Seicento olandese, che vanta una pressoché ininterrotta fortuna scenica di più di tre secoli, venire tacciata di irrappresentabilità per il pubblico del ventunesimo secolo? Quando Peter Eversmann così si interrogava in merito ai possibili problemi di messinscena del *Gysbregh van Aemstel* (1637) in epoca contemporanea (2012: 287), in un *Companion* dedicato a Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679), il palcoscenico dello Stadsschouwburg di Amsterdam era in procinto di ospitarne un nuovo allestimento della compagnia Het Toneel Speelt diretta da Ronald Klamer con la regia di Jaap Spijkers (cf. HTS; Vondel 2012; Klamer 2018). Il loro intento dichiarato era proprio di tentare di ripristinare il plurisecolare appuntamento di capodanno con l'opera

dopo alcuni decenni di oblio.¹

È noto come ad Amsterdam agli inizi del diciassettesimo secolo si verificasse un importante ampliamento urbanistico con il riassetto della struttura dei canali e l'innalzamento di nuovi edifici, in risposta all'arrivo di decine di migliaia di profughi in fuga dalla *Reconquista* spagnola e alla ricerca di prospettive economiche più vantaggiose (Prandoni 2012: 238-9). In particolare, nel 1637 la tragedia *Gysbregh van Aemstel* venne composta per lo spettacolo inaugurale dello Schouwburg, primo teatro in pietra della città, modellato sul palladiano Teatro Olimpico di Vicenza dall'architetto Jacob van Campen, con scenografia permanente a due livelli, senza arco di proscenio (cf. Eversmann 2013: 269-74; Hummelen 1996: 202; Albach 1970). Come ricorda Klamer, si trattava di una tipologia di edificio mai vista nei Paesi Bassi prima di allora, "con soluzioni moderne come pannelli girevoli e strutture di sollevamento per gli attori" (2018). Anche la parola Schouwburg era un'invenzione di Vondel, un neologismo neerlandese coniato per l'occasione, che letteralmente significa 'luogo del guardare'. Con la costruzione di un nuovo teatro la variegata vita spettacolare della città, già molto fiorente ma fino ad allora affidata alle singole Camere di Retorica di origine tardo-medievale (cf. Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen 1991), poté finalmente concentrarsi attorno a uno spazio unitario che permettesse la partecipazione a pagamento alle rappresentazioni di un'intera comunità pluralistica, non gerarchica e ancora alla ricerca di se stessa, per riflettere sui temi e le questioni scottanti che la coinvolgevano (Hogendoorn 2012: 11-15; Eversmann 2013: 289-93).

Con il *Gysbregh*, per esempio, sottolinea Marco Prandoni, avvalendosi di eventi medioevali, Vondel fa sì che gli spettatori partecipino a una complessa rievocazione del passato in cui il crollo della città invita alla meditazione sulla sofferenza dei vinti, per inserirsi nello spinoso dibattito seicentesco sul ruolo tenuto da

1 Quest'articolo, che dedico con profonda stima e gratitudine a Guido Avezzù, anticipa alcune riflessioni trattate con diversi focus e finalità nell'edizione critica italiana del *Gysbregh van Aemstel* di Vondel in corso di stampa (Brunetti-Prandoni 2018). Le traduzioni della tragedia che qui si propongono sono frutto dell'assidua collaborazione con Marco Prandoni, che ringrazio di cuore per l'aiuto alla stesura di questo contributo.

Amsterdam durante la Rivolta contro la Spagna e dai cattolici nella neonata Repubblica delle Province Unite; temi pressoché rimossi o per lo più sottaciuti nelle opere storiografiche del tempo. Non essendosi infatti schierata dalla parte di Guglielmo d'Orange, la città era rimasta un bastione lealista cattolico, un porto sicuro per i religiosi provenienti da tutti i Paesi Bassi sconvolti dalla guerra. Nel rituale civico festivo costituito dall'apertura del nuovo teatro, dunque, pur con l'urgenza di legittimare un presente di *novitas* politica e costituzionale, si meditava in senso figurato anche sulla sorte delle vittime della guerra (nel 1637 ancora in corso²); si ricordava e al contempo si commemorava la sofferenza patita dalla popolazione vinta e il suo eroismo negli anni dell'isolamento e dell'assedio (cf. Prandoni 2018; 2012: 241; 2013: 304-7).

Originario di Colonia, dove i genitori anabattisti anverse si erano rifugiati in seguito alle persecuzioni religiose, Vondel crebbe ad Amsterdam e si convertì ben presto agli ideali umanistici, trasformandosi lentamente da autore antimondano della camera di retorica brabantina a drammaturgo rinascimentale moderno. Il *Gysbreght* fu concepito dopo anni di studio del latino e del greco, la traduzione di due tragedie di Seneca, il fallimento di un progetto di scrittura di un vasto poema epico sull'imperatore Costantino il Grande e con un rilevante debito verso il secondo libro dell'*Eneide* di Virgilio (cf. Prandoni 2007: 31-8).

La vicenda inscena il crollo di Amsterdam nel 1300, dopo un anno di assedio. Quale novella Troia, la città viene conquistata con l'inganno la notte di Natale, mentre la popolazione celebra la messa, grazie a una nave stipata di soldati: il Cavallo di Mare. Il signore di Amsterdam, Gijsbreght,³ vorrebbe rimanere a sacrificarsi per la patria morente, ma l'angelo Raffaele, *deus ex machina* della vi-

2 Con la tregua di Anversa del 1609 la Spagna ammette *de facto* la costituzione della Repubblica delle Province Unite, ma il riconoscimento *de iure* tra il consenso delle nazioni arriverà solo nel 1648 con la pace di Vestfalia (cf. Grootes-Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen 2009; Geyl 2001; Israel 1998; Schama 1997).

3 Si mantiene qui la tradizionale distinzione grafica, già presente nella *princeps* del 1637, tra "*Gysbreght*", con cui ci si riferisce al titolo della tragedia, e "*Gijsbreght*", nome del protagonista eponimo (cf. Vondel 1637). Per un'edizione critica moderna della tragedia si veda Vondel 2013; Brunetti-Prandoni 2018, in corso di stampa.

ceda, dà ragione alla moglie Badeloch e gli ordina di partire per l'esilio insieme alla famiglia. La promessa con cui lo congeda è che Amsterdam, un giorno, – nel Seicento, il presente del pubblico in sala alla prima – “con splendore ancor più grande risorgerà dalle ceneri e dalla polvere” (“Zy zal met grooter glans uit asch en stof verrijzen”, Vondel 1638: 5.1830).⁴ Per quanto manchino elementi apertamente protestanti nell'opera, Vondel vi esalta esplicitamente la disfatta dei cattolici, offrendo loro, però, una legittimazione storica da sconfitti in seno alla nuova Repubblica.

Il debutto, inizialmente previsto per il 26 dicembre 1637 (coerentemente con la collocazione natalizia degli eventi), subì una breve dilazione a causa delle proteste del concistoro calvinista per la presenza di alcuni riferimenti ‘papisti’ nel testo. I borgomastri liberali, però, ritenendo plausibile che una vicenda ambientata nel Medioevo presentasse rituali cattolici e personaggi di religiosi in scena, ne permisero la rappresentazione il 3 gennaio 1638. Da allora la tragedia rimase nei repertori teatrali di Amsterdam, diventando col tempo un appuntamento consueto per capodanno, imprescindibile per la città, e banco di prova per i migliori interpreti e allestitori olandesi (cf. Albach 1937: 132; Smits-Veldt 1996). Nel 1968, però, la tradizione non resistette alle istanze della rivoluzione culturale e al pressante desiderio di rinnovamento dei cartelloni spettacolari. A parte qualche tentativo isolato, anche di importanti registi come Hans Croiset nel 1988, per alcuni decenni sull'opera calò dunque il silenzio.

A partire dagli anni Novanta si assistette a un riassetamento culturale in una società alla ricerca di un riorientamento identitario e nel 2003 la tragedia venne riproposta in scena con un allestimento fortemente attualizzante e politicamente impegnato da

⁴ Il testo base utilizzato in questa sede non è quello della *princeps* del 1637, pubblicato dal cartografo e matematico Willem Blaeu, ma quello edito dallo stesso Blaeu nel 1638 in occasione dell'effettivo debutto. La scelta della seconda edizione come testo base è dovuta alle particolari circostanze in cui venne alla luce. Come dichiarato nel frontespizio, Vondel stesso partecipò alla revisione del secondo testo di Blaeu, in cui vennero corretti alcuni refusi e introdotte piccole modifiche. L'interessamento autoriale, al fine di mettere a disposizione del pubblico un testo molto più corretto, ci ha convinti a preferire la versione del 1638 a quella del 1637.

parte del Theater Nomade di Ab Gietelink. Solo nel corso del 2011 si ritenne però giunto il momento di provare a ripristinare il tradizionale appuntamento annuale tra il *Gysbreght van Aemstel* e lo Stadsschouwburg di Amsterdam per il pomeriggio di capodanno 2012,⁵ innescando, come si è detto, ancora una volta, l'annoso e acceso dibattito tra critici e letterati sull'effettiva possibilità di rappresentare l'opera per un pubblico contemporaneo. Le maggiori perplessità avanzate, come già avvenuto nei secoli precedenti, non si focalizzavano tanto sui contenuti di natura storica (le cui implicazioni divennero sin dagli esordi subito oscure per la gran parte del pubblico olandese e quindi in un primo tempo ricontestualizzate, successivamente 'museificate' e infine negate), quanto sulla concezione strutturale di tipo narrativo, sulla netta prevalenza della parola sull'azione data dalla presenza di lunghi monologhi; una caratteristica precipua di molto teatro neerlandese del Seicento (cf. Eversmann 2012: 309-10).

Un argomento analogo, per esempio, venne avanzato ai primi dell'Ottocento anche da Jean Cohen presentando la prima traduzione francese di alcune opere patriottiche dei più importanti poeti drammatici olandesi per la collana *Chefs-d'oeuvres des Théâtres étrangers* pubblicata da Ladvocat. Nel mettere in evidenza come, a suo avviso, il merito del teatro dei Paesi Bassi fosse quello di essersi orientato molto presto sui modelli antichi, ancor prima dei classicisti francesi, Cohen ne prevede anche una difficile accoglienza sui palcoscenici parigini (1822: XVI-XVII). Il giudizio formulato non nasceva, come ci si potrebbe aspettare, da una considerazione in merito alla problematica ricezione degli argomenti trattati, ma da un'attenta disamina della struttura compositiva delle opere, compiuta per valutarne la possibile resa sui palcoscenici parigini a lui contemporanei. Ciò che il critico soprattutto deplorava nel *Gysbreght* – ma più in generale in tutta la produ-

5 Lo spettacolo rimase in cartellone ad Amsterdam fino all'8 gennaio 2012 e venne poi rappresentato in diverse città olandesi fino al successivo 18 febbraio; quindi venne nuovamente riproposto come appuntamento di capodanno, con lievi modifiche nel cast, anche nel gennaio 2013, 2014 e 2016. Dopo il quarto allestimento in cinque anni l'ente che eroga i contributi alle compagnie teatrali olandesi non ha ritenuto opportuno rinnovare il sussidio alla compagnia e l'avventura di Het Toneel Speelt si è conclusa (cf. HTS; Klamer 2018).

zione drammatica di Vondel – era la scarsa abilità nella costruzione dell'intreccio e un'insufficiente padronanza degli effetti scenici (96). Questo giudizio non stupisce, considerando la molteplicità dei generi spettacolari e l'atteggiamento fortemente imprenditoriale sotteso alle produzioni parigine sulle scene del XIX secolo; ma se decise ugualmente di tradurre il *Gysbreght* fu proprio in virtù dell'enorme successo spettacolare ottenuto in Olanda, grazie anche ai rilevanti tagli testuali operati per adattarlo alle esigenze della scena:

Le motif que nous avons eu pour donner la traduction de cette pièce, de préférence à celle de *Palamède* ou de *Marie Stuart*, a été qu'elle est la seule des tragédies de l'auteur qui soit restée au théâtre. Depuis qu'elle a été composée elle se joue constamment cinq ou six fois à Amsterdam vers les derniers jours de l'année; les meilleurs acteurs se font un devoir d'y prendre des rôles, et les décorations y sont d'une beauté extraordinaire, surtout celle qui représente la chapelle du couvent. Nous n'avons pas besoin de dire qu'à la représentation on supprime bien des passages, et que l'on raccourcit surtout les récits sans fin qui se répètent dans toutes les scènes.

[Il motivo che ci ha convinti a tradurre questo testo, preferendolo a *Palamede* o *Maria Stuarda*, è che è l'unica tra le tragedie dell'autore che sia rimasta in vita sulle scene. Da quando è stata composta, ad Amsterdam la si recita costantemente cinque o sei volte verso fine anno; i migliori attori ritengono un dovere recitarne i ruoli, e le scenografie sono straordinariamente belle, specialmente quella che rappresenta la cappella del convento. Non abbiamo bisogno di dire che nella rappresentazione si espungono molti passi e che si accorciano soprattutto i racconti senza fine che si ripetono in tutte le scene. (Cohen 1822: 99-100)]

D'altra parte, è certo come ad Amsterdam, sin dalle primissime rappresentazioni seicentesche, la declamazione dei versi alessandrini della tragedia venisse accompagnata anche da cori cantati e *tableaux vivants* che illustravano i momenti salienti della vicenda (cf. Eversmann 2012: 311-12). In particolare, il *tableau* dedicato ai "Kloostermoorden" ("Omicidi nel chiostro") è unanimemente ricordato con molteplici allestimenti e fatto segno di grande ammi-

razione in resoconti e studi storico-critici. Benché nei testi a stampa della tragedia licenziati dall'autore di propria mano (Vondel 1637; 1638; 1659)⁶ non vi siano espliciti riferimenti all'inserimento di un'azione pantomimica, sul palcoscenico cittadino – poco prima del lungo racconto del fratello di Gijsbreght, Arend, che descrive l'eccidio perpetrato in città, nel raccordo tra le due scene dialogiche del quarto atto (4.1072-3) –, il pubblico in sala assisteva a una rappresentazione eloquente e allusiva, bloccata in un'immagine sintetica, del massacro compiuto nel monastero (cf. Albach 1987; Vergeer 2015).

Nel 1729, a ragione di questa particolare organizzazione della rappresentazione e della sua eccezionale fortuna sulle scene di Amsterdam, lo stampatore dello Schouwburg David Ruarus, decise di pubblicare il testo “ora, per la prima volta, stampato parola per parola, com'è recitato nello Schouwburg di Amsterdam” (“Nu voor de eerste reize van woord tot woord gedrukt, gelijk het op den Amsterdamschen schouwburg gespeeld wordt”, Vondel 1729: frontespizio).

Tra le molte mutazioni prodotte dalla prassi attoriale, questa versione propone anche una partizione degli atti in scene assente nei testi precedenti, nonché l'indicazione della fine del terzo e del quarto atto in posizioni successive rispetto alle edizioni licenziate da Vondel. In questo modo i due cori cantati collocati a suggello di ciascun atto – “Rey van Klaerissen” (“Coro di clarisse”, Vondel 1637; 1638: 3.903-50) e “Rey van burghzaten” (“Coro di abitanti del castello”, Vondel 1637; 1638: 4.1239-88) –, vengono inglobati nell'azione recitata, mutando la loro primitiva funzione drammatica da commento corale extradiegetico a canto intradiegetico.

Nell'edizione del *Gysbreght* del 1729, in particolare, la fine del terzo atto viene disposta in concomitanza con l'esecuzione del *tableau vivant* relativo allo sterminio delle monache (Disraeli 1794: vol. 2, 171). Ne consegue quindi che, nelle rappresentazioni, subito dopo il “Coro di clarisse” si assistesse anche alla scena tra il vesco-

6 Si tratta delle due prime edizioni e dell'*ultima manus* autoriale, in cui la tragedia è profondamente rivista non solo dal punto di vista morfologico e ortografico ma anche ideologico, a seguito della conversione di Vondel al cattolicesimo romano avvenuta intorno al 1640 (cf. Brunetti-Prandoni 2018).

vo Gozewijn, la badessa Klaeris e Gijsebreght, ambientata all'interno del monastero, e quindi al *tableau vivant* del barbaro eccidio (Vondel 1729: 3.3-4.951-1072). Con questa soluzione la tradizione rappresentativa olandese prima del finale d'atto costruisce, con estrema sapienza tecnica, una sorta di 'episodio' drammatico chiuso dall'andamento crescente.

Rey van Klaerissen.

O Kersnacht, schooner dan de daegen,
 Hoe kan Herodes 't licht verdraegen,
 Dat in uw duisternisse blinckt, 905
 En word geviert en aengebden?
 Zijn hooghmoed luistert na geen reden,
 Hoe schel die in zijn ooren klinckt.

Hy pooght d'onnoosle te vernielen,
 Door 't moorden van onnoosle zielen, 910
 En weckt een stad en landgeschrey,
 In Bethlehem en op den acker,
 En maeckt den geest van Rachel wacker,
 Die waeren gaet door beemd en wey.

Dan na het westen, dan na'et oosten. 915
 Wie zal die droeve moeder troosten,
 Nu zy haer lieve kinders derft?
 Nu zy die ziet in 't bloed versmooren,
 Aleeerze naulix zijn geboren,
 En zoo veel zwaerden rood geverft? 920

Zy ziet de melleck op de tippen
 Van die bestorve en bleecke lippen,
 Geruckt noch versch van moeders borst.
 Zy ziet de teere traentjes hangen,
 Als dauw, aen druppels op de wangen: 925
 Zy zietze vuil van bloed bemorst.

De winckbraeuw dect nu met zijn booghjes
 Geloken en geen lachende ooghjes,
 Die straelden tot in 't moeders hart,
 Als starren, die met haer gewemel 930
 Het aenschijn schiepen tot een' hemel,
 Eer 't met een' mist betrocken werd.

Wie kan d'ellende en 't jammer noemen,
 En tellen zoo veel jonge bloemen,

Die doen verwelckten, eerze noch	935
Haer frissche bladeren ontloken,	
En liefelijck voor yder roken,	
En 's morgens droncken 't eerste zogh?	
Zoo velt de zein de korenairen.	
Zoo schud een buy de groene blaeren,	940
Wanneer het stormt in 't wilde woud.	
Wat kan de blinde staetzucht vrouwen,	
Wanneerze raest uit misvertrouwen!	
Wat luid zoo schendigh dat haer rouwt!	
Bedruckte Rachel, schort dit waeren:	945
Uw kinders sterven martelaeren,	
En eerstelingen van het zaed,	
Dat uit uw bloed begint te groeien,	
En heerlijk tot Gods eer zal bloeien,	
En door geen wreedheid en vergaet.	950

[*Coro di clarisse* / Notte di Natale, più luminosa del giorno, / come può Erode sopportare la luce / che, celebrata e adorata, / rifulge nelle tenebre? / La superbia non ascolta ragione, / per quanto chiara risuoni alle orecchie. // Erode vuole annientare l'innocente, / uccidendo anime innocenti. / Suscita il lamento in città e in campagna, / a Betlemme e nei dintorni, / risvegliando lo spirito di Rachele, / che va errando per distese erbose, // verso Occidente, e verso Oriente. / Chi consolerà la madre afflitta / che perde i suoi amati bambini, / appena venuti al mondo, / trucidati nel sangue / da spade tinte di rosso? // Vede tracce di latte ai bordi / delle labbra livide, / strappate al seno della madre. / Vede tenere piccole lacrime, / come gocce di rugiada, sulle guance / sporche, insozzate di sangue. // L'arco delle sopracciglia copre / gli occhietti chiusi, non più ridenti, / che scintillavano nel cuore della madre / come stelle, brillanti / nel viso trasformato in un cielo; / un viso ora avvolto nella nebbia. // Chi può dire il dolore e il pianto, / e contare quanti giovani fiori / sono appassiti prima / di mettere fresche foglie, / di spargere profumo amorosamente, / di bere con il nuovo giorno la prima rugiada? // Così trancia le spighe la falce. / Così scuote le verdi foglie una tempesta, / quando infuria nel bosco selvatico. / Cosa può tramare una cieca brama di potere, / quando spinta dal sospetto si scatena! / Davanti a cosa si potrebbe fermare? // Misera Rachele, smetti il tuo errare. / Muoiono martiri i tuoi

bambini, / primi segni di quel seme / che germoglierà dal tuo sangue / e fiorirà splendido a gloria di Dio. / La crudeltà non lo farà appassire. (Vondel 1638: 3.903-50)]

Iniziando con il canto sulla strage degli innocenti compiuta da Erode e terminando su un ‘quadro’ del massacro delle monache, si innalza allora la tensione e si tiene ancor più avvinto lo spettatore al filo degli eventi. In questo modo il “Klostermoorden” costituisce un sapiente *coup de théâtre* alla fine dell’atto centrale della tragedia. Senza un momento esplicativo, inoltre, il pubblico in sala verrebbe a conoscenza della terribile morte del vescovo, nonché delle sevizie compiute sulla badessa e le consorelle, molto dopo, solo nella scena iniziale del quinto atto dal personaggio del “Messaggero” (“Bode”, Vondel 1637; 1638: 5.1393-520). Il vivo e truculento racconto di atti non riproducibili in scena nel dettaglio – sulla scorta del divieto, più o meno esplicito, del teatro classico di rappresentare azioni violente – viene così anticipato da un’immagine muta, pregnante e dal forte impatto emotivo. In merito a questo specifico *tableau* messo in scena nel 1738 un commentatore illustre come Luigi Riccoboni scrive:

Une autre singularité de l’ancien Théâtre, est ce qu’on nomme *Vertoning* (Représentation) on baisse le rideau au milieu d’un Acte, & on dispose les Acteurs sur le Théâtre, de manière qu’ils représentent, comme à la façon des Pantomimes, quelque action principale du sujet. C’est ainsi que dans *Gysbrecht van Aemstel*, on leve le rideau, & le Théâtre représente les Soldats d’*Egmont* ennemi de *Gysbrecht*, qui saccagent un Couvent de Religieuses, où chaque Soldat en a une qu’il traite comme il veut: l’Abbesse est étendue au milieu du Théâtre, tenant sur ses genoux le vénérable *Goswin*, Evêque exilé d’Utrecht, massacré dans ses habits Pontificaux, la mitre en tête & la crosse à la main.

[Un’altra singolarità del Teatro antico è quella che si chiama *Vertoning* (Rappresentazione) si abbassa il sipario nel mezzo di un atto, e si organizzano gli attori sulla scena, in modo che rappresentino, alla maniera dei Pantomimi, alcune azioni principali del soggetto. Così, nel *Gysbrecht van Aemstel*, si alza il sipario e il teatro rappresenta i soldati di *Egmont*, nemico di *Gysbrecht*, che saccheg-

giano un convento di suore, dove ogni soldato ne ha una che tratta come vuole. La Badessa giace in mezzo al Teatro, tenendo in ginocchio il venerabile Goswin, vescovo esiliato di Utrecht, massacrato nei suoi abiti pontificali, con la mitra in testa e il pastorale in mano. (Riccoboni 1740: 145)]

Accanto a questa descrizione Eversmann (2012: 313-14), sulla scorta di Albach (1937: 139), ricorda anche un allestimento del *tableau* a fine Settecento, descritto da Pierre Coste d'Arnobat, la cui visione suscita negli spettatori un forte impatto emotivo; un'impressione utilizzata, secondo la lettura di Tim Vergeer, come "Denkraum", lo "spazio del pensiero", dell'elaborazione e del distacco dai traumi del reale teorizzato da Aby Warburg (2015).

Dopo aver analizzato il numero di personaggi coinvolti, l'organizzazione spazio-temporale, i costumi e gli oggetti descritti, la presenza dei cori, i *tableaux*, nonché la lunghezza dei versi, e dopo essersi concentrato sulle caratteristiche strutturali e le esigenze tecniche proposte dalla tragedia di Vondel nella sua primitiva stesura, Eversmann si dice piuttosto scettico sul potenziale di rappresentabilità rimasto al *Gysbreght* nel XXI secolo (2012: 314-15). L'allestimento della tragedia concepito da Het Toneel Spelt nel 2012 ribadisce, invece, che la bellezza letteraria dei versi di Vondel deve poter tornare a parlare al pubblico contemporaneo dai palcoscenici, per rispondere alle urgenze emotive e culturali della società, anche a costo di qualche licenza di adattamento.

Il coraggio di una riscrittura 'carnale' dei cori natalizi

La compagnia Het Toneel Speelt, che si è assunta il compito di rinnovare il tradizionale appuntamento con il *Gysbreght*, è stata fondata da Ronald Klamer e Hans Croiset nel 1995 con lo scopo precipuo di rivisitare il patrimonio teatrale nazionale con un'attenta esegesi dei testi drammatici tesa a superare le oltranzesperimentali di molto teatro olandese di fine secolo (cf. HTS). In uno spettacolo nel complesso piuttosto conservativo per l'attenzione dedicata al valore della parola e alla pronuncia del verso di Vondel, spiccano comunque alcune innovative e per certi versi sorprendenti scelte di allestimento (cf. Brunetti-Prandoni 2016a; 2016b).

I diversi luoghi scenici previsti dalla tragedia, ben confacentesi a uno spazio politopico di ascendenza medievale quale quello dello Schouwburgh del 1637, vengono risolti nel 2012 mediante l'utilizzo di una particolare struttura mobile: un palcoscenico-piattaforma di ferro che si solleva e si trasforma metaforicamente, di volta in volta, da mura della città assediata a cappella, a stanza del palazzo degli Aemstel, in cui si svolgono le scene conflittuali tra la coppia di coniugi, Gijsbreght e Badeloch. L'immenso e austero pavimento a scacchiera della piattaforma, inoltre, che rimanda a una ben nota iconografia artistica del Seicento olandese e in particolare a Vermeer, sottolinea anche la loro insanabile contrapposizione sulla supremazia delle ragioni della sfera pubblica su quelle della sfera privata, che verrà risolta solo al di fuori dello spazio umano con l'intervento del sovrannaturale. Infine, se nel testo di Vondel il *deus ex machina* è rappresentato in modo glorioso dall'angelo Raffaele, nello spettacolo di Het Toneel Speelt sul finale della vicenda compare invece, con la medesima funzione risolutiva, una delle monache seviziate durante la distruzione di Amsterdam: la badessa Klaeris che, martoriata, ritorna nei panni di un angelo, lacerato e insanguinato; un angelo che non scende più dall'alto, ma emerge barcollando dal basso. Al pari dell'*Angelus Novus* di Klee, secondo la celebre lettura proposta da Benjamin, è l'emblema di un angelo che è necessariamente sospinto verso il futuro, ma con lo sguardo rivolto all'indietro, verso le macerie e le vittime della Storia:

Es gibt ein Bild von Klee, das Angelus Novus heißt. Ein Engel ist darauf dargestellt, der aussieht, als wäre er im Begriff, sich von etwas zu entfernen, worauf er starrt. Seine Augen sind aufgerissen, sein Mund steht offen und seine Flügel sind ausgespannt. Der Engel der Geschichte muss so aussehen. Er hat das Antlitz der Vergangenheit zugewendet. Wo eine Kette von Begebenheiten vor uns erscheint, da sieht er eine einzige Katastrophe, die unablässig Trümmer auf Trümmer häuft und sie ihm vor die Füße schleudert. Er möchte wohl verweilen, die Toten wecken und das Zerschlagene zusammenfügen. Aber ein Sturm weht vom Paradiese her, der sich in seinen Flügeln verfangen hat und so stark ist, dass der Engel sie nicht mehr schließen kann. Dieser Sturm treibt ihn unaufhaltsam in die Zukunft, der er den Rücken kehrt, während der Trümmerhaufen

vor ihm zum Himmel wächst. Das, was wir den Fortschritt nennen, ist dieser Sturm. (Walter Benjamin, *Über den Begriff der Geschichte*)

[C'è un quadro di Klee che s'intitola *Angelus Novus*. Vi si trova un angelo che sembra in atto di allontanarsi da qualcosa su cui fissa lo sguardo. Ha gli occhi spalancati, la bocca aperta, le ali distese. L'angelo della storia deve avere questo aspetto. Ha il viso rivolto al passato. Dove ci appare una catena di eventi, egli vede una sola catastrofe, che accumula senza tregua rovine su rovine e le rovescia ai suoi piedi. Egli vorrebbe ben trattenersi, destare i morti e ricomporre l'infranto. Ma una tempesta spira dal paradiso, che si è impigliata nelle sue ali, ed è così forte che egli non può più chiuderle. Questa tempesta lo spinge irresistibilmente nel futuro, a cui volge le spalle, mentre il cumulo delle rovine sale davanti a lui al cielo. Ciò che chiamiamo progresso è questa tempesta. (Benjamin 2014: 120-1)]

Mentre l'angelo-monaca sevizata pronuncia i celebri versi di congedo rivolti a Gijbreght tutti i coefficienti visivi della scena sembrano suggerire con forza che il progresso verso quel futuro preannunciato di novità e gloria è sì inarrestabile, ma anche che non può essere costruito senza distruggere quanto fatto in precedenza; quindi che il progresso viene eretto sulle macerie del passato, sulla carne martoriata dei vinti e sugli orrori compiuti. In un'Olanda che da decenni dolorosamente riflette e s'interroga sul comportamento tenuto nella Seconda guerra mondiale nei confronti delle deportazioni di massa degli ebrei (Anbeek 2006), il monito lanciato da Het Toneel Speelt con questa scelta dirompente non può essere frainteso.

In linea con una rilettura in chiave contemporanea di alcune cifre tematiche del testo si pone in primo luogo la sua riscrittura da parte di Laurens Spoor, "in un certo senso fedele a Vondel . . . ma con notevoli cambiamenti e diversi tagli" (2018). Lavorando in sinergia con Klamer all'adattamento, pur mantenendo la forma in versi dell'originale, Spoor ha tradotto la lingua del Seicento in un olandese più comprensibile, ma che rispettasse metro e rima. Per favorire la comprensibilità senza ricorrere a parole palesemente moderne, nella versione per la scena ha privilegiato termini che si capisse-

ro e al contempo che facessero pensare al pubblico “Ah, sì, dev’essere Vondel!” (ibid.). Infine, come in altri allestimenti della tradizione, ha scelto sia di eliminare brani che a un orecchio contemporaneo risulterebbero troppo lunghi, sia di trasformare in dialogo alcuni monologhi, spezzando in due un verso e attribuendo il testo che segue a un altro personaggio.

Ma la novità più eclatante di questo spettacolo, sulla cui specifica portata scenica è interessante riflettere in dettaglio, è l’introduzione di tre nuovi cori composti in neerlandese moderno dal noto poeta cattolico Willem Jan Otten (1951-) in sostituzione dei primi tre celebri originali di Vondel. Al pari del drammaturgo seicentesco, Otten si è convertito al cattolicesimo in età adulta e non intende prescindere dalla dimensione religiosa della tragedia: “la sua riscrittura attualizzante dei cori”, scrive Prandoni, sembra porsi come “una critica verso la sensibilità novecentesca che ha innalzato (nel modernismo) l’arte a feticcio di Dio o crede di poter fruire arte cristiana al netto della fede” (2016: 161).

Nella primitiva suddivisione in cinque atti della tragedia, Vondel compose quattro cori (“*reyen*”) di struttura senecana con funzione extradiegetica, distanziante e di commento agli eventi, da eseguire ciascuno alla fine dei primi quattro atti, secondo le consuetudini drammaturgiche del periodo (cf. Van Gemert 1990: 48-94):

- “Coro delle vergini di Amsterdam / Si accordi il coro scelto di dolci voci” (“*Rey van Amsterdamsche maeghden / Nu stelt het puick van zoete keelen*”, Vondel 1638: 1.415-50), un canto di lode per la liberazione della città con l’invito a gioire sia per la fine delle ostilità che per il Natale;
- “Coro di nobili / Noi nobili, con la gioia nel cuore” (“*Rey van edelingen / Wy edelingen, bly van geest*”, Vondel 1638: 2.675-744), un canto di lode per Cristo bambino, al contempo sovrano divino e umile infante;
- “Coro di clarisse / Notte di Natale, più luminosa del giorno” (“*Rey van Klaerissen / O Kersnacht, schooner dan de daegen*”, Vondel 1638: 3.903-50), un compianto sul massacro degli Innocenti a Betlemme;
- “Coro di abitanti del castello / Dove mai si è trovata al mondo” (“*Rey van burghzaten / Waer werd oprechter trouw*”, Vondel 1638:

4.1239-88), un canto di lode per l'amore tra Gijsbreght e Badeloch, e di compassione per il timore che il marito sia morto.

Come ricorda Eversmann (2012: 296-8), anche se le loro intitolazioni alludono a gruppi di cittadini di Amsterdam, i cori si distaccano dal *continuum* narrativo della storia, a partire dal metro dei versi, dall'accompagnamento musicale presente sin dai tempi di Vondel e da una probabile collocazione spaziale separata dall'azione dialogica. L'argomento dei vari canti, invece, è strettamente legato, per analogia o contrasto, a quanto è accaduto o sta per accadere in scena: uno dei motivi su cui si impernia, infatti, l'intera tragedia è che la caduta della città e il massacro delle monache avvengono la notte di Natale, proprio nel momento in cui si realizza l'incarnazione – “Et verbum caro factum est” (“E il verbo si è fatto carne”, Giov. 1:1-14) – e la cristianità accoglie la nascita del messia. Si è detto che nel *Gysbreght* la salvezza per la città di Amsterdam corrisponde a una rinascita a nuova vita in seno alla Repubblica contestualmente alla distruzione e all'abbandono del passato e degli antichi ideali aristocratici medievali. Mentre allora i soggetti cantati dai primi tre cori (1. la gioia per la vittoria con l'attesa del messia; 2. la nascita gloriosa del bambino; 3. il compianto sul massacro degli innocenti) tematizzano per contrasto le tappe della progressiva caduta di Amsterdam e dell'annientamento di una stirpe, nel quarto coro, sulla scorta di una nota predica di San Bernardo sul *Cantico dei Cantici*, si esaltano i valori intimi della famiglia e del legame coniugale, ideali imprescindibili e fondanti per la nuova società olandese seicentesca:

Waer werd oprechter trouw
 Dan tusschen man en vrouw 1240
 Ter weereld oit gevonden?
 Twee zielen gloende aen een gesmeed,
 Of vast geschakelt en verbonden
 In lief en leedt.
 ...
 Daer zoo de liefde viel,
 Smolt liefde ziel met ziel,
 En hart met hart te gader.
 Die liefde is stercker dan de dood. 1260

Geen liefde kooft Gods liefde nader,
 Noch schijnt zoo groot.

Geen water bluscht dit vuur,
 Het edelst, dat natuur
 Ter weereld heeft ontsteecken.
 Dit is het krachtigste ciment,
 Dat harten bind, als muuren breecken
 Tot puin in 't end.

1265

...

[Dove mai si è trovata al mondo / fedeltà più sincera / che tra moglie e marito? / Due anime forgiate in una dall'ardore, / saldamente congiunte e legate / nella gioia e nel dolore. // . . . // Ove sia toccato un tale amore, / fonde l'amore anima con anima, / e cuore con cuore, in uno. / Quell'amore è più forte della morte. / Non c'è amore che si avvicini di più / all'amore di Dio, o sia così grande. // Non c'è acqua che estingua il fuoco / più nobile che la natura / abbia acceso al mondo. / Questo è il cemento più potente / che lega i cuori, quando i muri crollano / in polvere, alla fine. // . . . (Vondel 1638: 4.1239-44, 1257-68)]

Nell'avvicinare l'allestimento del *Gysbreght*, Klamer e la compagnia si sono interrogati a lungo sul livello di comprensione della Bibbia del pubblico secolarizzato contemporaneo e sull'opacità dei temi sottesi ai cori, così cruciali per la comprensione dell'opera. Vale la pena ribadire che nei tre secoli di fortuna scenica della tragedia l'atteggiamento con cui sono stati affrontati i cori presenta una lunga tradizione di varianti. Basti dire che, se il testo edito nel 1729, come si è visto, ingloba con funzione intradiegetica nell'azione i secondi due cori, espunge *de facto* i primi due.

"I cori di Vondel sono sacri." – scrive Klamer – "Il terzo coro 'Notte di Natale, più luminosa del giorno' ('O Kerstnacht schooner dan de daegen') è diventato un noto canto natalizio, intonato ancor oggi in chiesa" (2018); ma in questo modo si è persa la percezione della funzione originaria all'interno della tragedia. A Otten viene quindi chiesto di sostituire i primi tre cori con sue composizioni originali, che diventano rispettivamente di "madri in attesa" ("aanstaande moeders"), "neomadri dopo il parto" ("pas bevallen moeders") e "madri senza figli" ("kinderloze moeders"); una nuova triade di poemi in sin-

tonia con l'universo creativo proposto nella raccolta *Gerichte gedichten* (Poesie indirizzate) del 2011. Per lui la poesia è “espressione – metafisica, con accenti misticheggianti, ma anche metaletteraria – del desiderio religioso, con cui si dà forma, nella lingua, all'esperienza del sacro” (Prandoni 2016: 152; cf. Sonnenschein 2013).

Mettendosi all'ascolto del testo di Vondel e della sua dimensione religiosa, infatti, il poeta e drammaturgo amplifica uno dei suoi temi sottotraccia – e a ben vedere forse uno degli assi portanti del marchingeo drammatico, sviluppato soprattutto nei primi tre cori: la Natività e la storia della salvezza, costruita sul sangue di Cristo e su quello dei martiri. La decisione di Klamer di far riscrivere completamente i cori da un poeta che conosce a fondo l'opera di Vondel e ne intuisce le posizioni teologiche, ha permesso, da un lato, di riattualizzare il messaggio sotteso al testo, ormai non più trasparente, rendendolo così maggiormente fruibile; dall'altro, però, ha dato vita a diverse discussioni sulla liceità di tale operazione (cf. Prandoni 2016: 161; Croiset 2018: 37).

In un'intervista rilasciata poco prima del debutto a una giornalista del *Volkskrant*, Otten ha rivelato che il cuore della sua concezione poetica consisteva nel tentare di mettere in evidenza lo stretto legame esistente nella tragedia tra guerra, religione e violenza carnale: da un lato, come tutta l'azione si svolgesse poco prima e durante la notte di Natale, dall'altro, che la distruzione e lo stupro perpetrati su Amsterdam avevano un peso ancor più rilevante perché accadevano proprio in quella notte (Veraart 2011):

Si potrebbe dire che in questa “Notte di Natale, più luminosa del giorno” si compie una Pasqua. Ciò che ho provato a fare nei miei nuovi cori è tematizzare in modo più diretto l'elemento della violenza carnale, della distruzione proprio di ciò che avrebbe dovuto essere protetto sopra ogni altra cosa. E io desidero spiegare, alla mia maniera “post religiosa”, cosa significhi il Natale e, oltre a ciò, raccontare come in quella notte Maria stia anche partorendo. Che io sappia non è mai stata scritta poesia sulle doglie, sulla rottura delle acque, sulle spinte e sulla dilatazione dell'utero di Maria... Eppure questo è imprescindibile in relazione alla stupefacente idea che Dio assuma sembianze umane, o quantomeno lo è per me. Così facendo credo di non allontanarmi da Vondel, che è un poeta assai legato ai sensi. L'incarnazione è per lui una questione cor-

porale. Cristo dà il suo corpo, non un'idea. In Vondel la parola si fa carne. (Klamer 2018)

L'idea di guardare al Natale in senso più materiale e fisico, ponendo l'accento sull'aspetto propriamente viscerale e carnale della venuta al mondo di Cristo, permette anche al poeta di creare dei parallelismi ideali con i conflitti civili dei Balcani, e più in generale con le guerre di religione, ben presenti allo spettatore olandese dello spettacolo di Het Toneel Speelt.⁷

Nel primo coro Amsterdam viene dunque assimilata alla donna gravida che nuda, fragile e inerme, può con sollievo lasciarsi andare al travaglio dal momento che il nemico è fuggito:

Luister, moeders, houd je adem in,
tot achter in de achterhuizen
kun je de Zuiderzee nu horen ruisen,
want de vijand heeft zich omgedraaid.

Druk je oor nu tegen deze stenen buik,
de muren van de Nieuwe Kerk,
en hoor hoe onze lieve vrouwe
steunt en zucht en kreunt en kermt,

want de vijand is geweken.
Vrouwe laat je water stromen,
al je vliezen mogen breken.
Weg de tenten vol met wapens,

stil en leeg de ommelanden,
je kunt de ganzen horen grazen,
want de vijand is geweken,
weg hun paarden briezend 's nachts.

Lieve vrouwe vang je weeën,
heus je schoot wordt wijd en groot,
de vijand is van hier gevlogen,
geef je over aan je barensnood.

⁷ Nel 1999 un regista italiano, Antonio Syxty, ha messo in scena a Milano un'altra tragedia di Vondel, *Lucifero*, con i medesimi intenti civili, tratteggiando al posto di due schiere angeliche in lotta fra loro, due bande rivali di *gangsters* (Brunetti 2017: 95-7; 2018: 54-6).

U komt er aan, u bent op weg,
maar voor u krijten gaat dat u er bent
sterft onze vrouwe eerst de moord,
omdat u helemaal bestaat uit mens,

een mens bent u, kleddernaakt te baren
nu de vijand zich heeft omgedraaid.

Warm als een stal wordt nu de kerk,
de os staat klaar om u tot kind te likken,
wij gaan naar binnen, u bent welkome,
verdwenen is de vijand in de stille nacht.

Alle kaarsen worden aangestoken,
uw stro geschud, het linnen wit en zacht
om u voorzichtig in te winden,
al nooit tevoren wordt op u gewacht.

[Ascoltate, madri, trattenete il respiro, / fino all'ultima delle ultime case / sentite il rumore del mare: / si è ritirato il nemico. // Accostate l'orecchio al ventre di pietra, / ai muri della Nuova Chiesa: / ascoltate i sospiri e i gemiti / e i pianti e i lamenti di nostra signora: // il nemico è partito. / Signora, lascia fluire le acque / Rompere le mucose. / Spariti gli accampamenti pieni di armi, // vuote e silenziose le terre intorno, / senti le oche brucare: / il nemico è partito, / spariti i cavalli schiumanti la notte. // Nostra signora inizia le doglie, / com'è grosso il grembo e largo, / è fuggito via il nemico, / ora lasciati andare al travaglio. // Quasi ci sei, sei sulla strada, / ma prima che tu gridi "ci sono", / muore la donna assassinata, / perché tu solo di uomo sei fatta, // umana sei, nuda tremante a partorire / ora che se n'è andato il nemico. // Calda come una stalla è la chiesa, / pronto il bue a leccare il bambino, / noi entriamo, sei il benvenuto, / sparito è il nemico nella notte silenziosa. // S'accendono le candele, / la paglia per terra, i panni bianchi e lievi, / per avvolgerti piano: / atteso, tu, ora più che mai prima. (citato da Veraart 2011; trad. Marco Prandoni)]

Ma è nel secondo coro che la metafora elaborata da Otten prende pienamente senso con cadenze cristologiche impensate in un sottile gioco intertestuale con l'originale: il parto è rappresentato come una diga che si rompe davanti all'incalzare delle onde, al pari

del figlio/Cristo, che per venire al mondo ha dovuto con violenza attraversare la madre e il nemico la città. “La nascita implica una morte” – scrive Prandoni – “il Cristo fattosi uomo dovrà morire, così come Amsterdam deve crollare per poter un giorno rinascere” (2016: 165):

O Kerstnacht, het is nu
 het uur van bevallen,
 uw mama, Maria,
 is vol van ontsluiting,
 haar weeën verwijden
 haar meer dan zij nog kan
 verdragen, bezwijkend,
 een sluisdeur gekraakt door
 een stormvloed een Noordzee,
 en u kwam ontketend
 naar buiten gedreven,
 als wrakhout op golven
 gesleurd en gesmakt in
 de branding, haar monding
 een wijdopen sluffer,
 een bres in de wering,
 een eiland, een duintje,
 zo spoelde zij hene,
 uw moeder, verdween zij
 volstrekt in de weeën,
 het kon haar niet schelen
 wie of zij nog baarde,
 al wist zij dit moet wel
 mijn God zijn, mijn alles
 die alles doorboort, zelfs
 het liefste het zachtste
 doet rijten, u perste
 naar buiten, u moest door
 haar heen als de vijand
 die aan komt gedreund door
 de straten de stegen
 de gloppen, hij bonst op
 de huizen het klooster
 de kerkdeur, geboren

wordt u als een vuist uit
een meisje, maar eenmaal
ter wereld, ach hemel,
hoe hangt u te druipen,
kletsnat als een vis aan
de haak, aan de streng uit
uw navel, een visje
dat hapt naar wat water,
naar tepel, ach wrakhout
gesmakt op een vloedlijn,
zoogdiertje gelegd in
een voerbak, u was maar
een rompje, toen u werd
geboren, want eenmaal
op aarde - o Kerstnacht
o vijand die nadert
en nadert en nadert -
ach eenmaal op aarde,
volslagen in handen,
van stervers was u, u
de zwakste van allen.
Ontredderd wij mensen,
want u bent niet meer dan
een pluisje een duintje,
wat bent u voornemens,
wat is hier het plan van,
u bent de verwachte -
maar hoe dan, maar hoe dan?

[O Notte di Natale, è l'ora / di partorire, / la tua mamma, Maria, /
è piena di dilatazione, / le doglie l'allargano / più di quanto pos-
sa / soffrire, cede, / porta di chiusa incalzata / da un'ondata, da un
Mare del Nord, / e tu sei sprigionato, / trascinato di fuori, / come
un relitto sull'onde / trasportato e sbattuto / in risacca, la foce di
lei / un'ampia laguna / una breccia nella difesa, / un'isola, una du-
na, / così lei fluiva, / tua madre, scompariva / del tutto nelle do-
glie, / che le importava / chi, se partorisce, / ma sapeva dev'essere
/ il mio Dio, il mio tutto / che tutto perfora, / il più dolce, il più ca-
ro / dilacera, ti ha spinto / di fuori, l'hai dovuta / attraversare co-
me il nemico, / che arriva in tumulto nelle / strade i vicoli, / le fes-

sure, sbatte alle / case al chiostro / alla porta della chiesa, come / un pugno da una / fanciulla sei nato, ma una volta / al mondo, o cielo, / eccoti fradicio, / zuppo come un pesce / all'amo, al cordone / dell'ombelico, pesciolino / che boccheggia un goccio d'acqua, / la mammella, oh relitto / gettato tra le onde, / mammifero adagiato / in mangiatoia, eri un piccolo / tronco, nulla più, quando sei nato, perché una volta / in terra – o Notte di Natale / o nemico che si avvicina, / più vicino, più vicino – / oh, una volta in terra, / eri abbandonato / nelle mani dei mortali, tu / il più fragile di tutti. / Noi sconvolti / da te, pulcino, piuma, / quali i tuoi piani, / quale il senso di ciò – / tu sei l'atteso – / ma allora cosa, come? (citato da Veraart 2011; trad. Marco Prandoni)]

Il terzo coro, infine, che sostituisce il celebre “Canto delle clarisse”, da un lato riflette sulla fredda sterilità dei ventri delle monache, madri nubili votate al Signore in attesa della nascita dell'eletto, dall'altro sulla barbara sevizie di cui sono oggetto da parte dell'invasore. Spostando il fuoco della narrazione dalla metafora sul massacro degli innocenti all'eccidio perpetrato sulle monache, Otten fa coincidere, nelle parole del coro, il momento della nascita di Cristo con quello dello stupro. Guardando al mistero dell'incarnazione da una prospettiva carnale, corporale, intende far riflettere lo spettatore con maggiore attenzione sulla “realtà contemporanea della guerra e dello stupro” (Veraart 2011):

Wij hebben ons ons hele leven
aan niemand hoeven geven,

wij ongehuwde moeders
van het stilste teerste kind,

altijd maar op laatste dagen
van de ene zoon die wél is voortgeplant

maar niet uit ons komt voort gekropen,
zie, zelfs ik die niet meer bloedt
bleef broeds op u. Eitje Pasen ben ik
achter in de tuin verstopt,

van Onze Lieve Heer ben ik
het neuriënde graf.

Wij zussen van Clarisse
zijn van de binnenstad de ziel,

een diepe buik is Amsterdam
met ons daar biddend midden in.

Wij zijn het oog van de orkaan.
Wij zijn het laagste punt,
de doorgebroken vijand
daalt kolkend op ons aan.
Mannenvloed golft joelend
op onze ongebruikte buiken af.

Er is geen sterveling die voelt, hier, hier,
hoe u beweegt, zelfs wij die dragen niet.

U alleen, u, lieve, met uw heel precies
op onze navels neergelegde handpalm

weet welke maand wij zijn, u hebt ons
uitgerekend en u kent ons uur.

Zachte warme buik is Amsterdam
met ons Clarissen biddend binnenin.

Van alle nacht is deze nacht de zachtste,
Kerstnacht schoner dan de dagen, o,

holst van heel het uitgezongen jaar,
hartje kloppend in de diepste schoot,

moet heus mijn uitgedorde buik straks
worden opgespoord en opgebruikt -
komt als wij zijn genomen echt
de vijand klaar - zal het zo zijn

komt in uw uitgerekend uur, o lieve lief,
de overwinnaar aan zijn eindelijk gerief?

[Non ci siamo concesse / una vita intera / noi madri nubili / del
bimbo più buono e caro / sempre solo nei giorni estremi / di quel
solo figlio generato / ma non da noi figliato, / vedi, perfino io che
più non perdo sangue / ti ho covato. Sono l'uovo pasquale / nasco-

sto in giardino, / di Nostro Signore / la tomba sussurrante. / Noi sorelle di Clarissa / siamo l'anima del cuore della città / un ventre profondo è Amsterdam / con noi al centro a pregare. / Siamo l'occhio noi del ciclone, / il punto più basso siamo noi, / il nemico all'assalto / precipita in vortice su noi. / Ondata d'uomo prorompe / nei nostri ventri inutilizzati. / Non c'è mortale a sentire qui, qui / come ti muovi, nemmeno noi che ti portiamo. / Tu solo, caro, tu solo con / palmo precisissimo sulle nostre unghie / sai a che mese siamo, ci hai / calcolate e conosci la nostra ora. / Un ventre caldo e dolce, Amsterdam, / con noi Clarisse al suo centro a pregare. / Tra tutte le notti è questa la più dolce, / Notte di Natale più lucida del giorno, oh / cuore dell'anno intero passato, / cuore che batte nel profondo del grembo, / tutto il mio ventre rinsecchito presto / sia indagato e utilizzato / – gode davvero il nemico / una volta prese noi? – che sia così? / nella tua ora segnata, caro, o caro, / soddisfa le sue voglie il nemico? (citato da Veraart 2011; trad. Marco Prandoni)]

Anche la struttura metrica con cui questi nuovi cori vengono scritti gioca un ruolo importante nella concezione del poeta. Si passa infatti dal ritmo magicamente sospeso del primo coro a quello concitato e incalzante del secondo, che mima con effetti fonosimbolici la violenza della nascita contemporanea alla conquista della città da parte del nemico, per tornare al teso smarrimento del terzo. Affinché risultino pienamente efficaci necessitano infatti che l'attore dia loro voce nell'azione scenica.

Coerentemente con la concezione sottesa alla raccolta *Gerichte gedichten*, in cui la poesia è un rapporto intimo tra creatura e Creatore a cui ci si rivolge con un "tu" (Veraart 2011), nello spettacolo di Het Toneel Speelt il coro è impersonato da una voce sola. L'attrice Marisa van Eyle fa un passo in avanti verso il pubblico in sala, rivolgendoglisi in una lingua improvvisamente vicina, familiare, contemporanea, dopo gli alessandrini secenteschi del dialogo tra gli attori. Si tratta di una figura straniante e straniata dalla rappresentazione, che permette il distacco epidittico dello spettatore di brechtiana memoria dalla problematica realtà rappresentata (cf. Szondi 2000: 101). Vestita di un abito in velluto nero trapuntato con ricami dorati, che rimanda a un immaginario secentesco a differenza dell'atemporalità caratteristica dei costumi

degli altri personaggi, l'attrice ci costringe a riflettere sul nostro presente.

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Albach, Ben (1937), *Drie eeuwen 'Gijsbreght van Aemstel': Kroniek van de jaarlijksche opvoeringen*, Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- (1970), “De Schouwburg van Jacob van Campen”, *Oud Holland* 85: 85-109.
- (1987), “De vertoning van de kloostermoorden in ‘Gijsbrecht van Aemstel’”, *Literatuur* 4: 328-35.
- Anbeek Ton (2006), “Un mondo privo di libertà, bontà e verità? La seconda guerra mondiale e la letteratura olandese”, in Herman van der Heide e Tina Montone (ed.), *Sessant'anni dopo. L'ombra della seconda guerra mondiale sulla letteratura del dopoguerra*, Bologna: Clueb, 25-39.
- Benjamin, Walter (2014), *Angelus Novus: saggi e frammenti* (1955), Torino: Einaudi.
- Bloemendal, Jan and Frans-Willem Korsten (eds) (2012), *Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679). Dutch Playwright in the Golden Age*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Brunetti, Simona (2017), “Dal cielo ai bassifondi. Il primo allestimento italiano del ‘Lucifer’ di Vondel per la regia di Antonio Syxty (1999)”, in Roberto Cuppone (ed.), *Tra Venezia e Saturno. Storia, drammaturgia e poesia per Paolo Puppa*, Pisa: Titivillus, 88-97.
- (2018), “Van de hemel naar de lagere regionen. De eerste Italiaanse mise-en-scène van ‘Lucifer’ (1999)”, in M. Meijer Drees, Marco Prandoni e Rita Schlusemann (eds), *De glans van Vondels ‘Lucifer’. Opvoeren, vertalen, herinneren*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 49-56.
- Brunetti, Simona e Marco Prandoni (2016a), “Proporre il teatro della Repubblica delle Province Unite a un pubblico italiano: il caso di Joost van den Vondel”, in Cinzia Franchi (ed.), *Editoria e Traduzione: focus sulle lingue di “minore diffusione”*, Roma: Lithos, 193-213.
- (2016b), “Joost van den Vondel Milano 1999/Amsterdam 2012-: due tragedie olandesi del Seicento sulle scene contemporanee”, in Simona Cappellari, Giorgio Colombo, Franco Paris e Marco Prandoni (eds), *Quaderni del premio letterario Giuseppe Acerbi*.

- Letteratura Olandese*, Castel Goffredo, Mantova: Associazione Giuseppe Acerbi, 44-9.
- (eds) (2018), ‘*Gysbreght van Aemstel*’ di Joost van den Vondel. *Il crollo di Amsterdam in una tragedia del Secolo d’Oro olandese. Edizione critica, traduzione, fortuna*, Bari: Edizioni di Pagina [in corso di stampa].
- Cohen, Jean (ed.) (1822), *Chefs-d’oeuvre du théâtre hollandais. Tome I. Hooft, Vondel, Langendyk*, Paris: Ladvoat.
- Croiset, Hans (2018), “Wat stáát er? ‘Lucifer’ opvoeren. Aantekeningen bij een van de eerste repetities (1979)”, in M. Meijer Drees, Marco Prandoni e Rita Schlusemann (eds), *De glans van Vondels ‘Lucifer’. Opvoeren, vertalen, herinneren*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 19-37.
- Disraeli, Isaac (1794), *Curiosities of Literature. A new edition with large additions and improvements*, 2 voll., London: printed for John Murray, Fleet-street.
- Eversmann, Peter G.F. (2012), “Dramaturgy – Staging problems in Vondel’s ‘Gysbreght Van Aemstel’”, in Jan Bloemendal e Frans-Willem Korsten (eds), *Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679). Dutch Playwright in the Golden Age*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 285-315.
- (2013), “‘Founded for the Ears and Eyes of the People’: Picturing the Amsterdam Schouwburg from 1637”, in Jan Bloemendal, Peter G.F. Eversmann, and Elsa Strietman (eds), *Drama, Performance, and Debate*, Leiden: Brill, 269-95.
- Geyl, Pieter (2001), *History of the Dutch-Speaking Peoples 1555-1648*, London: Phoenix Press.
- Grootes, Eddy K. and Maria Adriana Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen (2009), “The Dutch Revolt and the Golden Age, 1560-1700”, in Theo Hermans (ed.), *A Literary History of the Low Countries*, Rochester, New York: Camden House, 153-291.
- Hogendoorn, Wiebe (2012), *De Schouwburg in beeld. Amsterdamse toneelscènes 1665-1772 / Sitting the Scene. The Amsterdam Stage in Pictures 1665-1772*, Houten: Hes & De Graaf.
- HTS = *Het Toneel Speelt*, <https://www.hettoneelspeelt.nl> (ultima consultazione 28 agosto 2018).
- Hummelen, Willem M. H. (1996), “1637. Jacob van Campen bouwt de Amsterdamse Schouwburg”, in Robert L. Erenstein (ed.), *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden. Tien eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 192-203.
- Israel, Jonathan I. (1998), *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*, Oxford: Clarendon.

- Klamer, Ronald (2018), "Non c'è arte senza ostacoli. Sulla vitalità del Gysbreght van Aemstel di Vondel", in Simona Brunetti e Marco Prandoni (eds), *'Gysbreght van Aemstel' di Joost van den Vondel. Il crollo di Amsterdam in una tragedia del Secolo d'Oro olandese. Edizione critica, traduzione, fortuna*, Bari: Edizioni di Pagina [in corso di stampa].
- Prandoni, Marco (2007), *Een mozaïek van stemmen: Verbeeldend lezen in Vondels 'Gysbreght van Aemstel'*, Hilversum: Verloren.
- (2012), "G.A. Bredero, P.C. Hooft, Joost van den Vondel. Amsterdam a teatro", in Jeannette E. Koch, Franco Paris, Marco Prandoni e Francesca Terrenato (eds), *Harba lori fa! Percorsi di letteratura fiamminga e olandese*, Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", 237-59 (edizione gratuita online <http://opar.unior.it/1631/>, ultimo accesso 28 agosto 2018).
- (2013), "Staging the History of Amsterdam in Vondel's 'Gysbreght van Aemstel': A Non-confessional Dramatic Contribution to the Narrative of the Dutch Revolt", in Jan Bloemendal, Peter G.F. Eversmann e Elsa Strietman (eds), *Drama, Performance, and Debate*, Leiden: Brill, 297-310.
- (2016), "Poesie indirizzate: Willem Jan Otten e i cori per un classico del teatro", in Herman van der Heide e Marco Prandoni (ed.), *Il segno elusivo. La traduzione italiana della poesia in neerlandese (e afrikaans) del XX e XXI secolo*, Rimini: Raffaelli, 151-71.
- (2018), "Un mosaico di voci in scena e sulla pagina. Storia, memoria, modelli culturali", in Simona Brunetti e Marco Prandoni (eds), *'Gysbreght van Aemstel' di Joost van den Vondel. Il crollo di Amsterdam in una tragedia del Secolo d'Oro olandese. Edizione critica, traduzione, fortuna*, Bari: Edizioni di Pagina [in corso di stampa].
- Riccoboni, Louis (1740), *Réflexions historiques et critiques sur les différens théâtres de l'Europe. Avec les Pensées sur la Déclamation*, Amsterdam: Aux Depens de la Compagnie.
- Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen, Maria Adriana (1991), *Dutch Literature in the Age of Rembrandt*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shama, Simon (1997), *The Embarrassment of Riches. An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Smits-Veldt, Mieke B. (1996), "3, Januari 1638. Opening van de Amsterdamse Schouwburg met Vondels 'Gysbreght van Aemstel'", in Robert L. Erenstein (ed.), *Een theatergeschiedenis der Nederlanden. Tin eeuwen drama en theater in Nederland en Vlaanderen*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 204-11.
- Sonnenschein, Johan (2013), "Het godverlaten gat - Otten, Kellendonk, Stevens", in Johan Goud (red.), *Het leven volgens Willem Jan Otten*.

- Redenen van het hart*, Zoetermeer: Klement, 111-30.
- Spoor, Laurens (2018), “‘Ah, sì, dev’essere Vondel!’: Come tradurre l’olandese in olandese”, in Simona Brunetti e Marco Prandoni (eds), *‘Gysbreght van Aemstel’ di Joost van den Vondel. Il crollo di Amsterdam in una tragedia del Secolo d’Oro olandese. Edizione critica, traduzione, fortuna*, Bari: Edizioni di Pagina [in corso di stampa].
- Szondi, Peter (2000), *Teoria del dramma moderno 1880-1950*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Van Gemert, Lia (1990), *Tussen de bedrijven door? De functie van de rei in Nederlandstalig toneel 1556-1625*, Proefschrift, Utrecht: Sub Rosa, Deventer.
- Veraart, Karin (2011), “Vondel met fremdkörpers”, *Volkskrant*, 22 december [<https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/vondel-met-fremdkörpers-b1f3e8a3/>] (ultima consultazione 23 settembre 2018)].
- Vergeer, Tim (2015), “Horror on Stage in the Dutch Republic. Re-thinking a Tableau Vivant from Joost van den Vondel’s *Gysbreght van Aemstel* (1637) through Aby Warburg’s Pathosformeln and Denkraum”, *Engramma. La Tradizione Classica Nella Memoria Occidentale* 130: 168-83.
- Vondel, Joost van den (1637), *Gysbreght van Aemstel, d’Ondergang van zijn stad en zijn ballingschap*, Treurspel, t’Amsterdam: by Wilhelm Blaeu.
- (1638), *Gysbreght van Aemstel, d’Ondergang van zijn stad en zijn ballingschap*, Treurspel, Door hem self verbertert en vermeert, t’Amsterdam: by Wilhelm Blaeu.
- (1659), *Gysbrecht van Aemstel. d’Ondergangk van zijne stad, en zijn ballingschap*, Treurspel, De leste druck, vermeert, en verbetert, t’Amsterdam: by de Weduwe van Abraham de Wees.
- (1729), *Gysbrecht van Aemstel*, Treurspel: Nu voor de eerste reize van woord tot woord gedrukt, gelijk het op den Amsterdamschen schouwburg gespeeld wordt, Amsterdam: David Ruarus.
- (2012), *Gijsbrecht van Amstel*, Het Toneel Speelt en Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam: met Mark Rietman, Carine Crutzen, Daan Schuurmans, Paul Hoes, Bart Klever, Reinout Scholten van Aschat, Marisa van Eyle, Fockeline Ouwerkerk, Leander de Rooij; regie Jaap Spijkers; reien Willem Jan Otten; dramaturgie, bewerking, hertaling Ronald Klamer en Laurens Spoor; decor Guus van Geffen; kostuums Bernadette Corstens; licht Stefan Dijkman; geluid Leo van der Zijden; Maud Mentink; advies casting Marc van Bree; fotografie Leo van Velzen.
- (2013), *Gysbrecht van Aemstel*, Met inleiding en aantekeningen door Mieke B. Smits-Veldt (1994), Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Piano d'evasione: carcere e utopia negli Shakespeare della Compagnia della Fortezza

NICOLA PASQUALICCHIO

Abstract

This article examines the performances that the Compagnia della Fortezza, composed of prisoners in the Volterra prison and directed by Armando Punzo, has drawn from Shakespeare's texts. The analysis is based on two preliminary assumptions: 1) that in experimental theatre the relationship of the show with the dramatic text is not 'representative' but 'reactive', and precisely for this reason inclined to activate multiple meanings even at the cost of the complete disarray of the original dramaturgy; 2) that the particular predilection shown by experimental theatre towards Shakespeare is mainly due to the recognition, within his work, of a rich potential for signification always to the point of breaking out, a sort of invitation to go beyond the confines of individual texts towards a largely intertextual stage rewriting. These assumptions are verified in the dramaturgical and directorial work of Punzo with particular regard to the three Shakespearean projects developed between 2009 and 2016, in which the purpose of freeing poetry from the confining nature of the text is configured as an 'evasion plan', which naturally acquires a strong and very specific feeling within the prison institution.

La Compagnia della Fortezza, fondata nel 1988 dal regista Armando Punzo all'interno del carcere di Volterra,¹ è da trent'anni una delle

¹ "A Volterra, ormai da secoli, la possente Fortezza medicea ospita un carcere. Dalla seconda metà del secolo scorso il carcere di Volterra, storica Casa di Reclusione, era stato destinato ad ospitare due distinti circuiti penitenziari. Uno, il circuito alta sicurezza, rivolto ai detenuti appartenenti alla criminalità organizzata. L'altro, il circuito di media sicurezza, destinato ai detenuti estranei a consorterie organizzate di tipo mafioso o terroristico. Dal mese di dicembre del 2013, consacrandone la vocazione trattamentale, l'istituto di Volterra è stato riconvertito in istituto destinato unicamente a detenuti media sicurezza. Tradizionalmente alla Fortezza vengono assegnati detenuti in espiazione di pene particolarmente lunghe. Proprio dalla permanenza dei condannati all'interno della struttura per molti anni, deriva la possibilità,

realtà più importanti del teatro di ricerca italiano.² Essa costituisce un caso del tutto particolare all'interno delle numerose iniziative italiane di teatro in carcere, sia per l'assiduità del lavoro, svolto pressoché quotidianamente da Punzo con i suoi attori carcerati in funzione della produzione di uno spettacolo all'anno, sia per gli obiettivi che si propone. Quella della Fortezza è infatti la sola esperienza di questo tipo che non si fissi un obiettivo di carattere primariamente sociale, sia esso di carattere riabilitativo o semplicemente ricreativo, ma artistico. Essa si attua infatti attraverso un rigoroso training, che mira a fare dei partecipanti degli attori in senso pieno, con il significato forte che la parola 'attore' ha assunto nel teatro del Novecento almeno a partire dalla pedagogia di Jerzy Grotowski: una figura di cui l'aspetto professionale e quello umano non possono essere scissi, in quanto il conseguimento della tecnica non può mai essere disgiunto da un altrettanto rigoroso percorso verso la consapevolezza interiore. Ma il fatto che il progetto teatrale di Punzo non intenda essere semplicemente strumentale rispetto agli intenti rieducativi del sistema carcerario, bensì un'impresa artistica e culturale valida in sé, non prescinde assolutamente, e d'altronde non potrebbe farlo, dalla concreta circostanza che esso sia nato e si sia sviluppato in una struttura carceraria e di avere come attori persone generalmente condannate a lunghe pene detentive. Anzi, di questa situazione tale progetto fa il suo punto forte e la sua profonda giustificazione artistica. Nell'ambito di quella che è stata significativamente definita una "poetica evasiva"³ (Ciari 2011: 61), Punzo vede nel carcere non tanto una metafora, quanto l'esempio-limite, il punto di massima e più tragica evidenza della condizione umana, o quanto meno di quella condizione umana che è presupposta da una certa concezione

rectius la necessità, di elaborare progetti trattamentali, che, sviluppandosi nel corso del tempo, consentano l'attivazione di altrettanti percorsi di crescita da parte degli interessati" (<http://www.lafortezzadivoltterra.it/voltterra/it>).

² In particolare negli ultimi anni, la Compagnia della Fortezza ha conseguito rinomanza e attenzione critica a livello internazionale. Aneta Mancewicz, nel suo studio sulle performance intermediali derivanti da testi shakespeariani, la descrive come "one of the most intriguing theatre groups in Europe" (Mancewicz 2014: 30).

³ L'idea di 'evasione' è naturalmente da intendersi qui nel suo senso più forte e concreto, diametralmente opposto a quello di svago o intrattenimento.

di stato e di società. Per questo, proprio il carcere può avere per l'uomo una funzione di 'risveglio', di una chiamata alla liberazione dalle istituzioni che ci chiudono, dai ruoli che ci legano, dai personaggi in cui ci troviamo segregati. Nella sua condizione di escluso da un mondo che si crede libero, il detenuto più di chiunque altro può raggiungere e trasmettere la consapevolezza di tale paradosso.

Il teatro è la forma di espressione artistica in cui meglio tale consapevolezza può imparare a riconoscersi e a rendersi visibile, anche perché esso è a sua volta il luogo metaforico di una potente, persistente dialettica tra reclusione e liberazione. Da una parte, infatti, il teatro, almeno nella sua moderna concezione occidentale, dipende dal testo scritto, ed è condannato a metterlo in scena rimanendo ingabbiato nella letteralità delle sue parole, nell'identità dei suoi personaggi, nella consequenzialità della storia che narra. D'altra parte, nel momento in cui questo testo prende a incarnarsi nei corpi, nelle voci, nei sentimenti di persone viventi che entrano in una reciproca e nuova relazione umana, si origina una spinta contraria alla conservazione letteraria del testo, che tende a svilupparne tutta l'implicita energia e la molteplicità di significati trasgredendone la lettera ed evadendo dalla prigione dell'ordine verbale costituito. Su un versante, dunque, il teatro come istituzione, prescrizione, testo; sull'altro, il teatro come evasione, liberazione dell'energia espressiva contenuta nel testo e della ricchezza imprevedibile dei suoi sensi riposti attraverso la poesia del linguaggio scenico. Ciò che avviene nella lunga, quasi annuale preparazione di uno spettacolo da parte di Punzo, dei suoi attori e dei suoi collaboratori (alle scene, ai costumi, alle musiche) è precisamente la trasformazione del teatro-istituzione (culturale) in teatro-liberazione (artistica); l'individuazione, potremmo dire, delle vie di fuga dalla fissità del testo rese possibili dalla realizzazione, sempre libera e rivedibile, dello spettacolo.

Con scarsissime eccezioni, dunque, ogni lavoro di Punzo prende le mosse da un testo, drammatico o, talvolta, narrativo. Ma lo fa per avviare quel processo di 'evasione' dal testo di cui abbiamo detto, processo in sé interminabile, e dunque ripreso sempre da capo e secondo le differenti vie di fuga che ciascuna partitura verbale preventiva contiene in sé e ci indica, ma ogni volta con il valore aggiunto di un'accresciuta esperienza umana e artistica. Nelle

scelte di Punzo e dei suoi attori, i testi di Shakespeare godono di un privilegio evidente e crescente, se scorriamo l'elenco degli spettacoli fin qui prodotti. Tale preferenza va in parte ricondotta al più ampio atteggiamento del teatro di ricerca nei confronti del massimo drammaturgo inglese. Tale teatro, almeno in Italia, ha frequentemente 'reagito'⁴ a Shakespeare, più di quanto non abbia fatto nei confronti di qualsiasi altro drammaturgo del passato o contemporaneo. La spiegazione di questo fenomeno è duplice. Innanzitutto, le opere di Shakespeare, in particolare quelle più celebri, sono sufficientemente conosciute, quantomeno nelle loro linee generali, da un pubblico vasto; le loro vicende possono perciò essere, secondo i procedimenti tipici della sperimentazione teatrale, variate, smontate e rimontate, interpolate, a partire da una conoscenza di base delle trame e dei personaggi che rende estesamente comprensibile la portata dell'intervento 'reattivo' praticato dallo spettacolo. In secondo luogo, persiste, anche nei teatranti contemporanei più avversi alla dimensione testuale del teatro, la coscienza che l'imparaggiabile ricchezza, potenza e varietà dell'opera shakespeariana la rendono tutt'oggi una inesauribile miniera di teatralità nel senso più profondo ed essenziale, ben al di là del valore letterario dei suoi testi. In tale prospettiva, Shakespeare appare al teatro di ricerca che gli 'reagisce', non tanto come un drammaturgo tra gli altri, per quanto grande egli possa essere, ma come il teatro nella sua essenza stessa, il deposito in qualche modo definitivo e insuperato delle potenzialità della teatralità occidentale: potenzialità tali che il teatro istituzionale, rappresentativo, 'letterale' nei confronti del testo, finirebbe più per limitarle che per liberarle.

'Smontare' Shakespeare può allora apparire, in questa direzione, non tanto un tradimento nei suoi confronti, quanto una prosecuzione fino al limite estremo di una sua congenita tendenza a debordare rispetto a sé stesso, ad aggregare con grande maestria ma anche straordinaria libertà i più diversi materiali; al contempo,

4 Utilizziamo il termine 'reagire' in intenzionale opposizione all'idea del 'rappresentare': nella prospettiva del teatro di ricerca, come aveva ben compreso e insegnato Grotowski, "uno spettacolo non è una rappresentazione della *pièce*, non una accettazione passiva ma una reazione" (Temkine 1969: 56).

l' 'apertura' ineguagliabile del suo linguaggio, la suggestione che esso possa dar voce e figura a ogni aspetto dell'uomo e del mondo, è una sorta di lezione ai teatranti verso quell'ulteriore apertura intertestuale (citazioni, interpolazioni, allusioni) che è spesso praticata nelle 'reazioni' sperimentali a Shakespeare, quasi che la sua lingua teatrale avesse la capacità e il privilegio di attirare a sé e fare proprie anche le parole di altri drammi, altri miti, altre forme letterarie.⁵

Il teatro di Punzo è certamente e comprensibilmente ascrivibile a tale approccio sperimentale nei confronti di Shakespeare, ed è per molti aspetti il più adatto a cogliere ed esaltare il potenziale di apertura intertestuale dei suoi drammi. Shakespeare possiede, nella prospettiva di Punzo, delle caratteristiche (la grandezza letteraria, l'assunzione nell'olimpico dei massimi poeti dell'umanità) che tendono a farne un caposaldo dell'istituzione culturale occidentale, e dunque un sistema testuale canonizzato e irrigidito nella sua intoccabile grandezza. Ma molti intelligenti e 'irrispettosi' allestimenti sperimentali, a cominciare da quelli di Carmelo Bene, hanno saputo mostrarci come sia il drammaturgo stesso ad avere iniettato nelle sue opere massicce dosi di antidoto a questo potenziale irrigidimento attraverso, appunto, la geniale libertà costruttiva dei suoi testi, la sua innata inclinazione a violare i confini tra l'alto e il basso, il comico e il tragico, la fiaba e la storia, il sogno e la realtà, e la sua capacità di cogliere nella mente dell'uomo l'incontenibile fluttuazione tra bene e male, meschinità e grandezza, ragione e follia. Tale antidoto è però, secondo Punzo, ormai scarsamente visibile e utilizzabile, e lo Shakespeare canonizzato e riciclato che conosciamo non serve più al

5 Sul generale atteggiamento del teatro italiano, non solo sperimentale, nei confronti di Shakespeare in particolare a partire dagli anni Settanta, ha scritto Vincenza Minutella che le recenti traduzioni per la scena delle opere del Bardo "considerably rewrite the source text, significantly cut it, or make omissions or additions. Moreover, there are cases in which Shakespeare's play is used only as an intertext to be combined with other texts" (38). Minutella assimila questo approccio intertestuale nei confronti di Shakespeare "to what Aaltonen describes as imitations or parodies of the source text which 'select material, ideas, or themes from it, . . . rearranging and combining them with new elements'" (Minutella 2013: 117). La fonte della citazione interna è Aaltonen 2000: 79.

teatro attuale. Ciò è però anche dovuto, agli occhi del regista, a una debolezza del drammaturgo congenita alla sua stessa genialità, quella di avere intuito una nuova condizione dell'umanità senza saperle però conferire la forma adeguata, senza riuscire a spingere il suo sguardo oltre l'esistente; di avere presentito un nuovo stato dell'uomo, incarcerandolo però dentro vecchie forme e parole lacerate tra questa nuova visione e i vincoli del passato:

Di Shakespeare non mi interessa il soggetto, ma la sua ombra. Dei suoi personaggi e intrighi che copiano la vita e le danno concretezza, mi interessa il non detto, il mancante, l'aspirazione a un'altra esistenza.

L'ombra è l'altra faccia della medaglia, è il negato, il personaggio mancato da riscrivere per sottrazione, è il soggetto invisibile.

...

Gli è mancata quella forza creativa che lo portasse a guardare oltre l'esistente, oltre quello che sembrava l'esistente.

Non ha avuto fiducia, non ha saputo creare un altro uomo che sentiva forte in sé, ma che non aveva ancora forma.

I suoi spiriti sono il timido tentativo di dare vita a possibilità ancora inesprese, in-esistenti, non ancora osservabili nell'uomo, ma che in qualche modo avvertiva.

Shakespeare, per essere troppo fedele alla realtà oggettiva dell'uomo, si è smarrito come poeta dell'Altro.

...

Non bisogna fermarsi a questo formatore e governatore di anime. Il teatro che ne rispetta la forma ne tradisce lo spirito.⁶

(<http://www.compagniadellafortezza.org/new/gli-spettacoli-2/gli-spettacoli/shakespeare-know-well/>)

Shakespeare, dice Punzo, "è superato" (ibid.). O forse, meglio, è da superare; ma tale superamento non può avvenire se non passando

6 Le frasi citate fanno parte della dichiarazione di poetica inserita da Punzo nel programma di *Shakespeare. Know well* e poi nuovamente in quello di *Dopo la Tempesta*, ora reperibili nel sito della Compagnia.

attraverso i suoi stessi testi. Negli spettacoli shakespeariani della Fortezza, dunque, l'ombra e il non-detto di Shakespeare lavorano a disgregare dall'interno lo Shakespeare-istituzione, e lo spirito celato nelle sue parole pianifica di evadere dalla prigione in cui la loro stessa grandezza formale tenderebbe a rinchiuderle. Shakespeare, per la Fortezza, è al contempo una prigione e un piano d'evasione.

È all'inizio del nuovo millennio che la compagnia del carcere comincia a rivolgere la propria attenzione al massimo dramma-turgo inglese, con il *Macbeth* del 2000⁷ (una sorta di psicodramma centrato sulla scena dell'uccisione di Duncan all'interno di un opprimente scatolone di cartone), seguito l'anno successivo da un *Amleto*⁸ che si scrosta di dosso progressivamente l'immagine ormai obsoleta e rassicurante di un testo troppo noto (qui rappresentato dall'immagine, via via smantellata, di un colorato e falsissimo villaggio svizzero) per approdare "a un testo che rielabora l'originale distruggendolo" (Punzo 2013: 107), l'*Hamletmaschine* di Heiner Müller. Ma è a partire dal 2009 che l'incontro con (e congedo da) Shakespeare ha prodotto i risultati più significativi, con la trilogia di spettacoli di cui ci proponiamo di svolgere ora una breve analisi: *Alice nel paese delle meraviglie – Saggio sulla fine di una civiltà – Primo studio* (2009), rielaborato e ripreso come *Hamlice – Saggio sulla fine di una civiltà* (2010); *Romeo e Giulietta – Mercuzio non vuole morire* (2011), rielaborato e ripreso come *Mercuzio non vuole morire – La vera tragedia in Romeo e Giulietta* (2012); *Shakespeare. Know well* (2015), rielaborato e ripreso come *Dopo la Tempesta. L'opera segreta di Shakespeare* (2016). Questo elenco mostra con chiarezza che la preparazione di ognuno dei tre spettacoli si è articolata in un progetto biennale, di cui si presentava un primo studio al termine del primo anno di lavoro per poi approdare al risultato 'compiuto'⁹ dopo altrettanto tempo. Risulta peraltro evidente

7 Prima rappresentazione 17 luglio 2000, carcere di Volterra.

8 Prima rappresentazione 16 luglio 2001, carcere di Volterra.

9 L'idea di spettacolo compiuto in senso pieno è in realtà estranea alla poetica come alla prassi teatrale di Punzo. Anche quando arriva alla prima rappresentazione ufficiale, uno spettacolo della Fortezza rimane un'opera per molti aspetti aperta: sia perché pronta a rimodellarsi nel momento in cui entra in altri spazi, convenzionali o meno, comunque molto diversi rispetto al cortile e agli interni della prigione dove è nato; sia perché la precisione del

da questi dati il fatto che la gran parte della ricerca di Punzo e della sua compagnia tra il 2009 e il 2016, con una sola parentesi dedicata a Jean Genet nel 2013 e 2014, ha avuto Shakespeare come proprio fulcro.

Può apparire sorprendente, se ci basiamo sul solo titolo (*Alice nel paese delle meraviglie*), che lo studio del 2009 abbia a che fare con Shakespeare, annunciandosi in apparenza come trasposizione scenica del capolavoro di Lewis Carroll. In realtà, già in esso è pienamente presente, al punto di costituire il vero senso dello spettacolo, quello slittamento del testo di *Amleto* verso il mondo nonsensico e fantasiosamente anarchico del personaggio di Carroll, che poi il titolo dello spettacolo successivo espone apertamente per mezzo del nome ibrido di *Hamlice*. L'idea forte di questo progetto teatrale nel suo complesso consiste nella concretizzazione scenica della metafora del testo-prigione: attori e spettatori sono contenuti per gran parte della performance all'interno di angusti spazi interamente rivestiti (sulle pareti, sul soffitto e sul pavimento) da teli candidi fittamente vergati da una calligrafia nera che riproduce il testo completo di *Amleto*. L'invasività grafica del testo è accentuata dalla sua presenza anche sui costumi bianchi di alcuni personaggi silenziosi e passivi, che si limitano ad appoggiarsi alle pareti coperte di parole e a toccarle come se fossero adepti e schiavi del testo scritto. Al bianco e nero, loro e della scenografia, ribadito dal costume nero di Punzo nelle vesti di un Amleto monologante, si opporrà in modo crescente il cromatismo sempre più vivace e acceso dei costumi e dei trucchi di personaggi provenienti da altri drammi, per lo più contemporanei, che via via popolano i corridoi e le stanzette attraverso i quali gli spettatori si spostano come tra le stazioni di un dramma medievale, le cui azioni però non si succedono nel tempo, ma avvengono e si ripetono simultaneamente. In quella sorta di singolare music-hall fantasioso e circense che si viene così a creare, popolato di *fools* e di *drag queens*, poche, e quasi interamente dette da Punzo, sono le battute letteralmente riprese da *Amleto*, e nulla resta dello svolgimento del suo plot; ma lo stesso testo di Carroll si presenta solo per allusio-

tracciato registico non impedisce, in ogni spettacolo, il mantenimento di un margine di libertà improvvisativa. cf. Ciari 2011: 62-4, 66-7.

ni, visive più che verbali, in particolare quella del Bianconiglio che, dopo avere introdotto il pubblico all'interno del testo-prigione attraverso una porta in forma di copertina di libro, si aggira tra pubblico e attori inseguito da Alice. Non sono due storie che si contrappongono o si intersecano, quella del principe di Danimarca e quella della bambina nel paese delle meraviglie, ma due posizioni culturali e artistiche, il testo-istituzione e il teatro-poesia, che si confrontano attraverso i loro emblemi. Alice non è lì per raccontare un'altra storia, ma per infondere un'altra energia, per sciogliere la fissità dei ruoli dei personaggi tradizionali. La sua forza è la disponibilità metamorfica che Carroll le ha infuso, l'impossibilità di fissarsi in una forma e in un'identità. Nell'anima di Amleto c'è terreno fertile per questo, purché lo si coltivi: già in Shakespeare, infatti, il principe sta stretto nella sua identità di preteso eroe vendicatore, ruolo al quale cerca di sottrarsi procrastinando il proprio dovere e cercando rifugio nel suo umore bizzarro e fantastico. Proprio questo umore, contagiato dalla disposizione anarchica dei personaggi di Carroll, sembra allora produrre un'espansione e una dissolvenza fantasmagorica del personaggio shakespeariano in altri personaggi e del suo testo in altri testi, come se Amleto potesse sognare la propria reincarnazione in figure della drammaturgia contemporanea francese (da Jean Genet a Jean-Luc Lagarce) o italiana (da Annibale Rucello a Enzo Moscato) o presentire la propria disgregazione nell'*Hamletmaschine* di Heiner Müller, tutti autori evocati ed estesamente citati all'interno dello spettacolo. Lo studio del 2009 termina con l'uscita all'aperto degli attori, che raccolgono nel cortile della prigione gli applausi del pubblico: finale emotivamente liberatorio, come il primo piccolo segnale di una possibile fuoriuscita dell'uomo dalle proprie prigioni sociali e culturali, ma in certa misura anche pessimista nel momento in cui il testo-prigione è stato lasciato intatto e i personaggi, nel loro tentativo di prescindere, sono stati comunque obbligati ad agire al suo interno. È un'aporia, questa, che Punzo e i suoi attori hanno avuto certamente presente nella successiva fase di lavoro, che ha portato alla realizzazione di *Hamlice*, spettacolo in gran parte coincidente con *Alice*, ma che ha al suo attivo, oltre a una notevole rifinitura sotto il profilo registico, alcune decisive variazioni. Una riguarda proprio il finale, nel quale la Compagnia decide di dare un se-

gnale più forte e propositivo, anche se forse un po' didascalico, in direzione della possibilità di superamento delle gabbie verbali e concettuali che ci chiudono: nella fuoriuscita finale, gli spettatori trovano ad attenderli una montagna di lettere dell'alfabeto di polistirolo, che gli attori li invitano a raccogliere e lanciare in aria, in una festosa e spettacolare pioggia di vocali e consonanti in libertà, mentre la voce di Punzo li incita a perpetuare il gesto, a scombinare le parole, ad azzerarne il senso che ci imprigiona, perché su nuove, inedite combinazioni di parole, "mai immaginate e mai dette, solo sognate" (Punzo 2013: 220)¹⁰ come quella che ha dato origine al nome 'Hamlice', potrà nascere un altro pensiero e un nuovo uomo.

Nella versione del 2010, d'altronde, l'opposizione simbolica tra prigionia nel testo e nell'istituzione e liberazione da essi non può più essere identificata con l'immediata opposizione fisica tra il dentro e il fuori. Se lo spettacolo inizia, infatti, ancora una volta con un percorso degli spettatori tra le pareti interne ricoperte dalle parole del testo, le stanze risultano tuttavia, per il momento almeno, svuotate di presenze attoriche, e il pubblico stesso ne è presto estromesso per confluire all'aperto, nel cortile del carcere. Lo spazio aperto non evoca però, in questo caso, una situazione di libertà, ma, al contrario, di chiusura: siamo infatti nella corte di Elsinore, che la voce di Punzo denomina nelle sue prime battute "il teatro della corte", un luogo che di per sé "induce disperazione", tanto che ci vuole del "coraggio ad entrare qui dentro".¹¹ La fuoriuscita fisica del pubblico in uno spazio esterno non corrisponde dunque a una liberazione simbolica, ma all'ingresso "in un altro tipo di claustrofobia" (Ciari 2011: 36), un teatro prigioniero del testo e del potere (la corte, appunto), ossia di un'istituzione culturale e di un'istituzione politica che si garantiscono vicendevolmente e si rispecchiano l'una nell'altra. Diversamente da quanto accadeva nel precedente studio, *Hamlice* accoglie una sia pur embrionale e frammentaria rappresentazione del testo shakespeariano, per

¹⁰ Queste parole fanno parte di un monologo della Regina della Notte, recitato da Punzo nel finale di *Hamlice* e parzialmente riportato in Punzo 2013.

¹¹ Le tre frasi citate fanno parte del monologo di Punzo in veste di Amleto che apre la parte dello spettacolo ambientata nel cortile.

quanto *sui generis*: il pubblico assiste all'apparizione del fantasma del padre e a brani di dialogo tra Amleto e Claudio e tra quest'ultimo e Rosencrantz e Guildenstern, oltre ad ascoltare i commenti preoccupati ("Non mi piace. Non mi piace. Non mi piace") di uno Yorick redivivo. Tali residui o echi di azioni previste dalla tragedia shakespeariana sono presentati in modo rapsodico e quasi trasognato, come filtrato attraverso la soggettività di Amleto, e nello stesso tempo rigido, marionettistico, funereo: è il teatro raggelato dal testo, interamente dominato dalla bicromia bianco-nero che prolunga sulla scena l'immagine dell'inchiostro sulla pagina. La storia che si dovrebbe rappresentare si mostra refrattaria a un dipanamento fluido e coerente, e tale impasse si presenta come una sorta di *objective correlative* della riluttanza di Amleto, già tutta interna a Shakespeare, a farsi eroe della propria vicenda e a farla proseguire verso il proprio compimento.

Bianchi pilastri di polistirolo cominciano a un certo punto a barcollare e cadere, come a premonizione del crollo di quell'ordine chiuso e a segnale della necessità di evadere dalla sua prigione pericolante. Ciò prelude infatti al ritorno della performance nello spazio interno tappezzato dal testo, ora popolato di tutti i suoi stravaganti personaggi. Ha così inizio il percorso tra le stazioni del rito profano cui già si era assistito in *Alice*, che si carica però di un senso più forte proprio grazie alla contrapposizione con ciò che l'ha appena preceduto nel cortile: il colore opposto al bianco e nero, la mobilità all'irrigidimento, l'apertura verso la parola di altri autori alla concentrazione sul testo shakespeariano, l'incrociarsi di frammenti di storie eterogenee all'obbligo di fedeltà a un'unica storia ormai estenuata. E Punzo, pur conservando in parte il trucco e il costume di Amleto, si ibrida con Alice, indossando un gonnellino da ragazza e coccolando un coniglio di peluche, e diventando di fatto l'Hamlice del titolo. Proprio il plusvalore simbolico derivante dalla contrapposizione con la prima parte sembra ora conferire a questa "follia carnevalesca" (Ciari 2011: 47) l'energia, ancora assente in *Alice*, capace di scatenare il già citato finale di liberazione dalle lettere e dalle parole usurate e far balenare la prospettiva utopistica, assente nel primo abbozzo, di una nuova civiltà.

Una grande chiave campeggiava, in *Hamlice*, nella scenografia della corte danese: chiaro riferimento alla ricorrente spro-

porzione di Alice rispetto agli oggetti a causa dei suoi frequenti cambiamenti di dimensione, e più in particolare alla difficoltà di trovare chiavi commisurate alla grandezza delle serrature della casa in cui a un certo punto del romanzo di Carroll la bambina si trova imprigionata. Ma quella chiave è lì anche per Amleto: Alice, maestra di fughe ed evasioni, in qualche modo gliel'ha fatta trovare in scena, come un invito a servirsene per liberarsi dalla prigione del suo ruolo. C'è tuttavia almeno un dramma di Shakespeare che, secondo Punzo, contiene già ben visibile dentro di sé la chiave che permetterebbe a tutti i suoi personaggi di sottrarsi all'obbedienza al testo e all'obbligo di sottostare al suo tragico svolgimento: il dramma è *Romeo e Giulietta*, e la chiave è Mercuzio. Solo lui, il detentore della facoltà poetica e della fantasia, simbolicamente opposte all'egoismo cieco e violento che da un certo punto sembra coinvolgere e travolgere tutti i personaggi, potrebbe infatti permettere al dramma di prendere una strada diversa da quella che conduce ineluttabilmente alla tragedia. Ed è in effetti a partire dalla sua scomparsa che tutto precipita, le morti si rincorrono e la sorte più avversa afferra le redini degli avvenimenti. Perciò Punzo, nel momento in cui decide di rivolgere a questo testo il suo nuovo progetto biennale ispirato a Shakespeare tra il 2011 e il 2012, innalza senza esitazioni Mercuzio al ruolo di protagonista.

Una nuova istanza anarco-poetica, ancora legata a un immaginario fiabesco, raccoglie qui il testimone da Alice, ma essa proviene, in questo caso, dalla fantasia dello stesso Shakespeare: si tratta infatti di Mab, la regina delle fate di cui Mercuzio si è fatto cantore e che Punzo arriva ad assumere come un emblema del suo lavoro con i carcerati: "Se ho mai fatto qualcosa, sono certo di aver portato con me la regina Mab nel cuore del carcere di Volterra" (Punzo 2013: 231). La morte di Mercuzio comporta inevitabilmente la morte di Mab; dunque, se Mab e il suo poeta sono la chiave per la liberazione dalla chiusa compiutezza del testo e dal tragico esito che esso prescrive, ciò che non deve accadere, che del testo stesso non deve essere accettato, è proprio la morte dell'amico di Romeo: Mercuzio non deve morire.

Anche Mercuzio, come Amleto, è, nella prospettiva di Punzo, un personaggio fondamentalmente refrattario all'assunzione di un ruolo, e dunque un potenziale nemico del testo stesso in cui abita:

uno di quei punti-limite in cui Shakespeare si affaccia, sempre secondo Punzo, su una visione così nuova e impensata del teatro da esserne egli stesso intimorito e da ritrarsene. E infatti Amleto, a dispetto del suo intrico di dubbi, della prolungata tergiversazione e della vera o strategica follia che la giustifica, finirà per rientrare nel ruolo e assumersi, per quanto imprevedibilmente e quasi casualmente, il compito di vendicatore. Quanto a Mercuzio, il Bardo doveva considerarlo un personaggio più rischioso e meno facilmente domabile, se è vero che, come riporta John Dryden, egli stesso dichiarò di essere stato “forced to kill him in the third act, to prevent being killed by him” (Dryden 1968: 221).

Il drammaturgo stesso, dunque, sembrava presentare la minaccia di cui Mercuzio era portatore nei confronti del suo testo, intuendo in lui, appunto, il personaggio-chiave che avrebbe potuto aprire la sua opera verso sensi e direzioni diverse da quelle previste dal suo autore. Prendendo a modello un precedente spettacolo di Carmelo Bene,¹² Punzo decide dunque di non far morire Mercuzio, o piuttosto di dedicare l'intera performance al tentativo del personaggio di opporsi al destino che la tragedia gli riserverebbe.

Nel raccogliere e portare a compimento gli spunti presentati nello studio allestito in carcere nel 2011, *Mercuzio non deve morire* ha significativamente mantenuto una natura fluida e mutevole, legata ai diversi spazi in cui è stato presentato, e alle diverse relazioni con il pubblico di conseguenza stabilitesi,¹³ ma non ha

12 *Romeo & Giulietta (storia di Shakespeare) secondo Carmelo Bene*, regia e drammaturgia di Carmelo Bene, andato in scena per la prima volta il 17 dicembre 1976 al Teatro Metastasio di Prato, costituisce il primo fondamentale esperimento di mescolazione intertestuale condotto sulla tragedia dei due amanti veronesi nell'ambito del teatro di ricerca italiano: la partitura verbale dello spettacolo innesta infatti sulle parti conservate di *Romeo e Giulietta* altri testi di Shakespeare (brani e situazioni dalla *Dodicesima notte*, nonché il sonetto 140) e di autori posteriori, in particolare poeti romantici o *maudits*: Thomas Hood e Alfred Tennyson, Tristan Corbière e Arthur Rimbaud. Ma ciò che più accomuna lo spettacolo di Bene e quello di Punzo è la decisione di affidare un ruolo protagonista, e ben più prolungato rispetto a quanto previsto dal testo, al personaggio di Mercuzio.

13 Andato in scena per la prima volta nel carcere di Volterra con il titolo *Romeo e Giulietta – Mercuzio non vuole morire – Primo Studio* (27-30 lu-

mai messo in discussione l'assunto principale, ovvero il protagonismo di Mercuzio e la sua ribellione contro una 'morte annunciata'. Lo spettacolo prende le mosse proprio dal duello tra Tebaldo e Mercuzio, e dal ferimento di quest'ultimo, il quale, benché raggiunto da un colpo esiziale, continuerà a rialzarsi per riprendere a duellare e nuovamente cadere a terra, senza mai arrendersi definitivamente alla morte. Allo sviluppo dell'azione drammatica si sostituisce a questo punto una sorta di azione rituale, un tentativo di esorcismo contro la morte attuato con i mezzi della poesia, sicché gli attori, e soprattutto Punzo-Mercuzio, si sottraggono alla continuazione della vicenda per farsi portavoce non più delle parole del testo di *Romeo e Giulietta* ma di un'ideale propagazione dello spirito poetico di Mercuzio alle parole di altre opere, altri drammaturghi e poeti e pensatori. Così il testo-pretesto di partenza deflagra, si libera dai propri vincoli e si apre a una dimensione spiccatamente intertestuale, dove brani di altri testi shakespeariani (*Otello*, *Re Lear*, *La tempesta*, *Riccardo III*, *La dodicesima notte*, *Antonio e Cleopatra*, *Sogno di una notte di mezza estate*, *Il racconto d'inverno*) si mescidano a una variegata silloge di autori, nei quali Punzo intravede delle possibili 'resurrezioni' poetiche di Mercuzio: Klossowski, Rostand, Achmatova, Pessoa, Artaud, Dostoevskij, Omero, Majakovskij. L'eterogeneità di questo repertorio balza all'occhio, ma non ne comporta affatto la casualità o sconclusionatezza: l'idea che lo tesse lungo una coerente sequenza è quella della divina scintilla poetica che pervade le cose rendendole leggere e luminose, e che non deve essere lasciata spegnere, pena il precipitare del mondo nella tenebra dell'ignoranza e dell'odio: pena, cioè,

glio 2011), lo spettacolo fu poi presentato nella sua forma 'evoluta' l'anno seguente, con un nuovo titolo che evidenziava meglio il ruolo di protagonista assunto dall'amico di Romeo: *Mercuzio non vuole morire – La vera tragedia in Romeo e Giulietta*. Dopo le prime rappresentazioni in carcere (24-28 luglio 2012), lo spettacolo con questo titolo fu rappresentato anche nelle strade di Volterra (28 luglio 2012) e in uno spazio teatrale tradizionale, il Teatro Palladium di Roma (5-6 marzo 2013). L'adeguamento agli spazi esterni al carcere comportò alcune modifiche rispetto all'allestimento interno alla Fortezza. Per quanto riguarda, in particolare, le valenze anche 'ideologiche' assunte dalla rappresentazione negli spazi urbani di Volterra, e lo specifico e più attivo ruolo in esso affidato agli spettatori, cf. Valenti 2016: 10.

la morte di Mercuzio e della regina Mab.

Il testo di *Romeo e Giulietta*, comunque, non è cancellato, ma appare a sua volta per frammenti verbali e allusioni visive. Di esso, parzialmente leggibile anche su grandi pannelli trasportati dagli attori, vengono conservati, nella recitazione, soprattutto brani che, nel momento in cui evidenziano la presenza e le responsabilità dell'odio e della violenza, già in sé le contraddicono e le combattono attraverso l'altezza poetica delle loro parole. In uno spettacolo che elegge la poesia ad antidoto contro la tragedia, è la poesia stessa che sostanzia il testo di *Romeo e Giulietta* a fungere da contraveleno contro gli avvenimenti tragici che la vicenda contiene. Per il resto, personaggi e situazioni del dramma sono evocati attraverso metafore o sineddochi, in alcuni casi di originale effetto visivo: pensiamo, per esempio, all'attore che 'indossa', in guisa di costume-scenografia, una miniaturizzazione del balcone di Giulietta; la quale è a sua volta rappresentata per tutto lo spettacolo da una giovane danzatrice che impugna un gigantesco fiore rosso, salvo poi moltiplicarsi in un gruppo di 'belle Giuliette addormentate', distese al suolo ognuna accanto al proprio mazzo di fiori. Più in generale, sul versante visivo-performativo lo spettacolo è contrassegnato da un costante movimento, ora più lento e quasi sognante, ora più concitato, degli attori, che rivestono in tal modo anche un ruolo coreico oltre che scenografico, essendo la scenografia costituita da pannelli o da oggetti (un sole, una luna, delle grosse sagome di pesci bianchi o multicolori) quasi sempre tenuti in movimento dagli stessi performer, che li trasportano, li rotolano, li posano per poi riprenderli e ricollocarli. Nei costumi, realizzati con intelligente fantasia da Emanuela Dall'Aglio, fatta eccezione per gli abiti neri di Mercuzio e dell'evocazione di Riccardo III, predomina la nota cromatica del bianco, in particolare negli oggetti e nelle vesti di ispirazione clownesca di quegli attori (un po' *fools*, un po' Pierrot) ai quali, dopo Punzo, è affidata la recitazione della maggior porzione di testo. Sul candore dominante, pochi, netti interventi di colore rosso non permettono di dimenticare la ferita sanguinante di Mercuzio e l'incombere della tragedia. L'affascinante impatto visivo di questo spettacolo è segno del fatto che, man mano che Punzo e i suoi attori e collaboratori procedono nel loro progetto artistico, la confezione formale degli spettacoli si

fa sempre più ricercata e fantasiosa; non si tratta, tuttavia, dell'affacciarsi di una tendenza estetizzante fine a se stessa, ma di una sempre più compiuta realizzazione, anche sul piano della *opsis*, di un'idea di teatro di sogno e poesia, libero da vincoli realistici e appartenenze cronologiche.

Nel 2016 il lavoro della Compagnia su Shakespeare tocca il suo culmine, approdando a un risultato di notevole interesse con *Dopo la tempesta. L'opera segreta di Shakespeare*, che riprende con piccole variazioni (la più sostanziale, come specificheremo più avanti, riguarda l'immagine finale) lo studio presentato l'anno prima con il titolo di *Shakespeare. Know well*. In questo caso il punto di partenza non è un singolo dramma, ma l'intero *corpus* del drammaturgo, letto per intero attraverso gli anni da Punzo e dai suoi attori, e poi selezionato soprattutto in base alle scelte dei detenuti. Siamo agli antipodi, naturalmente, rispetto alla presentazione di un'antologia di 'grandi brani' shakespeariani, una sorta di *the best of*. Ciò è dovuto solo in parte al fatto che le scelte quasi mai coincidono con lo Shakespeare più noto e riconoscibile, pescando di preferenza in parti piuttosto recondite di alcune tra le opere più famose (*Riccardo III*, *Re Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Otello*, *La tempesta*) o direttamente in drammi, almeno in Italia, meno noti e scarsamente rappresentati (*Enrico IV*, *Riccardo II*, *Pericle principe di Tiro*, *Timone d'Atene*, *Troilo e Cressida*), nonché nei *Sonetti*. La vera distanza da un'impostazione antologica è determinata dal fatto che le varie scene, tutte in verità ridotte a monologhi anche quando nel testo sono lunghe battute di dialogo rivolte a interlocutori che nello spettacolo non figurano, sono contenute in una ben precisa situazione drammaturgica e scenica: una sorta di onirico, sofferto congedo di Shakespeare stesso dai suoi personaggi. Prima seduto accanto a una scrivania, intento a lasciarne cadere con aria perplessa pezzi di argenteria che battono con clangore gli uni sugli altri, poi vagante in silenzio sulla scena da un personaggio all'altro, accostando ciascuno di essi con un misto di pietoso stupore e di paterno rammarico, Shakespeare-Punzo contempla l'universo da lui creato come pentito di averlo fatto. Sembrerebbe desideroso di revocare nel nulla la propria creazione, o almeno di correggere i comportamenti e i destini dei protagonisti delle sue opere: li segue nei loro lenti, trasognati movimenti, li tocca, li abbraccia, av-

vicina la bocca alle loro orecchie, quasi volesse consolarli del ruolo in cui li ha inchiodati, o forse suggerire un diverso esito, una deviazione dal sentiero obbligato che la sua scrittura ha tracciato; ma a Desdemona, che cammina come aggrappata al fatidico fazzoletto con un incedere grottescamente cadenzato e inarcato all'indietro, strappa più volte di mano, rabbiosamente, il fazzoletto stesso, come per liberare la donna dall'asservimento a quell'oggetto, che la incatena alla sorte tragica a cui è destinata. Ma lei non ne vuole sapere, o non può, e torna ogni volta a raccogliarlo, scegliendo la rassicurante incarcerazione nel proprio ruolo.

A proposito di tale condanna ad aderire al ruolo, se abbiamo usato poco fa il verbo 'inchiodare', l'abbiamo fatto anche sulla base di una precisa suggestione offerta dalla scenografia dello spettacolo, che dissemina nella parte sinistra della scena numerose grandi croci di legno in posizione obliqua, con un riecheggiamento del paesaggio simbolico di *Wielopole Wielopole* di Tadeusz Kantor. Nessun personaggio è issato su uno di questi strumenti di martirio (uno, però, recita alcuni versi dell'*Enrico IV* disteso su una croce posta a terra) ma i ritmici battiti che scandiscono tutto il sonoro della prima parte dello spettacolo come lontani colpi battuti sul legno suggeriscono l'idea dell'inchiodamento alla croce. L'intenzione simbolica non ci pare quella di assimilare i singoli patimenti di ogni personaggio al martirio di Cristo, quanto piuttosto di indicare appunto la costrittiva adesione alla parte stabilita dal testo come una sorta di crocifissione. L'ingresso in scena di scale a pioli ad appoggio introduce però, in combinazione con le forme delle croci, un'ulteriore suggestione figurativa, quella delle immagini pittoriche della Deposizione di Cristo, in cui scale appunto di questo tipo vengono poggiate alla Croce per liberare gli arti dai chiodi e permettere il recupero del corpo di Gesù. L'intero spettacolo potrebbe essere interpretato, seguendo questa traccia simbolica, come una grande scena di Deposizione, di schiodatura dei personaggi dai loro testi e dalle loro storie, che rimangono a campeggiare sullo sfondo come croci vuote, mentre chi ne è disceso consegna le parole che ne ha portato con sé a nuovi possibili sensi e a un teatro di là da venire: in attesa di una Resurrezione di cui al

momento non si conoscono i tempi o le forme.¹⁴

Per ora i personaggi si trovano in una sorta di situazione limbo, figure di confine tra i residui di un teatro-istituzione al quale si stanno strappando e le forme ancora invisibili di un teatro nuovo per un uomo nuovo. Per questo essi assomigliano a fantasmi che dicono le loro battute come giungessero alla loro mente da lontano – allo stesso modo, forse, dei suoni misteriosi e remoti della bella, ipnoticamente iterativa colonna sonora – come frammenti di una storia a cui hanno appartenuto ma da cui ora sono usciti (anche se a volte una fiamma dell’originaria passione sembra ancora riscaldare le loro battute, come nel caso della rabbia di Calibano e della gelosia di Otello). Sono, dice di loro lo stesso Punzo, “una foresta di statue morte e potenti”, tra le quali “si aggira uno spirito che vuole essere liberato” (<http://www.compagniadellafortezza.org/new/gli-spettacoli-2/gli-spettacoli/shakespeare-know-well/>). La statuarietà di questi personaggi è concretamente resa visibile, oltre che dalla muscolatura effettivamente scultorea di molti attori, in gran parte a torso nudo e con regali gonnelloni a strascico, dalla loro eretta immobilità o dagli spostamenti lentissimi. Queste ‘statue’ sono morte rispetto alla precedente vita del testo, ma non lo sono in modo assoluto, perché uno spirito vivificante sotterraneamente le abita e attende di essere liberato, ed è quell’“opera segreta di Shakespeare” che il titolo annuncia. Esso già si rivela in parte nelle parole pronun-

14 Nella sua analisi di *Shakespeare. Know well*, Gerardo Guccini coglie acutamente il ruolo rivelatore che le croci hanno nei confronti di un flusso energetico che da esse sembra originarsi, orientando dinamicamente l’intero spettacolo. Disposte “come se un soffio gigantesco le avesse piegate, abbattute, disperse, accumulate sul lato sinistro” (Guccini 2016: 13), le croci orientano infatti “le traiettorie degli attori, che fluiscono sistematicamente da destra verso sinistra confermando che questi simboli moltiplicati esercitano un forte potere attrattivo Tutte le figure, infatti, entrano da destra, si spostano verso sinistra, attraversano la foresta di croci e di lì escono. Nessuna, mai esce dal lato destro, che resta . . . spopolato di azioni” (14). Sul piano simbolico, la principale connotazione di scale e croci, in quanto per lo più vuote e inutilizzate, appare a Guccini “la sottrazione di corporeità” (13), che ne determina la disponibilità all’assunzione di un senso “avvolgente e sospeso” (ibid.), irriducibile a un’interpretazione metaforica; anche se esse “non debbono disgiungersi del tutto dall’originaria simbologia del Calvario, della quale restano componenti sostanziali, per quanto perturbate” (14).

ciate, che risuonano davvero potenti, della potenza che è propria di Shakespeare, ma che qui risulta amplificata e come assolutizzata sia dalla condizione esistenziale degli attori-carcerati, sia dalla decontestualizzazione rispetto ai testi di provenienza.

La prima parte del titolo, *Dopo la Tempesta*, è carica di significato. Da un lato, essa contiene un'allusione biografica all'autore, che si congeda dal teatro proprio dopo avere composto *La tempesta*, e chi sa quante volte dopo di allora, negli ultimi anni di ritiro a Stratford-upon-Avon, ha riguardato indietro alle proprie creature o le ha sognate, come qui fa il suo alter-ego Punzo. D'altro lato la tempesta è condizione atmosferica cara a Shakespeare come metafora di un ribaltamento universale, del sovvertimento totale di ogni principio, della perdita di ogni rassicurante orizzonte. Varie volte gli attori, in battute tratte da *Pericle*, *Re Lear*, *Otello*, ribadiscono quest'immagine e il suo valore simbolico; ma è lo spettacolo nel suo complesso ad apparire come la messa in scena di un paesaggio dopo la tempesta, del naufragio di una civiltà da cui emergono le parole di Shakespeare come preziosi ma inutilizzabili relitti. Perché da questi resti di teatro si possa sperare di trarre qualcosa di nuovo, Punzo ribadisce ancora una volta la necessità di liberarli definitivamente dalla prigione del libro. Questo è presente, come oggetto scenico, in due forme distinte. Con un effetto visivo che conferma la felice vena di surrealismo barocco della costumista Emanuela dall'Aglio, esso appare attorno al collo di alcuni personaggi in forma di gorgiera, che suggerisce però immediatamente, e assai significativamente, anche l'idea di una gogna. Ma, alla fine dello spettacolo, un vero libro compare tra le mani di Punzo, il quale comincia a smembrarlo impassibilmente pagina per pagina, causando il pianto diretto di due donne, con le quali ha precedentemente tentato dei brindisi sempre interrotti, e che rappresentano forse il suo desiderio di gloria e la sua vanità letteraria. L'autore rinnega se stesso, fa piazza pulita della propria opera, libera i personaggi dalla gabbia testuale in cui per secoli li ha tenuti prigionieri. Ma questa liberazione non si manifesta in toni euforici: l'atmosfera dello spettacolo, anche nella chiusura, rimane indefinitamente assorta, sospesa. Questa performance non accoglie mai quei tocchi festosi e vitali che nei due precedenti spettacoli di tanto in tanto acceleravano il ritmo e illuminavano la scena: le stesse scelte cromatiche, che 'sporcano' il consueto predominio del bianco e del nero non più con colori vivaci (il rosso

in particolare) ma con il beige di pochi vestiti e soprattutto del legno di croci e scale, confermano un atteggiamento più austero e meno appagante nei confronti degli spettatori, che restano indefinitamente nell'attesa che qualcosa abbia inizio, che il vagare e il monologare di questi fantasmi si raccolga almeno in un germe di azione. Ma ciò non è possibile, perché questo spettacolo non è, manifestamente, un inizio, ma una fine, quella "fine di una civiltà" cui già in *Hamlice* si faceva riferimento: la Deposizione, come si è detto, non è ancora Resurrezione. Perché, a partire da questa fine, si dia un nuovo inizio, non basta aprire le gabbie; è necessario cominciare a parlare il linguaggio che costruisca un mondo dove le gabbie non esistono più. Questo linguaggio, secondo Punzo, per ora non lo abbiamo; verrà, se lo cerchiamo, ma solo dopo che il linguaggio dettato dai testi, dalle istituzioni, dalle prigioni, avrà smesso di parlare: dopo la tempesta.

Non dobbiamo dunque confondere, benché suggestioni in questo senso non manchino, questo 'non finale' con l'agonia interminabile dei personaggi di Beckett, o con l'implosione e lo sfinimento del teatro messi in scena da Carmelo Bene.¹⁵ A Punzo preme di opporre con chiarezza, a queste forme di pessimismo estremo, la carica utopistica del suo teatro. E, lo fa, in questo caso come in quello delle lettere 'liberate' dal pubblico al termine di *Hamlice*, con un'immagine finale che, senza ancora potercelo mostrare, apre verso il futuro. *Shakespeare. Know well* si chiudeva sull'ingresso di un bambino che attraversava lo spazio scenico facendo lentamente rotolare dinnanzi a sé una gigantesca palla (forse un nuovo mondo che gli uomini di domani saranno in grado di mettere in moto e far girare) e poi, al momento degli applausi, si sedeva accanto a

15 Riferendosi alle loro rispettive interpretazioni di *Amleto*, ma con considerazioni che valgono benissimo per l'intero atteggiamento dei due registi nei confronti di Shakespeare (e, alla fine, del teatro tutto), Cristina Valenti ha tracciato sinteticamente una lucida distinzione tra Bene e Punzo: "Partendo entrambi dall'identificazione di Amleto come luogo metaforico del teatro di tradizione, essi se ne servono per opporsi alla sacralità del testo celebrando, il primo, l'impossibilità della rappresentazione fino alla parodia della stessa, il secondo, il superamento del dramma come gabbia formale . . . Due esiti rispettivamente riconducibili all'ambito antiregistico in cui si muoveva Carmelo Bene, a favore dell'attore-artifex, e all'ambito postdrammatico in cui si muove Armando Punzo" (Valenti 2016: 8).

Punzo, a suggerire una possibile continuità, un passaggio di testimone, tra il 'vecchio' drammaturgo e il fanciullo. *Dopo la tempesta* si conclude, invece, con la più esplicita e fiduciosa metafora del bambino che prende Punzo per mano e, vincendo una residua riluttanza del drammaturgo-regista ad abbandonare i suoi personaggi, lo conduce con sé verso l'esterno e verso il futuro.

Riferimenti Bibliografici

- Aaltonen, Sirkku (2000), *Time-Sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ciari, Lapo (2011), *Armando Punzo e la scena imprigionata. Segni di una poetica evasiva*, San Miniato: La conchiglia di Santiago.
- Dryden, John (1968), "Defence of the Epilogue: or an Essay on the Dramatic Poetry of the Last Age" (1672), in John Dryden, *Saggi critici*, a cura di Piero Mirizzi, Bari: Adriatica.
- Guccini, Gerardo (2016), "Una fortezza piena di teatro. Su *Shakespeare. Know well* e la drammaturgia di Punzo", *Prove di Drammaturgia* 21 (1/2): 13-16.
- Mancewicz, Aneta (2014), *Intermedial Shakespeares on European Stages*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Minutella, Vincenza (2013), *Reclaiming Romeo and Juliet. Italian Translations for Page, Stage and Screen*, Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.
- Punzo, Armando (2013), *È ai vinti che va il suo amore. I primi venticinque anni di autoreclusione con la Compagnia della Fortezza di Volterra*, Firenze: Clichy.
- Temkine, Raymonde (1969), *Il Teatro-laboratorio di Grotowski*, Bari: Di Donato.
- Valenti, Cristina (2016), "Liberarsi da Shakespeare, ovvero gli Shakespeare della Fortezza", *Prove di Drammaturgia* 21 (1/2): 4-13.

Sitografia

- <http://www.lafortezzadivolterra.it/volterra/it>, Sito di informazione della Casa di Reclusione di Volterra (ultimo accesso 30 luglio 2018).
- <http://www.compagniadellafortezza.org>, Sito ufficiale della Compagnia della Fortezza (ultimo accesso 1 agosto 2018).

Il giovane rapsodo nella Stanza della Segnatura di Raffaello

SOTERA FORNARO

Abstract

In the representation of Homer in *Parnassus* in the Room of the Segnatura, Raphael was perhaps inspired by the contemporary 'poeti canterini'. Sitting to the right of the poet, he paints a young man writing: the figure, whom later interpreters define as 'a rhapsode', alludes to the transcribers of Homer. Or maybe he wants to imply that the figure is a contemporary translator of Homer (Poliziano?). Raphael could also be alluding to the beginning of the translation of Lorenzo Valla's *Iliad*, which was in the Library of Julius II.

1.

Da Guido Avezù ho imparato molto, non solo da quel che ha scritto, ma anche dalle conversazioni che ho potuto avere con lui, specie quand'ero ancora agli inizi della mia carriera accademica. Perciò al momento di rendergli omaggio, intendo dedicargli queste note su una delle opere d'arte più famose al mondo, il *Parnaso* di Raffaello nella Stanza della Segnatura e per questo motivo: lì compare un giovane seduto, con penna e calamaio, che guarda verso Omero, come in attesa dei suoi versi, per trascriverli. L'atteggiamento reverente, ma insieme ansioso e partecipe, di quella figura, mi ricorda per analogia la mia disposizione d'animo quando conobbi Guido, che rappresentava per me un autorevole maestro. E spero perciò con queste mie idee, qualunque sia il loro valore, di fargli un piccolo, simbolico, dono.

2.

Pensate come note preparatorie per un lavoro di più ampio respiro,¹ le considerazioni che seguono si concentrano dunque sulla figura del giovane scrivano, verso cui l'Omero del *Parnaso* tende il braccio come a istituire un legame di ideale continuità, e che ricambia con lo sguardo il poeta, in una pausa mentre sta scrivendo.² Il modello iconografico per la figura di Omero è indubbiamente il Laocoonte; ma qui non voglio occuparmi di Omero, e nemmeno delle possibili suggestioni che a Raffaello possono essere venute da altre raffigurazioni od opere d'arte.³ Accennerò invece da una parte ai testi che, conosciuti direttamente o per il tramite di suoi consiglieri, possono aver fornito a Raffaello elementi per immaginare Omero; dall'altra addurrò delle ipotesi sulle analogie che Raffaello può aver istituito tra la figura e l'attività del poeta epico per eccellenza e i poeti a lui contemporanei. Concluderò con un'ipotesi che riguarda il giovane scrivano, la cui interpretazione costituisce l'oggetto di questo lavoro.

3.

Raffaello fu certamente influenzato, anche solo per il tramite degli ispiratori del programma iconografico della Stanza, dal rinnovato interesse per la vita di Omero da parte degli umanisti alla fine del '400, sollecitata del resto dalle fonti antiche che Demetrio Calcondila prepose alla *editio princeps* dei poemi omerici (1486) e dalla stessa *praefatio* del dotto greco. Le vite omeriche degli umanisti sono segnate dal paradosso che caratterizza anche quelle antiche: sebbene nessuna opera abbia esercitato sulla letteratura occidentale un'influenza analoga ai poemi omerici, del loro autore

1 In corso di elaborazione insieme a Raffaella Viccei, che si occuperà più specificamente delle fonti iconografiche di Raffaello.

2 L'immagine del *Parnaso*, con Omero ed il rapsodo, è reperibile nel sito online dei Musei vaticani al link <http://www.museivaticani.va/content/museivaticani/it/collezioni/musei/stanze-di-raffaello/stanza-della-segnatura/parnaso.html#&gid=1&pid=1> (ultimo accesso 23.9.2018).

3 Su tutto questo rinvio a Viccei (in stampa).

non si sa nulla, né lo sapevano gli antichi. Sì che, come scriveva lo studioso che più d'ogni altro, alla fine del '700, determinò la nascita della cosiddetta 'questione omerica' e che per primo ha studiato alcune testimonianze iconografiche antiche di Omero, ossia Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729-1812), anche i ritratti antichi di Omero debbono essere considerati ritratti ideali, tesi cioè a restituire sacralità, solennità, aura divina ad un uomo che si poteva solo immaginare, in mancanza di qualsiasi dato storico (Heyne 1801). Un'osservazione, quest'ultima, che risale in fin dei conti a Plinio (*Nat. Hist.* 35.9). Così come le vite antiche di Omero ci restituiscono dunque racconti di fantasia, i cui dettagli, compreso il luogo natale, scaturiscono perlopiù per autoschediasma dagli stessi poemi, anche le raffigurazioni rispondono ad un immaginario forgiato su modelli tipici e su alcuni dati comuni della tradizione biografica, come la cecità: sì che Omero diventa 'multiplo' come le sue patrie.⁴

4.

Occorre dunque premettere che Raffaello non poteva formarsi un'idea dell'aspetto di Omero dai suoi poemi, perché essi non contengono alcuna informazione autobiografica, ma anche perché certamente, ignaro del greco, non poteva leggerli, né gli era accessibile, nel momento in cui lavorava alla Stanza, una traduzione latina dell'*Odissea*, da cui avrebbe potuto apprendere nei dettagli degli aedi Femio e Demodoco. L'Omero di Raffaello non ha nulla, perciò, che lo accomuni agli aedi omerici. Non canta accompagnandosi

4 Cf. Most 2004. Attribuire una valenza biografica a particolari fittivi che si trovano in un'opera letteraria è un processo che riguarda non solo Omero e non solo gli autori antichi. Non ne sono affatto esenti nemmeno gli scrittori contemporanei, specie se vogliono nascondersi dietro uno pseudonimo: basti pensare al 'caso' Elena Ferrante, pseudonimo di una scrittrice ormai di fama mondiale di cui non si sa nulla e a cui si continua a dare la caccia inseguendo le notizie che sembrano trarsi dai suoi romanzi, come se questi contenessero necessariamente elementi autobiografici. Sulle biografie omeriche e su quello che apprendiamo da esse sulla ricezione della poesia omerica si rinvia ai numerosi lavori di Barbara Graziosi, a partire da Graziosi 2002. Altre informazioni in https://livingpoets.dur.ac.uk/w/Welcome_to_Living_Poets (ultimo accesso 23.9.2018).

con uno strumento a corde, non siede su un trono, non è in un momento simposiale; è sì cieco, come Demodoco, ma non può contare su qualcuno che lo sostenga e gli porga lo strumento musicale, come appunto accade all'aedo nella reggia dei Feaci (*Odissea* 8.62-70). Insomma, la figura di Omero nel *Parnaso* non dipende dalle descrizioni degli aedi omerici e spicca per originalità. Ne restò stupefatto anche Luigi Antonio Lanzi (1732-1810), autore nel 1792 della prima moderna storia della pittura in Italia, che così commentava l'affresco: "Omero fra Virgilio e Dante è la testa forse *che più sorprende*; egli è un uomo invaso da uno spirito superiore, e sembra parlare e vaticinare" (Lanzi 1795-1796: 392; corsivo mio).

5.

Tuttavia un ruolo nell'immaginario di Raffaello poteva avere già solo il primo verso dei due poemi, che apre l'invocazione proemiale alla Musa nell'*Iliade* e alla dea della poesia nell'*Odissea*, e vedremo che forse l'artista leggeva o gli era stato letto l'inizio dell'*Iliade* in latino: ossia poteva immaginarsi il poeta che invoca la Musa, alla quale chiede ispirazione, anzi alla quale chiede, nell'*Iliade*, di cantare servendosi di lui. Ed infatti l'Omero di Raffaello, dalla testa rivolta verso l'alto, la bocca semiaperta, è poeta in preda ad *enthousiasmos*, in rapporto diretto con la divinità, come un vate. Perciò i suoi versi sono colmi di una sapienza d'origine divina, che contiene la verità a cui però si può attingere solo con una corretta interpretazione, ossia cercando il contenuto di verità dietro il velo delle finzioni pagane: il che è tra l'altro necessario perché il primo e più importante dei poeti antichi possa essere accolto in posizione di spicco in un ciclo figurativo voluto dal Papa nei suoi appartamenti privati e teso ad esaltare la teologia cristiana.⁵ Omero rappresentò infatti a partire dalla metà del XV secolo quel che Virgilio era stato per il Medioevo: la fonte di ogni sapere. "Un Omero sapiente, filosofo, padre della poesia e oceano del sapere, al cui cospetto è facile, quasi immediato inchinarsi con am-

5 Il precedente iconografico di Omero è certamente il Laocoonte: cf. ora Viccei (in stampa); accenni anche in Rijser, 2012: 149-50; Moormann 2004: 136-8.

mirato rispetto, non altrettanto penetrare nel mistero dei suoi versi sublimi” (Megna 2009: xvi; Megna 2007). Una rappresentazione di Omero vate e profeta, nelle vesti anzi di un evangelista, non meraviglia nemmeno nella tradizione bizantina (cf. Pontani 2005). Tuttavia l’Omero di Raffaello se ne differenzia anche perché non porta tra le mani un libro: il che significa quasi un’anomalia in una Stanza nei cui affreschi compaiono molti libri, forse alludendo alla biblioteca del Papa committente.⁶ Sembra perciò quasi ovvio che la tradizione in cui l’Omero del *Parnaso* si inserisce sia piuttosto quella neoplatonica del *furor* poetico, a cui si richiama anche l’allegoria della poesia che compare nel tondo sul soffitto della stessa stanza.⁷ Nello *Ione* di Platone, com’è noto, Socrate attribuisce il “parlare bene” di Omero da parte di Ione e dei suoi colleghi non alla *techne*, ma ad un’“energia divina” (*theia dynamis*) che muove il cantore, e che Socrate paragona a quella del magnete: “allo stesso modo anche la Musa ha il potere di rendere ispirati degli uomini direttamente e, attraverso questi ispirati, si istituisce una catena di altri ispirati dal dio” (*Ione* 533e). Che i contenuti dello *Ione* di Platone ispirassero Raffaello non può meravigliare in un ambiente pregno di neoplatonismo.⁸ L’Omero del *Parnaso*, infatti, ha il braccio teso in direzione di un giovane che, seduto, col calamo sospeso, pare dipendere dal vecchio poeta: a significare forse la trasmissio-

6 È questa la nota tesi di Wickhoff 1893. Una rassegna delle ipotesi sulla funzione della stanza e sui possibili ispiratori è data da Taylor (2009), che contiene anche l’inventario dei libri della biblioteca di Giulio II, ed a cui qui si rinvia.

7 Inoltre “nel monocromo al di sotto della parte sinistra del *Parnaso*, in corrispondenza del gruppo con i poeti epici guidati da Omero, Raffaello rappresenta il salvataggio dell’*Iliade* da parte di Alessandro Magno (*Alessandro che fa riporre in un cofano di Dario l’Iliade di Omero*), concretamente aiutato da un soldato che depone i testi omerici in una cassa classicheggiante. Questo episodio era usato nel Rinascimento per indicare il rapporto fra letteratura, arti, armi e simboleggiare il patrocinio delle arti da parte dei sovrani. La relazione topografica e semantica con Omero e il giovane *scripturus* è evidente ed è richiamata anche dall’identico *schema* del braccio destro di Omero e del Macedone.” (Viccei, in stampa). Cf. anche Cannata Salomone 1997: 76-8; Farinella 2014: 360; diversamente Moorman 2004: 138.

8 Cf. Megna 1999. Per il neoplatonismo ficiniano nel *Parnaso* cf. almeno Reale 1999. Cf. anche Most 2001.

ne per magnetismo dell'ispirazione, per cui tutti i poeti costituiscono tra loro una "catena", come dice Socrate. Analogo concetto si trova, per restare più vicini all'età della composizione dell'affresco, nel proemio dell'*Ambra* (1485) di Angelo Poliziano,⁹ un autore che è verosimile Raffaello conoscesse: in quella *Selva* di Poliziano si dice tra l'altro che tutti i poeti dipendono da Omero, fonte a cui si abbeverano attingendo *arcanos* (v. 15).¹⁰ Ed ancora nella *Oratio in expositione Homeri* (1486) dello stesso Poliziano,¹¹ Omero, il più importante dei poeti, la fonte di ogni sapere, di ogni filosofia e di virtù, viene descritto cieco, mendico, avido di conoscenza sì da porre poi sotto gli occhi di chi ne legge le opere tutto quel che lui non poteva vedere. Omero, dunque, fu, scrive Poliziano, poeta di versi "non lavorati" (*illaborata*) ed "estemporanei" (*extemporanea*), di origine divina, messi per iscritto (*excerpta*) bene o male da qualcuno (§ 11), riportati poi alla luce da Solone, e quindi raccolti in un solo *corpus* da Pisistrato (§ 66).¹² Accanto a questi passi di Poliziano, altri se ne potrebbero citare, nella generale riscoperta cinquecentesca delle 'biografie' omeriche (Pier Candido Decembrio, Petrus Parleo, Ponticus Vitruvius), che ricordano la cecità di Omero, il suo 'divino furore', e che accennano alla redazione di Pisistrato.¹³ Qui importa sottolineare solo che a questa tradizione biografica umanistica, in parte di ascendenza neoplatonica, Raffaello pare richiamarsi nel 'suo' Omero. Passa così in secondo piano, per quel che riguarda specificamente Omero, il modello

9 Per Poliziano ed Omero cf. Pontani 2011: 365-7 e 395-402; Id., in Poliziano 2002: xxxiv-xxxvi; Fabbri 1997: 116-22; Levine Rubinstein 1982: 205-39; Maier 1966: 83-98; Megna 2007 e 2009. Cf. ora anche Silvano 2010.

10 . . . *ita prorsus ab uno / impetus ille sacer vatium dependet Homero. / Ille, Iovis mensae acumbens, dat pocula nobis / Iliaca porrecta manu, quae triste repellant / annorum senium vitamque in saecula propagent*; "quel sacro impeto dei vati dipende tutto da Omero. Quello, sedendo alla mensa di Giove, ci porge i boccali con mano iliaca, perché respingano la trista vecchiaia degli anni e diffondano nei secoli la vita" (*Ambra*, vv. 16-20, trad. mia). Edizione del poemetto con ricco commento in Poliziano 1996.

11 Cf. Megna 2007.

12 Sui cursori accenni al ruolo di Licurgo, Solone e Pisistrato nella tradizione omerica nella *Oratio* di Poliziano cf. Megna 2007 e 2009: xlvii-xlviii.

13 Per quest'ultimo aspetto qui basti rinviare alla messa a punto di Ferreri 2002 e 2007.

dantesco che potrebbe aver ispirato la composizione generale del *Parnaso* e la pittura della “bella scola” di poeti intenti a gruppi a conversare tra loro, come è nel quarto canto dell’*Inferno* e nel ventesimo del *Purgatorio*. L’Omero di Raffaello è anzi isolato, rapito nella propria ispirazione, e non impugna l’enigmatica spada che caratterizza l’Omero di Dante (*Inferno*, 4.85-8).¹⁴ Si deve dunque interrogare la figura che con Omero appare in più diretta comunicazione, il ragazzo seduto con il calamo in mano. Chi rappresenta questo giovane?

6.

Nel Settecento, Francesco Aquila (1676-1740), in una descrizione del *Parnaso* a commento delle proprie incisioni, vi vide un “giovane rapsodo”,¹⁵ ossia un poeta che si pone sulla scia di Omero. Il termine ‘rapsodo’ ha, com’è noto, anch’esso ascendenza platonica: come Ione, il rapsodo è l’esecutore ed il rielaboratore di Omero.¹⁶ Nel 1935 Deoclecio Redig de Campos, basandosi tra l’altro su una scorretta lettura del Vasari, per il quale il giovane non è un poeta ma solo “uno che scrive”,¹⁷ ha voluto vedervi Ennio. Il saggio dello storico dell’arte brasiliano apparve nell’organo dell’Istituto di Studi Romani, in linea col programma culturale fascista di enfatizzare qualsiasi elemento contribuisse alla costruzione del ‘mito di Roma’; ma quell’interpretazione è divenuta quasi una vulgata.¹⁸ Senonché l’identificazione vien meno già per il semplice fatto che il più antico dei poeti latini sarebbe qui da Raffaello inspiegabilmente rappresentato co-

14 Sull’Omero di Dante (e sulla conoscenza da parte di quest’ultimo dei poemi omerici) cf. Cerri 2007. Sulle affinità e differenze tra Dante e Raffaello, e sul Limbo e il Parnaso come metafore di visioni del mondo cf. Petruzzelli 2014.

15 *Astant longo agmine vates; Smyrnaeumque, fundentem carmina, arrectis auribus, parato calamo, extensoque super coxendices complicatas papyro, iuvenis rapsodus auscultat* (Aquila 1722).

16 Sul ruolo dei rapsodi nella tradizione omerica cf. Ferrari 2010.

17 Vasari 1568: 1250: “. . . Omero che, cieco con la testa elevata cantando versi, ha a’ piedi uno che gli scrive”.

18 Recepta ad esempio da Reale 1999 (poi 2010, in un volume curato con Elisabetta Sgarbi per lo stesso editore). Cf. anche Hoogenwerff 1947-1949.

me l'unico non laureato, com'è stato tra l'altro notato da Harry B. Gutman nel 1958.¹⁹ Si potrebbe certo pensare ad uno dei discepoli di Omero di cui parlano le *Vite* antiche, ad esempio Testoride, come ha proposto in un saggio in corso di pubblicazione Adam Foley:²⁰ ma Testoride nella *Vita* omerica pseudo-erodotea è presentato come un disonesto plagiatario, e non si capisce perché Raffaello, se mai fosse stato a conoscenza di quella tradizione, dovesse addirittura glorificarlo sul Parnaso. Perché poi proprio Testoride e non altri 'discepoli' di Omero, solo ad esempio Arctino, considerato dai lessicografi diretto allievo di Omero? (Cerri 2000: 8-11). Invero ogni tipo di esatta identificazione, specie quando si ha a che fare con figure generiche, come è quella in questione, presta il destro ad infinite obiezioni;²¹ e forse conviene restare su quel che l'immagine dice e può rivelarsi più fecondo per la nostra ricerca.

7.

Il ragazzo non è vestito all'antica e soprattutto scrive servendosi di strumenti contemporanei a Raffaello: penna, carta e calamaio. Il che implica sia una distanza temporale tra Omero e il giovane che il richiamo ad una pratica di scrittura contemporanea al pittore, non al poeta antico. Dunque: Omero, in preda alla divinità, sta improvvisando, il ragazzo sta registrando i suoi versi. E questo richiama, da una parte, la pratica di trascrivere i versi dei poeti improvvisatori, i cosiddetti 'canterini', e dei poeti da strada, per darli poi alle stam-

19 Gutman 1958: 33: "Rechts und links von der Zentralgruppe erblicken wir Gruppen von Gestalten, die durch ihre Lorbeerkränze als Dichter gekennzeichnet sind. Nur ein Nichtdichter ist unter ihnen, der Schreiber, der Homer's Gesänge aufzeichnet und der . . . seine Gegenstücke in der Disputa und der Schule von Athen findet."

20 *Raphael's Parnassus and Renaissance Afterlives of Homer*. L'articolo apparirà nella rivista *Renaissance Quarterly*, come mi informa l'autore. Ne ho potuto leggere solo la versione provvisoria, temporaneamente messa a disposizione sul sito *academia.edu*, ma poi ritirata dall'autore. Questo saggio presenta alcune consonanze con il mio lavoro, il che per me è importante, dato che non sono primariamente una studiosa di Umanesimo, ma differisce nell'interpretazione della figura del giovane che scrive.

21 Cf. per quel che riguarda la *Scuola di Atene* quanto scrive Most 2001.

pe, pratica attestata nel Cinquecento per le strade di Roma e dell'Italia.²² Non pochi di questi poeti erano ciechi, ed alcuni recitavano, con grande successo, anche episodi di ascendenza omerica, ad esempio la morte di Ettore: nel 1998 Silvia Rizzo ha mostrato come proprio questi 'canterini' servirono da termine di paragone per il poetare di Omero ai primi umanisti. In particolare i due fratelli Angiolo e Pier Candido Decembrio "hanno immaginato il poeta in tutto simile a un poeta canterino dei loro tempi intento a girare per le piazze cantando gesta epiche . . . Su questo punto era particolarmente esplicito Angelo", afferma la studiosa (Rizzo 1998: 340). Nella biblioteca di Giulio II c'era una copia della *Politia Litteraria* di Angiolo Decembrio, che a proposito di Omero risponde alla *Vita Homeri* (1442) del fratello Pier Candido, citandolo e confutandolo in un passo che attesta con chiarezza l'analogia tra Omero e i poeti illetterati del tempo.²³ Può essere che Giulio II fosse stato particolarmente colpito dal passo in questione della *Politia Litteraria*, libro che aveva nella sua biblioteca, e che perciò lo avesse raccontato a Raffaello, influenzandone il lavoro in una Stanza a lui così cara.²⁴ È dunque possibile che il Papa stesso abbia suggerito a Raffaello l'analogia tra Omero e i poeti canterini, ma anche che il pittore si rifacesse alla propria esperienza: e perciò ne derivasse la necessità di rappresentare, accoppiato ad Omero, uno scrivano che registrasse i versi del poeta creduto *illetteratus*. Ed è questa la mia prima ipotesi.

8.

Più tardi sembrò naturale che il giovane scrivano fosse un diffusore con la scrittura dell'opera di Omero. Così scrive Giovanni Pietro Bellori (1613-1696), nella sua *Descrizione delle quattro im-*

22 Cf. per esempio Salzberg 2011.

23 Nr. 36 dell'inventario pubblicato da Taylor 2009: 141; per l'interpretazione in ambito storico-linguistico cf. Rizzo 1998.

24 L'irrisolta questione sull'ispiratore o gli ispiratori del programma della Stanza della Segnatura non può qui essere posta. Per Cannata Salomone (2002), ad esempio, si tratta di Baldassar Castiglione. Da ultimo Farinella (2014: 353) afferma la predominanza di Giulio II nel dettare il programma iconografico.

magini dipinte da Raffaello da Urbino nella Stanza della Segnatura (1695):

Non lungi la nobil Clio dal lato destro vedesi il grand'Omero in lungo manto di color celeste. Sta egli in piedi, e come da furore divino rapito solleva la fronte, distende la palma, e col gesto della mano accompagna gli eroici carmi. Ben si ravvisa alla cecità degli occhi, ed all'atto maestoso, e grave, canuta la barba, nella sembianza istessa, che l'età prisca lo finse. *Di fianco ad Omero si volge un giovine intento a notare i carmi di questo immortal Cantore.* Sedendo egli sopra un sasso, incavalca una gamba, e tiene con la sinistra sulla coscia il foglio col vasello dell'inchioostro. Con la destra sospende la penna, e guardando fisso ad Omero, pende dalla sua bocca coll'udito inteso al suono. *Così è fama che Omero, andasse cantando in varie parti i suoi libri, li quali trascritti, e raccolti, fossero poscia in giusti Poemi ridotti.* (Bellori 1825: 92, corsivo mio)

Un secolo più tardi gli fa eco Pietro Paolo Montagnani, spregiudicato libraio della Roma di fine Settecento,²⁵ nella *Esposizione descrittiva delle Pitture di Raffaello Sanzio da Urbino*:

Omero . . . , il più celebre di tutti i poeti greci, che fiorì circa mille anni prima della nostra era volgare, ed a cui sette città si contesero la gloria di aver dato i natali. Egli facendo mostra di fronte di tutta la persona, canuto la barba prolissa, offeso dalla sua cecità gli occhi in alto rivolti, vestito di largo manto ceruleo, in sembianza di un uomo ispirato canta i suoi versi, ed accompagna il canto col gesto della man destra, mentre sostiene con l'altra il ripiegato suo manto. La gravità gli siede sulle ciglia, e gli brilla in fronte la Delfica fiamma. Un giovane scrittore di rapsodie, alla di lui destra seduto in un masso, cui fa ombra una pianta di alloro, con una coscia sollevata sopra dell'altra, su cui appoggia un libro aperto, ove scrive i versi di Omero, tiene colla mano alzata una penna sospesa sul libro, ed il calamaio con l'altra, mentre ha il volto, e gli occhi così fissi verso di Omero, *che pare aver raccolta tutta l'anima sulla sua fronte per udire, e ritenere i versi del gran Cantore, onde consegnarli alle carte.* (Montagnani 1828: 131-2, corsivo mio)

²⁵ Cf. Tarzia 2000.

In queste due descrizioni si attribuisce al gesto di Omero una funzione pratica.²⁶ Ma qui importa come questi due interpreti intendano che il ragazzo stia scrivendo per tramandare i versi omerici: ma come li tramanda? Abbiamo pensato che la tradizione a cui qui Raffaello allude sia appunto quella scritta dei poemi; ma c'è un'altra maniera di 'tramandare' Omero, ed è renderlo accessibile a tutti coloro che non conoscono il greco, quindi tradurlo. Non occorre qui ricordare quanto la conoscenza e la diffusione di Omero sia una questione culturale essenziale per i primi umanisti; e quanto gli immediati predecessori di Giulio II abbiano contribuito a tale diffusione, finanziando i tentativi di traduzione latina dei poemi omerici.²⁷ E dunque ci chiediamo: quel giovane contemporaneo rappresentato da Raffaello annota i versi omerici oppure – ed è la mia ipotesi alternativa – li traduce?

9.

Per quanto infatti continui a sembrare suggestiva la possibilità che qui Raffaello abbia presente i poeti 'canterini', occorre anche dire che al suo Omero manca un elemento comune nell'iconografia di quelli: ossia lo strumento a corde, la viola o lira da braccio, che era considerata diretta erede della lira antica. Gli studi sull'iconografia del canterino nel primo Cinquecento hanno piuttosto collegato la prassi di quei poeti, di cantare seduti, su un palchetto e con la lira, con Orfeo e Apollo, quale appunto compare nel *Parnaso* di Raffaello; e lo stesso strumento è anche attribuito di Omero nella pittura e silografia (Degl'Innocenti 2011). Dato che, per rappresentare Apollo, Raffaello si attiene all'iconografia contemporanea

26 Con la mano il poeta accompagnerebbe il canto, sia che questo sia inteso come movimento tipico della declamazione, sia che serva per portare il ritmo della canzone. Così non è, perché si tratta invece di un gesto regale di Omero, che ha corrispondenza anche nel monocromo con Alessandro al di sotto dell'affresco, come ha mostrato Viccei (in stampa). Cf. n12.

27 Sulle traduzioni umanistiche di Omero cf. Fabbri, 1997; Alessandra Rocco 2000; e la tesi di dottorato inedita di Adam Foley: *Homer's Winged Words and Humanist Latinity: The Task of Translating Homer in the Italian Renaissance*.

dei poeti con la viola, per Omero vuole coscientemente distanziarsene: dunque l'Omero di Raffaello pare piuttosto dar corpo, come abbiamo accennato, ad una concezione neoplatonica di Omero, quale è appunto quella che traluce dalla *Collatio laureationis* di Francesco Petrarca,²⁸ e soprattutto dalla già ricordata *Ambra* di Angelo Poliziano, una *silva* che costituisce una glorificazione dottissima del poeta epico, nonché dalla *Oratio in expositione Homeri* dello stesso umanista, dove l'eccellenza di Omero viene argomentata sulla base delle fonti antiche come Dione Crisostomo, lo pseudo-Plutarco e le *Vite* antiche.²⁹ Un poeta, dunque, preda di 'eroici furori', e d'altro canto fonte unica di ogni altra poesia e padre di tutti i poeti, come aveva scritto anche Carlo Marsuppini nell'epistola dedicatoria della sua traduzione a Nicolò V (vv. 21-30). Ma per attingere a quella fonte occorreva poterne ascoltare la poesia: e quindi il ragazzo che medita e scrive potrebbe essere proprio chi osa contendere con il sommo Omero, traducendone il canto (così ancora nell'epistola di Marsuppini, vv. 7-8).³⁰ Poliziano si era distinto per l'eleganza della sua traduzione dell'*Iliade* (1469-1475), che gli procurò il soprannome di *Homericus adulescens*. Che sia dunque Poliziano il giovane in rapporto con Omero, intento ad ascoltarne i versi che sta traducendo? L'ipotesi, per quanto indimostrabile, non sembra impossibile: non solo a me, infatti, gli scritti di Poliziano sono parsi una probabile fonte d'ispirazione per Raffaello.³¹ Ma qui non interessa, come si è detto, un'esatta identificazione.

10.

Che Raffaello possa aver pensato ad un traduttore, invece che a un poeta, potrebbe dirlo innanzitutto l'abbigliamento moderno del giovane e la modernità dei suoi strumenti di lavoro. Credo porti forza alla mia ipotesi il fatto che, in ambiente neo-platonico "del

28 L'idea è sviluppata da Viccei (in stampa). Cf. anche i cenni in Fumaroli 2018: 251-8.

29 Cf. Pontani 2011: 365-7; Megna 2007 e 2009.

30 Sul contesto della traduzione cf. Megna 2007 e 2009.

31 Cf. Foley (in stampa).

furor poetico di origine divina partecipa anche, emotivamente e nel concreto del suo impegno versorio, il traduttore, proprio come nello *Ione* i rapsodi recitavano i versi omerici per divina ispirazione” (Megna 2009: xli, n3). Lo suggerisce forse ancora un altro elemento, mai tirato in causa, e che qui vorrei invece mettere in luce. La biblioteca di Giulio II conteneva un solo esemplare di Omero, ossia la traduzione latina in prosa dell’*Iliade* di Lorenzo Valla (1444 circa),³² che inizia così:

Scripturus ego quantam exercitibus Graiis cladem excitaverit Achillis furens indignatio, ita, ut passim aves feraeque cadaveribus heroum ac principum pascerentur: te Calliope, vosque aliae sorores sacer Musarum chorus, quarum hoc munus est proprium et quae vatibus praesidetis, invoco, oroque ut haec me edoceatis quae mox docere ipse alios possim. Primum quaenam origo indignationis, ac materia fuit?³³

Le prime due parole: *scripturus ego* sconcertano non solo perché, ovviamente, non rispettano affatto l’inizio dell’*Iliade*, ma perché rinviando direttamente all’atto dello scrivere, che dubitativamente può attribuirsi ad Omero, ma che si addice certamente al traduttore. Anche l’espressione *ut haec me edoceatis quae mox docere ipse alios possim*, è un’evidente aggiunta all’originale: certo quest’aggiunta esplicita l’idea di Omero principe e maestro di tutti i poeti, ma d’altro canto allude allo scopo della traduzione, “insegnare ad altri” quel che le Muse hanno “insegnato” al poeta. L’enfasi sulla ‘scrittura’ come tramite di diffusione della poesia epica non ha paralleli negli altri tentativi rinascimentali di traduzione del proemio iliadico. E non è da escludere che Raffaello, o avendo in prima persona tra le mani l’esemplare della biblioteca, o perché gli era stato letto o tradotto l’inizio, possa essere stato influenzato proprio da quest’inusuale proemio nell’immaginare il giovane che, a distanza di secoli, ascolta il vate ispirato e ne tramanda i versi per far da maestro agli altri: e lo fa traducendo, non poetando a sua volta.

32 Nr. 28 dell’inventario pubblicato da Taylor 1999: 141.

33 Cito dall’edizione del 1541 (Valla 1541: a2).

Riferimenti bibliografici

- Aquila, Francesco (1722), *Picturae Raphaelis Sanctij Urbinatis ex aula et conclavisbus palatii Vaticani*, Roma: typis ac sumptibus Dominici de Rossi.
- Bellori, Giovanni Pietro (1825), *Della vita e delle pitture di Raffaello da Urbino per Vasari, Bellori e Missirini*, Milano: per Niccolò Bettoni.
- Bruno, Giordano (2000), *De gli eroici furori*, in Michele Ciliberto (ed.), *Dialoghi filosofici italiani*, Milano: Mondadori, 805-9.
- Cannata Salomone, Nadia (1997), *A dispetto della morte: il sospiro di Alessandro e la memoria della poesia. Una prima ricognizione delle fonti*, in Zygmunt G. Barański e Lino Pertile (eds), *In amicizia. Essays in honour of Giulio Lepschy, The Italianist*, Special supplement 17, 56-82.
- (2002), “Evidentia in narratione”: filologia e storia nell’iconografia del *Cupido di Michelangelo e della Stanza della Segnatura*, in Luisa Miglio e Paola Supino (eds), *Segni per Armando Petrucci*, Roma: Bagatto Libri, 35-59.
- Cerri, Giovanni (2000), *Poemi epici attribuiti ad Omero*, in Giovanni Cerri (ed.), *La letteratura pseudepigrapha nella cultura greca e romana, Atti di un Incontro di studi*, Napoli, 15-17 gennaio 1998, *AION* (fil) 22: 29-58.
- (2007), *Dante e Omero (il volto di Medusa)*, Lecce: Argo.
- Degl’Innocenti, Luca (2011), “Il poeta, la viola, l’incanto. Per l’iconografia del poeta canterino nel primo Cinquecento”, *Paragone* 62: 141-56.
- Fabbi, Renata (1997), “Sulle traduzioni umanistiche da Omero”, in Franco Montanari e Stefano Pittaluga (eds), *Posthomeric I*, Genova: DARFICLET, 99-124.
- Farinella, Vincenzo (2014), *Alfonso I d’Este. Le immagini e il potere: da Ercole de’ Roberti a Michelangelo*, Milano: Officina Libraria.
- Ferrari, Franco (2010), “Omero, i rapsodi e la fabbrica degli *Inni*”, in Silvia Poli (ed.), *Inni omerici*, Torino: UTET, 9-34.
- Ferreri, Luigi (2002), “Alla scuola di Emanuele Crisolora. La teoria di Aristarco sull’origine della scrittura sullo sfondo della «Vita Homeri» di Pier Candido Decembrio”, *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 16, n.s. 13: 101-11.
- (2007), *La questione omerica dal Cinquecento al Settecento*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Foley, Adam, in stampa, “Raphael’s Parnassus and Renaissance Afterlives of Homer”, *Renaissance Quarterly*.
- Fumaroli, Marc (2018), *La repubblica delle lettere (La République des*

- Lettres*, 2015), traduzione di L. Frasin Guarino, Milano: Adelphi.
- Hoogenwerff, Godefridus I. (1947-1949), “La Stanza della Segnatura. Osservazioni e commenti”, *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 23-4: 317-56.
- Graziosi, Barbara (2002), *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gutman, Harry B. (1958), “Zur Ikonologie der Fresken Raffaels in der Stanza della Segnatura”, *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 21.1: 27-39.
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob (1801), *Homer nach Antiken gezeichnet*, von Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein, mit Erläuterungen von Christian Gottlob Heyne, Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Lanzi, Luigi Antonio (1795-1796), *Storia pittorica della Italia*. Vol. 1, Bassano: Raimondini.
- Levine Rubinstein, Alice (1982), “The Notes to Poliziano’s *Iliad*”, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 25: 205-39.
- Maier, Ida (1966), *Ange Politien. La formation d’un poete humaniste*, Genève: Droz.
- Megna, Paola (1999), *Lo Ione platonico nella Firenze medicea* (1997), Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici.
- (2007), *Angelo Poliziano, Oratio in expositione Homeri*, a cura di Paola Megna, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- (2009), *Le note del Poliziano alla traduzione dell’Iliade*, Messina: Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici.
- Montagnani, Pietro Paolo (1828), *Esposizione descrittiva delle Pitture di Raffaello Sanzio da Urbino*, Roma: Stamperia della Reverenda Camera Apostolica.
- Moormann, Eric M. (2004), “‘The Man who Made the Song Was Blind’: Representations of Homer in Modern Times I”, *Pharos* 12: 129-50.
- Most, Glenn Warren (2001), *Leggere Raffaello. La Scuola di Atene e il suo pre-testo*, Torino: Einaudi.
- (2004), “How many Homers?”, in Anna Santoni (ed.), *L’Autore multiplo*, Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 1-14.
- Petruzzelli, Giusy (2014), *Dal Limbo al Parnaso. Modelli iconografici e visioni del mondo*, in Luisa Rotondi Secchi Tarugi (ed.), *Roma pagana e Roma cristiana nel Rinascimento*. Atti del XXIV convegno internazionale Chianciano Terme-Pienza, 19-21 luglio 2012, Firenze: Cesati, 173-83.
- Poliziano, Angelo (1996), *Silvae*, a cura di Francesco Bausi, Firenze: Olschki.
- (2002), *Liber epigrammatum Graecorum*, a cura di Filippomaria Pontani, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

- Pontani, Filippomaria (2005), "A Byzantine Portrait of Homer", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 68: 1-26.
- (2011), *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Reale, Giovanni (1999), *Raffaello: Il "Parnaso": una rilettura ermeneutica dell'affresco con la prima presentazione analitica dei personaggi e dei particolari simbolici*, Milano: Rusconi.
- Redig de Campos, Deoclecio (1935), "Il ritratto del poeta Ennio nella Stanza della Segnatura", *Roma. Rivista di studi e di vita romana* 13: 193-200.
- Rijser, David (2012), *Raphael's Poetics: Art and Poetry in High Renaissance Rome*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Rizzo, Silvia (1998), "Omero, lingua volgare e lingua grammaticale: riflessioni in margine a luoghi di Pier Candido Decembrio, Angelo Decembrio e Annio da Viterbo", *Rinascimento* s. 2, 38: 337-44.
- Rocco, Alessandra (2000), *Carlo Marsuppini traduttore d'Omero. La prima traduzione umanistica in versi dell'Iliade (primo e nono libro)*, presentazione di Renata Fabbri, Padova: il Poligrafo.
- Salzberg, Rosa (2011), *La lira, la penna e la stampa: cantastorie ed editoria popolare nella Venezia del Cinquecento (The Lyre, the Pen and the Press: Performers and Cheap Print in Early Cinquecento Venice, 2008)*, traduzione di Luisa Casanova Stua, con la collaborazione di Eleonora Nespoli, Milano: CRELEB.
- Silvano, Luigi, (2010), *Angelo Poliziano, Appunti per un corso sull'Odissea*. Editio princeps del Par. gr. 3069, a cura di Luigi Silvano, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Tarzia, Fabio (2000), *Libri e rivoluzioni. Figure e mentalità della Roma di fine ancien régime (1790-1800)*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Taylor, Paul (2009), "Julius II and the Stanza della Segnatura", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72: 103-41.
- Valla, Lorenzo (1541), *Homeri poetarum omnium principis Ilias per Laurentium Vallam Latio donata*, Lugduni: apud Seb. Gryphium.
- Vasari, Giorgio (1568), *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, e architettori*, Firenze: Giunti.
- Vicci, Raffaella, in stampa, "Omero e il giovane rapsodo nella Stanza della Segnatura di Raffaello", in Valentina Prosperi e Valeria Flavia Lovato (eds), *Omero nel Rinascimento*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Wickhoff, Franz (1893), "Die Bibliothek Julius II", *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 14: 49-64.

The Authors

The Authors

Angela Maria Andrisano è Professore Ordinario di Filologia classica all'Università di Ferrara. Si è occupata prevalentemente di lirica arcaica greca, filologia dei testi teatrali greci (privilegiando Aristofane), storia della tradizione classica. Ad esemplificazione della sua ricerca si ricordano: *Il corpo teatrale tra testi e messin-scena* (Carocci 2006), *Biblioteche del mondo antico* (Carocci 2007), “Il prologo delle *Ecclesiazuse* di Aristofane: questioni di interlocuzione” (*Dioniso*, n.s. 3, 2013: 127-479), “La satira dei nuovi spettacoli tragici. La danza corale e la danza dei Carciniti nel finale delle *Vespe* aristofanee (vv. 1483-1537)”, in Alberto Camerotto e Stefano Maso (eds), *La satira del successo. La spettacolarizzazione della cultura nel mondo antico (tra retorica, filosofia, religione e potere)* (Mimesis 2017, 51-79).

Paola Angeli Bernardini is Professor Emerita at Carlo Bo University, Urbino. She is co-editor of *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* and co-director of the series *Filologia e critica*. She is the Italian correspondent for *Nikephoros*. During her career her main research areas were archaic Greek poetry (Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides), the history of Classical and Hellenic theatre, the history of ancient sport and of Lucian, the history of Boiotia and the Argolid during the Archaic and Classical periods, and local epic traditions. In recent years, she has extended her research to the analysis of the relationship between the poet and the city community and between the theatrical message and the town. She has recently published *Il soldato e l'atleta. Guerra e sport nella Grecia antica* (il Mulino 2016).

Andreas Bagordo has taught at the Albert Ludwigs University, Freiburg, Germany, since 1999 and has been a Professor there since 2005. He graduated from the University of Rome La Sapienza: his thesis, under the supervision of Luigi Enrico Rossi, was published as *Die antiken Traktate über das Drama* (Teubner 1998), and he gained his PhD at Göttingen in 1998 (*Beobachtungen zur Sprache des Terenz*, published 2001) and his Habilitation at Freiburg in 2001 (*Reminiszenzen früher Lyrik bei den attischen Tragikern*, published 2003). He wrote an edition with translation and notes of Sappho (*Sappho. Gedichte*, 2009) and the whole of the section on lyric in the *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur* (2014). Since 2011 he has been working on the KomFrag-project of the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften (commentary on the fragments of Greek comedy), and has published six volumes in the series (*Telekleides* 2013; *Alkimenēs–Kantharos* and *Leukon–Xenophilos*, both 2014; *Aristophanes’ fr. 590–674*, 2016; fr. 675–820, 2017; fr. 821–976, 2018).

Anton Bierl is Professor Ordinarius for Greek Literature at the University of Basel (since 2002). He served as Senior Fellow at *Harvard’s Center for Hellenic Studies* in Washington DC (2005–2011) and is Member of the *Institute for Advanced Study*, Princeton (2010/11). He is director and co-editor of *Homer’s Iliad: The Basel Commentary*, originally in German, since 2002, now also as revised editions in English, and he is founder and editor of the series *Mythos Eikon Poiesis*. Among other functions, he is Member of the Advisory Board of the Verona-based Journal *Skenè*.

His research interests include Homeric Epic, Greek Drama, i.e. Tragedy, Comedy and Satyr-play, Archaic Lyric, Song and Performance Culture, the Ancient Novel, Greek Myth and Religion, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* and Reception Studies, esp. Modern Productions of Greek Drama. His books include *Dionysos und die griechische Tragödie: Politische und ‘metatheatralische’ Aspekte im Text* (Narr 1991), *Die Orestie des Aischylos auf der modernen Bühne* (Metzler 1996; Italian revised edition *L’Orestea di Eschilo sulla scena moderna*, Bulzoni 2004), *Der Chor in der Alten Komödie* (Teubner/Saur 2001; English revised edition *Ritual and Performativity*, Harvard University Press 2009), and the co-edited

volumes *Literatur und Religion. Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen*, 2 voll. (De Gruyter 2007), *Gewalt und Opfer: Im Dialog mit Walter Burkert* (De Gruyter 2010), *Ästhetik des Opfers* (Fink 2012), *Intende Lector: Echoes of Myth, Religion and Ritual in the Ancient Novel* (De Gruyter 2013), *The Newest Sappho* (Brill 2016), *Time and Space in Ancient Myth, Religion and Culture* (De Gruyter 2017).

He is currently working on a book titled *Youth in Fiction. Love, Myth, and Literary Sophistication in the Ancient Novel*, another monograph about Greek chorality, a translation of Sappho with a short commentary for Reclam, and, besides his duties in the Homerkommentar, is going to write the commentary on the *Oresteia* for the Lorenzo Valla series.

Silvia Bigliuzzi is Professor of English Literature at Verona University. Her fields of interest include literature and the visual arts, textual performance, translation studies, Shakespeare, the English Renaissance and the Classical legacy. Among her publications, *Il colore del silenzio. Il Novecento tra parola e immagine* (Marsilio 1998), *Oltre il genere. Amleto tra scena e racconto* (Edizioni dell'Orso 2001), *Sull'esecuzione testuale* (ETS 2002), *Nel prisma del nulla. L'esperienza del non-essere nella drammaturgia shakespeariana* (Liguori 2005), *John Donne. Poesie* (ed. and trans. with Alessandro Serpieri, Rizzoli 20092), *William Shakespeare. Romeo e Giulietta* (ed. and trans., Einaudi 2012), the Italian translation of the Arden edition of *Double Falsehood* (Rizzoli 2012), and the edition of several collections of essays (*Distraction Individualized. Figures of Insanity in Early Modern England* (Cierre 2012), *Theatre Translation in Performance* (Routledge 2013), *Revisiting the Tempest. The Capacity to Signify* (Palgrave 2014), *Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, and Civic Life* (Routledge 2016) as well as Journal Special Issues (*Scepticism and The Culture of Paradox, English Literature* 1 2014; *Diegesis and Mimesis, Skenè* 2.2 2016; *The Tyrant's Fear, Comparative Drama* Part 1: 51.4 2017, and Part 2: 52.1-2 2018). She is co-editor of *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, the Arden series *Shakespeare Global Inverted* (Bloomsbury), and *Anglica* (ETS).

Maria Grazia Bonanno ha indagato i principali momenti della letteratura greca: si è occupata di lirica arcaica, fornendo interpretazioni dei principali poeti (soprattutto Saffo e Archiloco), teatro, con particolare interesse per Eschilo, Aristofane e la commedia (Cratete), poesia ellenistica (Teocrito e la figura del *poeta doctus*). Ha dimostrato particolare interesse per la messa in scena del dramma antico, soprattutto attraverso lo studio della *Poetica* di Aristotele, sulla quale ha recentemente pubblicato un volume delle sue più significative ricerche (*Aristotele ambiguo? Qualche riflessione sulla Poetica*, Edizioni Università di Trieste 2016). Ha anche percorso le strade della lessicografia (Esichio) e della prosa filosofica (Platone), con brevi incursioni nel tardo arcaico (S. Ilario e Giamblico). Ha insegnato a Bologna, Siena e Roma. Attualmente è Professore Emerito dell'Università di Roma Tor Vergata. Tra le sue pubblicazioni *Studi su Cratete comico* (Antenore 1973), *L'allusione necessaria. Ricerche intertestuali sulla poesia greca e latina* (Edizioni dell'Ateneo 1990), di cui è uscita da poco una nuova edizione accresciuta (Serra 2018), e *La lettura del filologo* (Edizioni Università di Trieste 2014). Insieme con Luigi Enrico Rossi e Roberto Pretagostini ha fondato e diretto la rivista *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca*. È componente del comitato scientifico delle riviste *Eikasmós*, *Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, *Lexis*. Ha fatto parte del comitato scientifico dell'I.N.D.A. (Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico).

Simona Brunetti è ricercatrice di Discipline dello Spettacolo presso l'Università di Verona dove insegna Storia del teatro e dello spettacolo. Gli ambiti principali di cui si occupa sono teatro ottocentesco italiano e francese, regia teatrale italiana e attività spettacolare rinascimentale e barocca. I suoi studi più recenti ruotano attorno alla prassi d'attore tra il XVII e il XX secolo, con un'attenzione particolare per l'area padana nel XVIII secolo. Dal 2009 al 2015 ha coordinato il progetto *Herla* della Fondazione Umberto Artioli Mantova Capitale Europea dello Spettacolo, dedicato alla ricerca archivistica e alla catalogazione di documenti inerenti la spettacolarità patrocinata dai Gonzaga nel periodo del loro massi-

mo splendore (1480-1630). Accanto a due monografie dedicate alla fortuna scenica in Italia della *Signora dalle Camelie* (Esedra 2004 e CLEUP 2008), ha pubblicato diversi saggi e un volume sul rapporto tra scrittura drammaturgica e prassi attorica nel XIX secolo (*Autori, attori, adattatori*, Esedra 2008). Dopo aver collaborato all'edizione complanare di *Angelo, tyran de Padoue* di Victor Hugo (Le Lettere 2012) e curato diversi volumi miscellanei, tra cui nel 2016 gli atti del convegno internazionale *Maestranze, artisti, apparatori per la scena dei Gonzaga (1480-1630)* (Edizioni di Pagina); è di prossima uscita l'edizione critica, con traduzione e fortuna scenica, della tragedia *Gysbrecht van Aemstel* di Joost van den Vondel, curata insieme a Marco Prandoni.

Douglas Cairns works on ancient Greek society, ethics, and literature, especially the emotions. He has held the Chair of Classics in the University of Edinburgh since 2004, having previously taught in the Universities of St Andrews, Otago, Leeds, and Glasgow. He has held research fellowships from the Leverhulme Trust and the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung as well as visiting positions in Japan (Kyoto and Tokyo), Italy (Pisa), and the United States (as George R. Langford Family Eminent Scholar Chair, Florida State University). He was elected to Membership of Academia Europaea in 2013 and to Fellowship of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and of the British Academy in 2018.

Recent collaborative research projects include 'A History of Distributed Cognition' (2014-17, Arts and Humanities Research Council), 'Emotions through Time: From Antiquity to Byzantium' (2016-18, Leverhulme Trust), and 'Honour in Classical Greece' (2018-22, European Research Council). He currently holds an Anneliese Maier-Forschungspreis, awarded by the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (2018-23, held at Technische Universität Dresden) and Mercator Fellowship, Johannes Gutenberg Universität, Mainz (2018-19).

He is the author of *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Clarendon Press 1993), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes* (Cambridge University Press 2010), and *Sophocles: Antigone* (Bloomsbury, 2016), as well as editor

or co-editor of 14 volumes, including (most recently) *Distributed Cognition in Classical Antiquity* (Edinburgh University Press 2018, with Miranda Anderson and Mark Sprevak) and *A Cultural History of Emotions in Antiquity* (forthcoming).

Giovanni Cerri was Full Professor of Greek Literature in the University of Naples “L’Orientale” from 1975 to 2006, then in the University of Rome “Roma Tre” from 2006 until November 2012, when he retired. His main works are: *Il linguaggio politico nel Prometeo di Eschilo. Saggio di semantica* (Edizioni dell’Ateneo 1975), *Legislazione orale e tragedia greca* (Liguori 1979), Bruno Gentili e Giovanni Cerri, *Storia e biografia nel pensiero antico* (Roma-Bari 1983), *La poetica di Platone: una teoria della comunicazione* (Argo 2007), *Parmenide di Elea, Poema sulla natura* (Rizzoli 1999), Bruno Gentili e Giovanni Cerri, *La letteratura di Roma arcaica e l’ellenismo* (Aragno 2005), *Dante e Omero. Il volto di Medusa* (Argo 2007), *Iliade XVIII: Lo Scudo di Achille* (Introduction, translation and Commentary, Carocci 2010), G. Cerri *et al.*, *Dall’universo-blocco all’atomo nella scuola di Elea: Parmenide, Zenone, Leucippo (Tre lezioni di G. Cerri, precedute da un’introduzione di M. Pulpito e S. Ranzato e seguite da dibattito e replica)*, a cura di Massimo Pulpito e Sofia Ranzato, Academia 2018; as well as poetic translations of the *Iliad* and of several Sophoclean tragedies.

Vittorio Citti è nato a Bologna nel 1932. Ha insegnato nei licei di Ferrara e di Cento. Poi è stato assistente di Letteratura Greca a Bologna, Professore Associato a Venezia e Professore Ordinario a Cagliari e a Trento. È stato direttore del Dipartimento di Filologia Classica e Glottologia di Cagliari, coordinatore del dottorato internazionale costituito tra le università di Trento, Lille III e l’EHESS de Paris. Ha studiato la tragedia greca, l’epigramma ellenistico e i componimenti greci e latini di Giovanni Pascoli. Tra le sue pubblicazioni, *Il linguaggio religioso e liturgico nelle tragedie di Eschilo* (Zanichelli 1962), *Tragedia e lotta di classe in Grecia* (Liguori 1979), *La parola ornata* (Adriatica 1986), *Studi sul testo delle Coefore*

(Hakkert 2006). Ha in corso di pubblicazione un'edizione critica, con introduzione, traduzione, commento e appendice metrica delle *Supplici* di Eschilo, in collaborazione con Carles Miralles e Liana Lomiento, presso l'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Dirige dal 1988, in collaborazione con Paolo Mastandrea ed Enrico Medda, la rivista *Lexis, Poetica, retorica e comunicazione nella tradizione classica*, con le collane connesse, *Supplementi di Lexis, Supplementi di Lexis*, Nuova serie, in collaborazione con Paolo Mastandrea ed Enrico Medda, *Classics in the Libraries*, in collaborazione con Paolo Mastandrea e Paolo Eleuteri. *A New Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus*, in collaborazione con Matteo Taufer. È membro dell'Accademia Pascoliana di Bologna.

Adele Cozzoli is Full Professor of Greek literature at the University of Rome "Roma Tre". Her research interests primarily focus on fifth-century Greek Theatre, with particular attention to Euripides (especially Euripidean fragments). In 2001, she published for the academic series 'Testi e commenti', directed by Bruno Gentili, Geoffrey Arnott, and Giuseppe Giangrande (Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali), her monograph *Euripide. Cretesi. Introduzione, testimonianze, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. She was also co-organizer of scientific international conferences on theatre: "Teatro greco postclassico e teatro latino: teorie e prassi drammatica" (16-18 October 2001, Herder 2003), "La tragedia greca e latina, le testimonianze archeologiche e iconografiche" (14-16 October 2004, Herder 2009). In 2015, with the cooperation of the University of Cagliari, she organized a conference entitled "Il Poeta, la festa e la scena. Spazi e contesti teatrali. Antico e moderno" (*Lexis Supplementi* 2017). In June 2018, she became coordinator of the academic interdisciplinary project "Lessico bilingue del teatro europeo", 'call4ideas2018', financed on the basis of external refereeing. Since 1994, another focus of her research has been Hellenistic poetry. Her most important and recent studies on this theme are: *Poeta e filologo. Studi di poesia ellenistica* (Herder 2012), "Un dialogo tra poeti. Apollonio Rodio e Teocrito" (*Lexis* 33, 2015: 218-40); "Filosofi e Filologi a Simposio. I Silli di Timone di Fliunte

e il primo dei Giambi di Callimaco” (*Aitia* 5, 2015, issue organized with Riccardo Chiaradonna). Since 2016, she has been responsible for the project “Variazioni sul teatro antico” (3rd Edition), involving the theatrical laboratories of many secondary schools in Rome and in Lazio, hosted by the Palladium Theatre of Rome, with the cooperation of Fondazione Roma Tre Palladium and Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico, Fondazione Onlus.

Francesco Dall’Olio ha terminato quest’anno il Corso di Dottorato in Filologia, Letteratura e Scienze dello Spettacolo all’Università di Verona; attualmente sta completando la sua tesi di dottorato (da discutersi nella primavera del 2019), dal titolo *King tyrannos: la tirannide greca nella letteratura elisabettiana*. Ha ottenuto la Laurea Magistrale in Filologia e Storia dell’Antichità all’Università di Pisa nel 2013, e un anno dopo ha ottenuto il diploma di licenza alla Scuola Normale Superiore. Fa parte della redazione della rivista *Skenè*, e durante i tre anni del corso, ha svolto attività di ricerca fuori sede come *visiting scholar* presso la Gallatin School of Individualized Studies (NYU). Ha pubblicato un articolo sul n. 66/b (2014) della rivista *Maia*, dal titolo “L’eroe malato: esclusione e mancata reintegrazione nell’*Oreste* di Euripide e nel *Filottete* di Sofocle”, e un altro sul numero speciale di *Comparative Drama*, n. 51/4 (2017), sulla presenza della teoria politica sulla tirannide di Senofonte e Platone nella cultura elisabettiana. Quest’articolo costituisce la versione scritta di un intervento sul personaggio di Cambise in Erodoto e il modello tragico presentato al Simposio Internazionale “La paura del tiranno”, a Verona, il 10-11 novembre 2016. È stato inoltre membro del comitato scientifico per il convegno “Bestiarium: Rappresentazioni dell’umano e dell’animale”, e ha partecipato come oratore alla Conferenza Internazionale “À corps perdu: limiti, costruzione, intensità del corpo”, tenuta a Verona nel settembre 2017, con un intervento dal titolo “Don’t Dream It, Be It: esaltazione e distruzione del corpo nelle *Baccanti* e in *The Rocky Horror Picture Show*” (la cui versione scritta è in via di pubblicazione). I suoi interessi di ricerca riguardano la tragedia greca, il suo rapporto con altre forme artistiche della letteratu-

ra greca e la sua eredità nella cultura moderna, con una particolare attenzione per il teatro elisabettiano e per il cinema.

Massimo Di Marco (1947) has been Full Professor of Greek Literature since 1986, he taught at the University of Trento (1986-1991), L'Aquila (1991-92), Roma Lumsa (1992-98), Roma "Sapienza" (1998-2018). He was Degree Course Director (Humanities, Roma Lumsa; Classics, "Roma Sapienza") and Coordinator of the Doctorate in Classical Philology (Roma "Sapienza"). His research interests focus on philosophical satire and parody, classical drama, Hellenistic poetry. He is the author of *Timone di Fliunte. Silli*, (Edizioni dell'Ateneo 1989), *Sapienza italica. Studi su Senofane, Empedocle, Ippone* (Studium 1998), *La tragedia greca. Forma, gioco scenico, tecniche drammatiche* (Carocci 2000, 20092), *Studi su Asclepiade di Samo* (Aracne 2013), *Satyriká. Studi sul dramma satiresco* (Pensa MultiMedia 2013), he has also published extensively on comedy, Hellenistic epigram, Callimachus, bucolic poetry, and is the author of a number of articles in *Der Neue Pauly*. In 2000 he founded *Poesis. Bibliografia della poesia greca* and was the associate editor. He edited, with Bruna M. Palumbo Stracca e Emanuele Lelli, *Posidippo e gli altri. Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario* (Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali 2005), and, with Eleonora Tagliaferro, *Semeion philias. Studi di letteratura greca offerti ad Agostino Masaracchia* (Aracne 2009). He is the editor of the Series *Exégesis* (Aracne). Forthcoming is a critical edition with commentary of Hermesianax of Colophon for Aracne Editrice. With Gianna Petrone, he will be co-editor of a multi-author *Storia del teatro antico* for Carocci Editore.

Marco Duranti ha conseguito il titolo di Dottore di ricerca in Letteratura greca nel 2017, in cotutela tra le università di Verona e Freiburg i.Br., con una tesi *intitolata Caratterizzazione dei personaggi e messaggio filosofico-religioso nell'Ifigenia taurica: da Euripide a Goethe*, ed è attualmente Cultore della materia presso l'Università di Verona, nonché docente di ruolo presso il liceo ITSOS Marie

Curie di Cernusco S/N (Milano). Ha pubblicato articoli sull'*Ifigenia taurica* e altri drammi euripidei sulle riviste *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, *Skenè*, *Comparative Drama*. Si è inoltre interessato alle *Ecclesiazuse* di Aristofane, pubblicando un contributo nel volume *Studi sulla commedia attica* (Freiburg 2015) e l'apparato di note per una traduzione di Umberto Albini recentemente pubblicata (*Stratagemmi* 36, 2017). È tra i curatori del volume collettaneo *Tracce, memorie, sintomi citazione tra filologia, letteratura e linguistica*, di prossima pubblicazione sulla rivista *Parole Rubate*. È inoltre intervenuto in convegni internazionali in Europa e in America.

Sotera Fornaro ha studiato a Bari, dove si è laureata (1986) con Carlo Ferdinando Russo, e dove ha conseguito il dottorato di ricerca in Filologia classica (1989); si è poi addottorata in Scienze Storiche (1992) presso l'Università di San Marino. Dopo il post-dottorato a Bari, è stata borsista DAAD ad Heidelberg ed assistente di Letteratura greca a Basilea, quindi ricercatrice all'Università di Sassari, dove dal 2004 è Professore Associato di Letteratura greca ed insegna anche Letterature comparate. È abilitata alla prima fascia in Letteratura greca (2012 e 2016), Filologia classica (2012) e Letterature comparate (2016). È stata borsista della Fondazione Alexander von Humboldt a Heidelberg e Berlino, Visiting Professor a Freiburg i.Br. e a Lüneburg. Ha studiato Omero, la retorica greca d'età imperiale (in particolare Dionigi d'Alicarnasso, Dione Crisostomo e Luciano), storia della ricezione e della tradizione classica, specie nella cultura di lingua tedesca (ad es. Hölderlin, Heiner Müller, Elfriede Jelinek); è specialista di storia degli studi classici tra '700 e '800, e ha collaborato tra l'altro al *Neuer Pauly* e ai suoi *Supplmente* con oltre 100 voci, all'*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* e alla *Storia della filologia classica*, a cura di Diego Lanza e Gherardo Ugolini (Carocci 2016). Ha tradotto e curato in italiano l'*Introduzione alla filologia greca* a cura di Heinz-Günther Nesselrath. Le sue più significative monografie sono: *Epistola a Pompeo di Dionigi di Alicarnasso* (Teubner 1997), *I Greci senza lumi. Christian Gottlob Heyne e l'antropologia stori-*

ca del mondo antico (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2004), *Percorsi epici. Alle origini della letteratura occidentale* (Carocci 2009), *Antigone. Storia di un mito* (Carocci 2012), *L'ora di Antigone dal nazismo agli anni di piombo* (Narr 2012), *Che cos'è un classico? Il classico in J.M. Coetzee* (Edizioni di Pagina 2013), *Antigone nell'età del terrorismo. Letteratura, cinema, teatro* (Pensa MultiMedia 2016). È autrice di una *Bibliografia della letteratura greca per Lo Spazio Letterario della Grecia antica* (Salerno 1996) e ha curato e prefato traduzioni da Friedrich Creuzer, Gottfried Hermann, Walter Hasenclever, Rolf Hochhuth, Johann Gottfried Herder, Johann Wolfgang Goethe.

Alessandro Grilli studied at the Scuola Normale Superiore (PhD in Classical Tradition), St. John's College Oxford and at Pisa University (Italy), where he now teaches Comparative literature, Hermeneutics and rhetoric, and Comparative history of classical literatures. He has been visiting research fellow in various European institutions (most recently at the Institute of Cultural Studies of the Humboldt University in Berlin). He has written extensively about ancient drama and the tradition of classical literatures. His research interests range from literary criticism and theory to theatre and drama studies, from applied rhetoric to gender and queer studies. He has published monographs and articles about ancient and modern authors (from Aristophanes to Proust, from Catullus to Walter Siti), about argumentation theory, and about film studies. His latest monograph *Storie di Venere e Adone. Bellezza, genere, desiderio* (Mimesis, 2012) is an analysis of the Adonis myth as a cautionary tale, where dominant female desire is demonized to construct paradigms of proper male behaviour. He is currently working on three books – one about Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*, one about horror literature and film (working title: *Aesthetics of Horror*) and another on the literary representation of social ineptitude (working title: *Misfits: Dorks, Losers, Eccentrics in Literature and Beyond*).

Stephen Halliwell is Professor of Greek at the University of St Andrews and a Fellow of both the British Academy and the Royal Society of Edinburgh. He has published extensively on Greek literature and philosophy, as well as on the influence of Greek texts and ideas from the Renaissance to the present. His books include *Aristotle's Poetics* (Duckworth 1986, 2nd edn. 1998), *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton University Press 2002: winner of the Premio Europeo d'Estetica 2008), *Greek Laughter: A Study of Cultural Psychology from Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge University Press 2002: winner of the Criticos Prize 2008), *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretations of Greek Poetics from Homer to Longinus* (Oxford University Press 2011), commentaries on books 5 (1997) and 10 (1988) of Plato's *Republic*, a translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* for the Loeb Library (1995), and verse translations of the plays of Aristophanes for the Oxford World's Classics Series, of which two volumes have so far appeared: *Birds and Other Plays* (1998, also contains *Lysistrata*, *Assembly-Women*, and *Wealth*), and *Frogs and Other Plays* (2016, also contains *Clouds* and *Women at the Thesmophoria*). His edition of pseudo-Longinus, *On the Sublime*, is forthcoming in the Lorenzo Valla series.

Edward M. Harris received a BA in Classics from Stanford University, a BA in Classics (*Literae humaniores*) from Oxford University, and an MA and PhD from Harvard University. He taught at Brooklyn College CUNY from 1983 to 2005 and was a member of the Graduate School (CUNY) from 1986 to 2005. In 2005 he became Professor of Ancient History at Durham University and in 2009 became Research Professor until his retirement in 2013. He is now Emeritus Professor of Ancient History at Durham University and Honorary Professorial Fellow at the University of Edinburgh. In autumn 1998 he was a Member of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton NJ, and in 2004/2005 an NEH Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In 2002/2003 he was Professeur invité at the University of Paris, Panthéon-Sorbonne and in May 2012 he was Directeur d'études invité at the Écolepratique des hautes études, Paris. Professor Harris has writ-

ten extensively on many aspects of the history of ancient Greece including the political and legal institutions of Classical Athens, the economy of ancient Greece, gender and sexuality, rhetoric and oratory, Greek religion, Attic tragedy, and Greek epigraphy. His first book was a study of the Athenian politician Aeschines. He has also published *Democracy and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens: Essays on Law, Society, and Politics in Classical Athens* (Cambridge University Press 2006) and *The Rule of Law in Action in Democratic Athens* (Oxford University Press 2013). Professor Harris has also co-edited five volumes of essays: with Robert Wallace, *Transitions to Empire* (Oklahoma University Press), with Lene Rubinstein, *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece* (Duckworth Press), with Gerhard Thür, *Symposion 2007: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Austrian Academy), with Delfim F. Leao and Peter John Rhodes, *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece* (Duckworth), and with David M. Lewis and Mark Woolmer, *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households and City States Markets, Households, and City-States* (Cambridge University Press). Finally, he has translated *Demosthenes, Speeches 20-22*, and *Demosthenes, Speeches 23-26* (University of Texas Press).

Olimpia Imperio (1965) è Professore Ordinario di Lingua e letteratura greca presso l'Università di Bari e dirige attualmente il Centro Interuniversitario di Ricerca di "Studi sulla tradizione" (Università di Bari-Repubblica di San Marino-Padova-Trento). Ambiti privilegiati della sua attività di ricerca sono il teatro comico e tragico (in particolare la commedia attica di V-IV secolo a.C.) e la ricezione di forme e temi della letteratura greca antica nelle letterature moderne.

Tra le sue pubblicazioni, *Parabasi di Aristofane. Acarnesi, Cavalieri, Vespe, Uccelli* (Adriatica Editrice 2004) e *Aristofane tra antiche e moderne teorie del comico* (Edizioni Università di Trieste 2014), oltre a saggi sulle immagini di Odisseo nella tragedia greca, sulla maschera dell'intellettuale nella commedia greca, sulla figura del medico nella tradizione comica antica e moderna, sull'Aristofane di Richard Porson, sui frammenti del commediografo

Callia, sul ruolo del coro nell'ultimo Aristofane e nella commedia del IV secolo a.C. e sui cori animali nella commedia greca, su oggetti di scena e ambiguità di genere nelle commedie femminili, superstiti e frammentarie, di Aristofane, sulle personificazioni dell'arte poetica nella commedia greca, sul conflitto generazionale nel teatro comico e tragico del V secolo a.C., sulla 'donna-diavolo' nella Grecia antica, sulla satira politica nel *Dionisalessandro* di Cratino e sulle testimonianze dei comici nella biografia plutarchea di Pericle. Ha in corso di stampa alcune voci della *Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy* curata da Alan H. Sommerstein per la casa editrice Wiley-Blackwell. Ha curato la traduzione delle *Rane* di Aristofane per il 53° ciclo delle rappresentazioni organizzate, per la stagione teatrale 2017, dall'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma antico nel teatro greco di Siracusa, e la traduzione dei *Cavalieri* di Aristofane per il 54° ciclo delle rappresentazioni organizzate, per la stagione teatrale 2018, dall'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma antico nel teatro greco di Siracusa. Nell'ambito del progetto *KomFrag: Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie*, diretto da Bernhard Zimmermann e promosso dalla Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, ha curato il volume 10.6 dei frammenti di Aristofane (*Eirene b'-Lemniai*), in corso di stampa.

Pierre Judet de La Combe is Directeur d'études at the École des hautes études en sciences sociales (Paris) and Directeur de recherches émérite at the CNRS. He was trained in classical philology at Lille by Jean Bollack. His main topics are Greek poetry (edition, commentary, translation), the history and the theory of philology and the relationship between theories of language and teaching practices in Europe. As a philologist and translator, he worked on Greek tragedy collaborating with several theatres (Paris, Avignon, Strasbourg, Lyon, Marseille) and taught philology and dramaturgy in several Italian Universities (Cagliari, Trento, Bologna, Venice) and lastly at the TeatroDue (Parma). After the publication of the commentary of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* he had begun with Jean Bollack (Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme 1981, 2001), he wrote several translations for the theatre:

Agamemnon, (2004, 2015), *Frogs* (2012) and, with Myrto Gondicas, *Prometheus Bound* (1996), *Medea* (2000, 2012), *Persians* (2000, 2018). On the topic of Greek tragedy he published in 2010 *Les tragédies grecques sont-elles tragiques? Théâtre et théorie* (Bayard). The question of interpretation and of translation was enlarged into a broader reflection conducted from a European political perspective about the multiplicity and historicity of languages in two books: *L'Avenir des langues. Repenser les Humanités*, with Heinz Wismann (Cerf 2004), and *L'Avenir des Anciens. Oser lire les Grecs et les Latins* (Albin Michel 2016). He is now finishing a translation and a commentary of Homer's *Iliad*, after the analysis he gave of the myth of this problematical "author", *Homère* (2017).

Walter Lapini è Professore Ordinario di Letteratura greca presso l'Università di Genova. Ha studiato a Firenze, Padova e Verona. Si è occupato di teatro greco comico e tragico, storiografia, filologia filosofica arcaica e classica, epigramma ellenistico, metodologia critico-testuale, letteratura pseudoepigrafa. È autore di numerosi articoli e di varie monografie, fra cui: *Spinoza e le inezie puerili* (Il Melangolo 2010), *Testi frammentari e critica del testo* (Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura 2013; continuazione di *Studi di filologia filosofica greca*, Olschki 2003), *L'Epistola a Erodoto di Epicuro* (Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura 2015), *Letteratura greca* (il Mulino 2017; con Antonietta Porro). Ha studiato in particolare: Erodoto (*Il POxy. 664 e la cronologia dei Cipselidi*, Olschki 1996), Tucidide (*La guerra ionica*, Il Melangolo 2002), Pseudo-Senofonte (*Commento all'Athenaion Politeia dello Pseudo-Senofonte*, Università di Firenze 1997), *Elleniche di Ossirinco*, Teofrasto, Plutarco, Favorino, Diogene Laerzio. Numerosi i suoi contributi di papirologia letteraria, sul *P.Hibeh* 1.13, sul *POxy.* 2331, sul *POxy.* 4030 (Eschine, *Contro Timarco*) e soprattutto sul papiro di Posidippo (*P. Mil. Vogl. VIII* 309), su cui ha anche pubblicato il volume *Capitoli su Posidippo* (Edizioni dell'Orso 2007). Una parte non secondaria della sua produzione scientifica verte su autori latini: Lucrezio, Orazio, Seneca, Tacito, Ditti-Settimio.

Vayos Liapis is Professor of Theatre Studies at the Open University of Cyprus. He has published on classical and postclassical Greek tragedy, Greek wisdom literature, textual criticism, Greek religion, and the reception of Greek tragedy in modern Greek literature. His latest book is *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford University Press 2012), and his latest co-edited book (with Antonis K. Petrides) is *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century* (Cambridge university Press 2018). He is currently working on a commentary on Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* and (with Avra Sidiropoulou) on a coedited volume on *Adapting Greek Tragedy*.

Liana Lomiento is Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Urbino Carlo Bo. Her main research interests are in Greek Metrics and Greek Lyric and Dramatic Poetry. She has published many essays concerning ancient Greek Theatre, with particular attention to the poetic forms and their relation to dramaturgy, a critical edition with an Italian translation and commentary of Cercidas of Megalopolis (*Cercida di Megalopoli. Introduzione, Testo critico, Traduzione e Commento*, Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale 1993), a handbook of Greek Metrics and Rhythmics in collaboration with Bruno Gentili (*Metrics and Rhythmics. History of Poetic Forms in Ancient Greece*, Engl. trans. by E. Chr. Kopff, Fabrizio Serra Editore 2008), an edition with commentary of Pindar's *Olympians* (Bruno Gentili, Carmine Catenacci, Pietro Giannini, Liana Lomiento, *Pindaro. Olimpiche*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore 2013). She is also author of the essay *Ancient Greek Verses: Considerations on the Evidential Status of the Sources for Meter* (Edizioni Università di Trieste 2013). She is Director of the *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medievale*, and of the Summer School in Greek Metrics and Rhythmics held annually at Urbino in the first week of September.

Francesco Lupi ha conseguito il dottorato di ricerca presso l'Università degli Studi di Verona, dove è attualmente docente a contratto nei settori di Lingua e letteratura greca e di Filologia classica. Ha lavorato come Postdoctoral Research Fellow presso la University of KwaZulu-Natal di Durban (2013-2015), e come Assegnista di ricerca presso l'Università degli Studi di Verona (2016, 2017-2018). Ha inoltre svolto attività di ricerca come fellow dello Scaliger Institute di Leiden, Olanda (2013), e nell'ambito del Summer Residency Program della University of Cincinnati, Classics Department (2017). I suoi interessi scientifici vertono principalmente sul dramma attico – in particolare sui frammenti della tragedia – e sulla storia della filologia classica, ambiti nei quali ha pubblicato diversi articoli e saggi. Ha in preparazione una monografia sulla storia editoriale del *corpus* dei frammenti sofoclei tra XVI e XVII secolo.

Andreas Markantonatos is the author of *Tragic Narrative: a Narratological Study of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (De Gruyter 2002), *Oedipus at Colonus: Sophocles, Athens, and the World* (De Gruyter 2007), and *Euripides' Alcestis: Narrative, Myth, and Religion* (De Gruyter 2013). He has edited several multi-authored volumes, including *Crisis on Stage: Tragedy and Comedy in Late Fifth-Century Athens* (De Gruyter 2012, together with Bernhard Zimmermann), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles* (Brill 2012) and *Brill's Companion to Euripides* (Brill 2018), and has published widely on Greek drama and literary theory. He is currently completing a work entitled *Euripides' Heracles: Mortal Bodies and Immortal Memory*. He is Professor of Greek at the Department of Philology in the University of the Peloponnese, Director of the Centre for Ancient Rhetoric and Drama (CARD), and Vice-President of the Olympic Centre for Philosophy and Culture (Olympia).

Giuseppe Mastromarco (1946) è Professore Emerito dell'Università di Bari, dove è stato Professore Ordinario di Grammatica greca e latina (1980-1992) e di Letteratura greca (1992-2016). Con Piero

Totaro dirige la Collana “Prosopa. Teatro greco: studi e commenti” (Pensa MultiMedia). In qualità di relatore, ha partecipato a numerosi Convegni internazionali; e ha tenuto seminari e conferenze nelle Università italiane e in varie Università straniere (Argentina, Francia, Germania, Inghilterra, Portogallo, Spagna, Svizzera). È redattore della rivista *Quaderni di Storia*; e fa parte del Comitato scientifico delle riviste *Dionysus ex machina*, *Eikasmós*, *Invigilata Lucernis*, *Lexis*, *Prometheus*, *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca*, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica (G)*, *Studia Philologica Valentina*, *Trends in Classics*.

Oggetto privilegiato della sua attività scientifica sono la commedia greca e la civiltà teatrale ateniese del quinto secolo a. C.: oltre a saggi su Aristofane e Menandro, pubblicati in riviste e opere collettanee italiane e straniere, è autore delle seguenti monografie: *Storia di una commedia di Atene* (La Nuova Italia 1974), *Introduzione ad Aristofane* (Laterza 1994), e, per la collana dei “Classici greci” dell’UTET, ha curato, in un primo volume (1983), la traduzione, con commento e note critico-testuali, di cinque commedie aristofanee (*Acarnesi*, *Cavalieri*, *Nuvole*, *Vespe*, *Pace*) e, in un secondo volume (2006), in collaborazione con Piero Totaro, di altre quattro commedie (*Uccelli*, *Lisistrata*, *Tesmoforiazuse*, *Rane*), e con Totaro ha pubblicato anche il volume *Storia del teatro greco* (Mondadori Education 2008). Dei suoi interessi di studio per il mimo greco è testimone la monografia *Il pubblico di Eronda* (Antenore, 1979), una seconda edizione della quale è stata pubblicata in inglese (*The Public of Herondas*, Gieben 1984). Altri suoi interessi di studio sono l’epica omerica, il dramma satiresco, la tragedia euripidea, l’epigramma ellenistico, l’esegesi antica demostenica.

Enrico Medda è Professore Ordinario di Letteratura greca presso l’Università di Pisa. Studioso del teatro classico e dell’oratoria antica, è autore dell’edizione critica con traduzione e commento dell’*Agamennone* di Eschilo (Bardi 2017), della raccolta di saggi *La saggezza dell’illusione. Studi sul teatro greco* (ETS 2013) e, con Vincenzo di Benedetto, del volume *La tragedia sulla scena* (Einaudi 1997).

Fausto Montana is Full Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Pavia. He is a member of the *Société Internationale de Bibliographie Classique* and the Italian member of the international *Comité de Rédaction* of the *Année Philologique*. He is co-editor of the *Brill's Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* and associate editor of the book series *Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes* (De Gruyter) and *Pleiadi* (Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura). He participates in the editorial boards of the project *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta* (CLGP) and of the journals *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* and *Aevum antiquum*, and is a member of the scientific committee of Pavia University Press.

His research interests range from the history and features of the Attic drama to the texts and history of ancient Greek scholarship (with special focus on exegesis). He is the author of more than one hundred scientific writings published in Italian and international journals and books. His most recent works include: the critical edition, with commentary, of ancient exegesis preserved on papyrus concerning the playwright Aristophanes (CLGP I.1.4, 2006; 2nd ed. 2012) and the historian Herodotus (CLGP I.2.6, 2018), the edited volume *The Birth of Scholiography. From Types to Texts* (with Antonietta Porro, De Gruyter 2014), the chapter *Hellenistic Scholarship* in the *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Brill 2015). He is currently working, with others, to a new critical edition of the *scholia vetera* to the *Iliad*.

Franco Montanari è Professore Ordinario di Lingua e Letteratura Greca all'Università di Genova dall'a.a. 1986/87. Laureato in Letteratura Greca nel 1973 all'Università di Pisa; allievo del corso ordinario (1969-1973) e di perfezionamento (1973-1974) della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Dal novembre 1977 è stato Professore incaricato di Filologia Bizantina; dall'a.a. 1983/84 Professore Associato di Grammatica Greca. Membro Straniero dell'Accademia di Atene e della Royal Society of Arts and Sciences di Gothenburg; Membro dell'Accademia Ligure di Scienze e Lettere. Laurea *honoris causa* presso l'Università di Thessaloniki.

Con altri studiosi coordina il progetto internazionale “Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta” (CLGP). Fa parte dello Advisory Board della Bibliotheca Teubneriana, del Comitato Scientifico del “Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici greci e latini”, della Kommission del progetto “Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie” della Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.

È direttore della *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* e della collana *Pleiadi*. Condirige (con Antonios Rengakos) la rivista *Trends in Classics* e la collana *Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes*. Fa parte del comitato scientifico delle riviste *Eikasmós* e *Seminari Romani* e dell’Editorial Board della rivista *Diogène*. Dirige il progetto “Aristarchus” (www.aristarchus.unige.net). Dal 2014 è presidente della Fédération Internationale des Associations des Études Classiques (FIEC). Dal 1995 al 2015 membro del Conseil de Fondation e del Comité Scientifique della Fondation Hardt pour l’Étude de l’Antiquité Classique. Dal 2009 al 2014 Vicepresidente, dal 2014 Tesoriere del Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines (CIPSH). Dal 1996 membro della Société Internationale de Bibliographie Classique (SIBC) e Direttore del Centro Italiano dell’Année Philologique (CIAPh). Dal 2000 è membro del Consiglio Scientifico del Centro Studi sui papiri e i documenti antichi “G. Vitelli” dell’Università di Firenze. Membro del Comitato Istituzionale dei Garanti per la Cultura Classica presso il MIUR. Coordinatore 2016-2017 del Regional Action Center – Italy (Università di Genova) dello International Year of Global Understanding. Oltre al *GI - Vocabolario della lingua greca* (III edizione, ristampa aggiornata Loescher 2016; edizione greca 2013; edizione inglese 2015; edizione tedesca in preparazione), è autore di oltre 240 pubblicazioni scientifiche.

Camillo Neri (1966) insegna Lingua e Letteratura greca all’Università di Bologna. Si occupa di poesia greca, di esegesi biblica, di tradizione e fortuna dei testi classici e di applicazioni informatiche alla filologia classica. È membro dell’*équipe* internazionale dell’*Année Philologique* (di cui coordina il gruppo bolognese), della rivista *Eikasmós*. *Quaderni Bolognesi di Filologia Classica* e del Centro

Studi “La permanenza del classico”. Tra le sue pubblicazioni principali, *Studi sulle testimonianze di Erinna* (Pàtron 1996), *Levitico*, in *La Bibbia dei LXX. 1. Il Pentateuco*, a c. di Luciana Mortari (EDB 1999), *Seneca nel Novecento* (Carocci 2001), *Erinna. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Pàtron 2003), *La lirica greca. Temi e testi* (Carocci 2004), *Hermeneuein. Tradurre il greco* (Pàtron 2009), *Breve storia della lirica greca* (Carocci 2010), *Lirici greci. Età arcaica e classica* (Carocci 2011), *Saffo. Poesie, frammenti e testimonianze* (Rusconi 2017), *Μέθοδος. Corso di lingua e cultura greca. Grammatica* (D’Anna 2018).

Eric Nicholson (PhD, Renaissance Studies, Yale University) teaches literature and theatre studies courses at New York University, Florence, and Syracuse University in Florence. An active member of Thespis Society, Verona, and of the international research collaborative “Theater Without Borders,” he has co-edited the volumes *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater* (Ashgate, 2008), and *Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theater* (Ashgate, 2014). He has recently contributed the chapter on “Sexuality and Gender” to Volume Three of *A Cultural History of Theatre* (Bloomsbury Press, 2017). At NYU and Syracuse Florence and elsewhere, he has directed plays by Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Molière, Pirandello, and others.

Recent Theatre Productions: (co-direction with Avra Sidiropoulou) *Promised Endings*, a theatrical work in progress on *Oedipus at Colonus* and *King Lear*, for Thespis Society, Verona, May 2018, *Clorilli, a Pastoral Drama by Leonora Bernardi* (Spring 2018) [for NYU Florence], *Shakespeare Goes Italian, the Musical* (Spring 2018) [for Syracuse Florence].

Other Selected Publications: “Who Watches the Watchmen, Especially When They’re On Edge?: Liminal Spectatorship in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* and Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*”, *Comparative Drama* 52.1-2 (2018): 103-121, “A Double *Dovere/Diletto*: Using Alessandro Serpieri’s Translations for Bilingual Productions of Shakespeare’s Plays”, *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* 4:1 (2018): 235-46, “‘She speaks poniards’: Shakespearean Drama and the Italianate Leading Lady as Verbal Duellist”, *Early*

Modern Literary Studies, special issue on *Women and Renaissance Drama*, edited by Edel Semple and Ema Vyroubalová (December 2017), *Shakespeare and the Italian Renaissance: Appropriation, Transformation, Opposition*, edited by Michele Marrapodi (Ashgate, 2014) (chapter on “Helen, the Italianate Theatrical Wayfarer of *All’s Well That Ends Well*”), *Renaissance Transactions: Ariosto and Tasso* (Duke Univ. Press 1999), edited by Valeria Finucci (chapter on Early Female Performances of Ariosto and Tasso).

Roberto Nicolai studied at the University of Rome “La Sapienza” (degree in 1983; postgraduate degree as specialist in manuscripts at the Scuola Speciale per Archivisti e Bibliotecari in 1986; PhD in 1990). In the years 1994 and 1995 he taught Greek language at the University of Cassino. From 1995 to 1998 he was Research Fellow at the Department of Greek and Latin Philology at the University of Rome “La Sapienza”. From 1998 to 2001 he was Associate Professor of Greek literature at the University of Sassari. From November 2001 he was Full Professor of Greek literature at the same University. Since November 2006 he has been Full Professor of Greek literature at the University of Rome “La Sapienza”, and from December 2008 to October 2010 he was also Dean of the Faculty of Scienze Umanistiche; from November 2012 to October 2015 he was Dean of the Faculty of Lettere e Filosofia, at the same University.

He is author of many contributions on Greek historical and geographical literature and on Attic tragedy. In 1992 he published the monograph *La storiografia nell’educazione antica* (Giardini) and in 1998 he edited an Italian translation of Polybius. In 2004 he published another monograph on Isocrates (*Studi su Isocrate*, Quasar). He contributed to a handbook on Greek literature by Luigi Enrico Rossi (1995) and was a member of the editorial board of the *Enciclopedia oriziana*. He is director of the periodical *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* and member of the editorial board of *Storiografia*, *Histos*, *Talia dixit*, *Philologia Hispalensis*, *Ordia prima*, *Studia Oliveriana* and *Aitia*. He is member of the board of GAHIA (“Geography and Historiography in Antiquity”).

Hiroshi Notsu is Professor of Comparative Literature and Classics in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities at Shinshu University (Nagano, Japan) where, as a member of the Comparative Literature Department, he has taught Classical Greek, Latin, and French since 2004. After studying Greek and Latin Literature at Tokyo University (Japan), he studied at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (Paris) and the Université de Limoges, from which he obtained a doctorate with a thesis on Aristophanic comedy (2003): *La structure symétrique et la composition eurythmique de deux comédies d'Aristophane: Les Acharniens et Les Oiseaux*. Aside from his teaching at Shinshu University, he regularly offers seminars on elementary Greek and Ancient Greek Comedy at Tokyo University; on elementary Latin and reading classes at Aoyamagakuin University (Tokyo); and on Homer's *Iliad* at Athénée Français (Tokyo). He is the author of a Japanese-Latin Lexicon (Kenkyusha 2008), a Japanese Lexicon of Latin Proverbs (Kenkyusha 2010), as well as the translator of the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes and of *Fragments of Old Comedy* (Iwanami Shoten 2008-2011). He is now working on new Japanese translations of Homer, Apuleius, and on the reception of Ancient Greek Theatre in Japan. He belongs to a team of Japanese researchers from Tokyo University and Shinshu University who have been supported by JSPS in 2017-19 for studying the "Reception and Diffusion of the Japanese Performance of Ancient Greek Drama" (<https://kaken.nii.ac.jp/en/grant/KAKENHI-PROJECT-17Ko2590/>).

Guido Paduano, nato a Venezia nel 1944, si è formato all'Università di Pisa e alla Scuola Normale Superiore. È stato ordinario di Letteratura Greca nelle Università della Calabria (1975-1977) e di Siena (1977-1983) di Filologia Classica, di cui è attualmente Professore Emerito, all'Università di Pisa (1983-2014). Nella stessa Università ha anche insegnato per molti anni Letterature Comparete, è stato Preside della Facoltà di Lingue dal 1987 al 1993, e Prorettore vicario dal 1994 al 2002.

I suoi studi si incentrano soprattutto sul teatro, in particolare modo quello classico, sia tragico che comico: ha pubblicato monografie su Eschilo, Euripide e Aristofane, e traduzioni commentate, oltre che di questi autori, di Sofocle e Menandro. Si è occupato anche di epica classica ed ellenistica, traducendo per Einaudi *Iliade*, *Odissea* e le *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio, per Bompiani le opere omnia di Virgilio, per la BUR la prima traduzione in italiano di Apollonio Rodio. Ha compiuto svariate incursioni nel teatro moderno e contemporaneo, specialmente per quanto riguarda la drammaturgia musicale e il melodramma (con monografie su Verdi e Puccini, e quasi cinquanta programmi di sala per i maggiori teatri italiani), e la persistenza dei modelli classici nella civiltà moderna, col volume *Lunga storia di Edipo Re* (Einaudi 1994). Ha partecipato al dibattito teorico contemporaneo, col libro *Il testo e il mondo. Elementi di teoria della letteratura* (Bollati Boringhieri 2013), e quello su *Il comico* in collaborazione con Concetta D'Angeli (il Mulino 1999). Il suo libro più recente è *Follia e letteratura. Storia di un'affinità elettiva dal teatro di Dioniso al Novecento* (Carocci 2018). Ha inoltre collaborato con alcuni registi, tra i quali Mario Martone e Walter Pagliaro, agli allestimenti scenici di testi teatrali, ed è direttore di *Maia*, rivista di letterature classiche dal 2006, e di *Dioniso*, periodico internazionale che si occupa di teatro antico, dal 2011.

Nicola Pasqualicchio è ricercatore di Discipline dello Spettacolo presso l'Università di Verona. I suoi interessi di ricerca, rivolti in prevalenza al teatro italiano e francese dei secoli XIX e XX, si sono indirizzati principalmente al *nouveau théâtre*, in particolare con una monografia su Samuel Beckett (*Il sarto gnostico*, Ombre corte 2006) e una, in preparazione, su Jean Tardieu (*Le tour du théâtre. Jean Tardieu drammaturgo*), e alla presenza dell'elemento fantastico e perturbante nella drammaturgia europea degli ultimi due secoli, argomento al quale ha dedicato numerosi articoli e la cura di volumi collettivi: *La meraviglia e la paura* (Bulzoni 2013), *La scena del perturbante* (Scripta 2018). Ha inoltre dedicato articoli e contributi per convegni agli aspetti teatrali dell'opera lirica, al teatro di figura, al rapporto tra teatro e cinema, alle teorie teatrali dell'Ot-

to e Novecento (Delsarte, Craig, Artaud), al teatro di ricerca contemporaneo, a Shakespeare. È fondatore e presidente di LIMEN, Centro di ricerca interdisciplinare sul fantastico nelle arti dello spettacolo, afferente al Dipartimento di Culture e Civiltà dell'Università di Verona. È membro del comitato editoriale di *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* e del comitato scientifico di *Il castello di Elsinore*.

Maria Pia Pattoni, who completed her studies at the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa, is Full Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Brescia, where she teaches Greek Language and Literature, Classical Philology and History of Greek and Latin Theatre. She is on the editorial board of the reviews *Dionysus* and *Aevum antiquum*. In 2016 she received the Praemium Classicum Clavarense (XXIII edition) from the Italian Association of Classical Culture (AICC) – Delegation of Chiavari. Her main interests are focused on Attic theatre with a special consideration for tragedy, Epic tradition, Aristotle's *Poetic*, Hellenistic poetry, ancient Greek novel; in her research work she also gives special attention to the Reception Studies and to the Classical tradition, as for instance the history of translations from Classical literature, and modern and contemporary adaptations of Classical themes and texts. She cooperated with the "National Institute of Ancient Drama" (I.N.D.A.) in many seminars and conferences during the opening of the season of Siracusa's theatre; she also translated, for the Institute, the *Alcestis* of Euripides (LII Cycle of Classical Representations – Greek Theater of Syracuse, 2016). Among her publications there are: *L'autenticità del Prometeo Incatenato di Eschilo* (Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa 1987), *Longo Sofista, Dafni e Cloe*, introduzione, traduzione e note di commento a cura di Maria Pia Pattoni (Rizzoli 2005), *Euripide - Wieland - Rilke - Yourcenar - Raboni: Alceste. Variazioni sul mito* (Marsilio 2006), *Lonus' Daphnis and Chloe: Literary Transmission and Reception*, in Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon Byrne (eds), *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, Blackwell 2014: 584-97; "Democratic paideia' in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*", *Polis. The Journal for Ancient Greek Political*

Thought XXXIV 2017: 251-72. She is editor of the volumes: (with Roberta Carpani) *Sacrifici al femminile: Alceste in scena da Euripide a Raboni* (Vita e Pensiero 2004), (with Enrico Medda and Maria Serena Mirto) *Komodotragedia. Intersezioni del tragico e del comico nel teatro del V secolo a.C.* (Edizioni della Normale 2006), *Prometeo: percorsi di un mito tra antichi e moderni* (Vita e Pensiero 2015).

Antonietta Provenza ha conseguito il titolo di Dottore di ricerca in Filologia e Cultura Greco-Latina (Palermo, 2007) e si è abilitata alle funzioni di Professore di II Fascia per il Settore di Lingua e Letteratura Greca (2017); attualmente è Assegnista di ricerca di Lingua e Letteratura Greca presso il Dipartimento “Culture e Società” dell’Università di Palermo. È membro di MOISA (“International Society for the Study of Greek and Roman Music and Its Cultural Heritage”) e autrice di una monografia sulla musicoterapia nella Grecia antica (*La medicina delle Muse. La musica come cura nella Grecia antica*, Carocci 2016). Altri studi, pubblicati su riviste specialistiche e volumi miscelanei, riguardano il Pitagorismo antico e la nozione di catarsi, Aristosseno di Taranto come fonte sui Pitagorici, le opere su Pitagora dei Neoplatonici Porfirio e Giamblico, il culto delle Muse in ambito pitagorico, aspetti socio-culturali connessi con gli strumenti musicali e loro valenze terapeutiche, i contesti di esecuzione della musica (in particolare il teatro). Si occupa anche di medicina greca – studiando le teorie antiche sulla generazione e la nozione di eredità in relazione alle malattie – di miti e di teatro, e ha studiato in quest’ambito, in particolare, le metafore animali in relazione alla follia nell’Eracle di Euripide e, riguardo alla commedia, il ruolo del poeta tragico nelle *Rane* di Aristofane.

Collabora nella redazione di *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* e della relativa collana *Skenè. Texts and Studies*, e di *Greek and Roman Musical Studies* (Brill). È autrice del saggio su “Music and Medicine” per il *Blackwell Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music* (a cura di Eleonora Rocconi e Tosca Lynch, di prossima pubblicazione), e sta attualmente lavorando alla stesura di una monografia su *Ethos* musicale e terapia nella Grecia antica

(Routledge) e di alcune voci per il *Dizionario della Cultura popolare greca e romana*, a cura di Emanuele Lelli (Bompiani).

Jordi Redondo, Doctor in Classical Philology (Salamanca, 1985) is Professor of Greek Philology at the Universitat de València. His main fields of research are the history of the Ancient Greek language, especially in the Classical and post-Classical ages, syntax, rhetoric, reception of Ancient Greek literature, and religion. He has been lecturer in Greek Philology at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (Galicia) (courses 1987-1990), and lecturer (courses 1990-1991), reader (courses 1991-2011) and Professor at the Universitat de València (País Valencià).

His main publications include the critical editions of the orators Antiphon (Fundació Bernat Metge, 2003-2004), Andocides (FBM, 2007-2008) and Alcidas (FBM, 2015), as well as the Spanish translations of the orators Antiphon and Andocides (1991), the poet Callimachus (1999) and the *Anatomical Procedures* of the physician Galen (2018). Scholarly works are the books entitled *La tradición clásica en la literatura castellana medieval. Cuatro estudios* (Ediciones Clásicas 2013), *Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Poetry: Some Contributions to the Study of the History of the Ancient Greek Language* (in collaboration with A. Sánchez i Bernet, Hakkert 2015); and *Para una sociología del griego antiguo: estudio de los sociolectos de la lengua griega: épocas clásica, helenística e imperial* (Ediciones Clásicas 2016).

Intended for teaching Greek religion, Greek literature and Greek syntax at university level are the handbooks *Introducció a la religió i la mitologia gregues* (Publicacions de la Universitat de València 2006); *Teoria i història literàries gregues* (Publicacions de la Universitat de València 2009, online); and *Curs de Sintaxi Grega* (Universitat de València València 2011, online). He has been a member of conference organizing committees in Catalonia, Italy and Spain, and a reviewer of journals published in Argentina, Canada, Catalonia, France, Italy, Poland, Spain, and the USA.

Adele Scafuro (BA, English, Vassar College; MA and PhD, Classics, Yale University) is Professor of Classics in the Dept. of Classics at Brown University (Providence, RI, USA) where she has taught since 1983. She has been the recipient of numerous fellowships including: Summer Fulbright in Rome, Junior Fellow, Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, D.C., Humboldt Fellowship at Technische Universität, Berlin and later at Leopold Wenger-Institut für antike Rechtsgeschichte und Papyrusforschung, Munich; ACLS (American Council of Learned Societies), Loeb Classical Library Foundation Grants (bis), Visiting Whitehead Professorship at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science, University of Tokyo; Onassis Foreign Fellowship, Athens. She recently taught a seminar at the University of Tokyo and has been a member of the staff teaching at TOPS (Tokyo-Oxford Program in the Summer) for the last three years. She is the author of essays on ancient Greek law, epigraphy, and drama, and of longer works including *The Forensic Stage: Settling Disputes in Graeco-Roman New Comedy* (Cambridge University Press 1997, 2000, 2004) and a translation, *Demosthenes. Speeches 39-49* (University of Texas Press, 2011). She co-edited with Alan L. Boegehold *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994, 2002), with Michael Fontaine *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy* (Oxford University Press 2014, 2018), and is Series Editor (Greek side) with John Bodel (Roman side) of *Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy*. She is currently collaborating with Dr. Nike Makris in Athens, writing on bronze inscribed dedications from the Acropolis, with John Davis in NYC, writing on the BAM revival of Telso and Breuer's *Gospel at Colonus*, and hoping to finish her book, *The Just and Bureaucratic City: Trials by Decree in Classical Athens*.

Seth L. Schein is Emeritus Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of California, Davis. He works mainly on Homeric epic, Attic tragedy, and classical receptions. His books include *The Iambic Trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles: a Study in Metrical Form* (Brill

1979), *The Mortal Hero: an Introduction to Homer's Iliad* (University of California Press 1984), *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays* (ed. by Seth L. Schein, Princeton University Press 1996), *Sophokles' Philoktetes: Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Interpretive Essay* (Focus 2003), *Sophocles, Philoctetes* (Cambridge University Press 2013), and *Homeric Epic and its Reception: Interpretive Essays* (Oxford University Press 2016). He is currently writing a commentary on the first book of Homer's *Iliad* and a memoir.

Avra Sidiropoulou is Assistant Professor at the M.A. in Theatre Studies Programme at the Open University of Cyprus, and artistic director of Athens-based Persona Theatre Company. She is the author of two monographs: *Directions for Directing. Theatre and Method* (Routledge 2018) and *Authoring Performance: The Director in Contemporary Theatre* (Palgrave Macmillan 2011). She has also contributed articles and chapters to several international peer-reviewed journals and edited books and she is the co-editor of the international volume *Adapting Greek Tragedy. New Contexts for Ancient Texts* (forthcoming by Cambridge University Press). She was a Visiting Researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and at the City University of New York (Martin E. Segal Theatre Center), as well as at the Universities of Surrey, Leeds and Tokyo (in the last case, as a Japan Foundation Fellow). As a director, she has staged performances (both independently and with Athens-based Persona Theatre Company) internationally. She will be a Visiting Scholar at the Centre for Global Shakespeare (Queen Mary University) in London and the Institute for Theatre Studies at Freie University in Berlin.

Avra is a playwright and director and has conducted practical workshops and delivered invited lectures in Cyprus, Greece, the USA, Turkey, Iran, Italy, Malta, Estonia, Spain, Latvia, the UK, Japan, and Israel. As a director, she has staged performances (both independently and with Persona Theatre Company) internationally. Her new directing project is the multimedia production *Phaedra I*—at Tristan Bates Theatre in London (<https://www.tristanbatestheatre.co.uk/whats-on/phaedra->).

Renzo Tosi è ordinario di Letteratura Greca nell'Università di Bologna. Tra le sue opere figurano gli *Studi sulla tradizione indiretta dei classici greci* (Clueb 1988), *La donna è mobile e altri studi di intertestualità proverbiale* (Pàtron 2011), e il *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche* (Rizzoli 2017); si è inoltre occupato di Tucidide, cui è dedicato un saggio del 2015, del teatro classico, del classicismo della fine del Settecento (è del 2011 il volume *I Carmi greci di Clotilde Tambroni*, Pàtron) e dei generi eruditi (lessicografia, scoliofilia, paremiografia) in età classica, tardoantica e bizantina.

Piero Totaro è Professore Ordinario di Lingua e Letteratura greca e di Storia del teatro greco all'Università di Bari Aldo Moro, dove, dal 2007 al 2015, è stato direttore Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità e del Tardoantico. È attualmente direttore del Centro internazionale di ricerca e studi su Carnevale, Maschera e Satira (CMS), ed è condirettore, con Giuseppe Mastromarco, della collana scientifica internazionale "Prosopa. Teatro greco: studi e commenti".

Si occupa principalmente di commedia e tragedia greca. Tra le sue pubblicazioni: *Le seconde parabasi di Aristofane* (Metzler 2000), in collaborazione con Giuseppe Mastromarco, *Commedie di Aristofane* (vol. II: *Uccelli, Lisistrata, Tesmoforiazuse, Rane*, UTET 2006) e *Storia del teatro greco* (Mondadori 2008); è autore di varie voci nella *Encyclopedia of Greek Comedy* curata da Alan H. Sommerstein per Wiley-Blackwell (2019). Sta ora completando le edizioni critiche con commento del *Pluto* di Aristofane, e, per l'Accademia dei Lincei, di tragedie frammentarie di Eschilo. Oltre al progetto Eschilo patrocinato dall'Accademia dei Lincei, collabora ad altri progetti di ricerca internazionali sul teatro greco, in particolare a *Fragmenta Comica (FrC) – Kommentierung der Fragmente der griechischen Komödie*, diretto presso l'Università di Freiburg i.Br. dal Prof. Bernhard Zimmermann e finanziato dalla Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften (si occupa dell'edizione, traduzione e commento dei frammenti comici adespoti: Band 28, in tre volumi); e al progetto di eccellenza dal titolo "Gramáticos, rétores y sofistas griegos como fuentes de la literatura grecolatina (III)", finanziato dal Ministero

spagnolo di Economía, Industria y Competitividad, diretto presso il Departamento de Filología Clásica y Románica della Facultad de Filosofía y Letras della Università di Oviedo dalla Prof. Dr. Lucía Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén (si occupa delle citazioni tragiche e comiche presso gli antichi grammatici e retori greci).

Martina Treu is Associate Professor in Greek Language and Literature at IULM University (Milan, Italy). She is coordinator and speaker of the Images Project (<http://www.images-project.org/>) and member of CRIMTA – University of Pavia (www.unipv.it/crimta). She has been Visiting Assistant Professor at the University of Venice and at the Catholic University, Brescia. She has worked in European theatres and cooperated on several adaptations of classical texts for the stage. Among her publications: *Undici cori comici* (Università di Genova, Dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni, 1999), *Cosmopolitico* (Arcipelago 2005), *La Mitologia a test* (Alpha test 2008), *La mythologie* (Belin 2009), *Il teatro antico nel Novecento* (Carocci 2009), *Emilio Isgrò, L'Orestea di Gibellina e gli altri testi per il teatro*, ed.by Martina Treu (Le Lettere 2011), “Never too late. *Antigone* in a German Second World War Cemetery on the Italian Apennines”, in Erin B. Mee and Helene P. Foley (eds), *Antigone on the Contemporary World Stage* (Oxford 2011: 307-23), “Tragicomic Oedipus”, in Francesco Citti e Alessandro Iannucci (eds), *Edipo classico e contemporaneo* (Olms 2012: 219-34), “Dark Ladies, Bad Girls, Demon Queens. Female Power and Seduction from Greek Tragedy to Pop Culture”, in Silke Knippschild and Marta García Morcillo (eds), *Seduction and Power. Antiquity in the Visual and Performing Arts* (Bloomsbury Academic 2013: 71-83), “Back to the demos. An anti-classical approach to Classics?”, in Lorna Hardwick and Stephen Harrison (eds), *Classics in the Modern World: a ‘Democratic Turn’?*, ed. by (Oxford University Press 2013: 171-9), “Who’s Afraid of Aristophanes? The Troubled Life of Ancient Comedy in 20th-century Italy”, in Douglas S. Olson (ed.), *Ancient Comedy and Reception* (De Gruyter 2013: 945-63), “The history of ancient drama in modern Italy”, in Betine van

Zyl Smit (ed.), *A Handbook to the reception of Greek Drama* (Wiley Blackwell 2016: 221-37), “*Ajax*”, in Rosanna Lauriola and Kyriakos N. Demetriou (eds), *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Sophocles* (Brill 2017: 27-76).

Mauro Tulli is Full Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Pisa. He is currently President of the PhD Programme “Scienze dell’Antichità e Archeologia”, Director of the Series “Biblioteca di Studi Antichi” (BSA) and of the Journal *Cronache Ercolanesi*. Since 2010 a member of the Executive Board of the “Consulta Universitaria del Greco” (CUG), he is currently its President. Since 2014 he has been a member of the “Comitato Istituzionale dei Garanti per la Cultura Classica” at the Ministry of Research. He is a member of the Executive Board of the “Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi” (CISPE). In 1989 he was co-founder of the “International Plato Society” (IPS), from 2010 to 2013, its President, and then organiser of the Symposium at the University of Pisa. From 1984 onwards, he has held lectures in Italy and abroad, has contributed to many conferences, has given lectures at every Symposium of the International Plato Society, and at the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy. Research fields: Papyri and Tradition of Greek Literature, Epic, the relationship between Literature and Philosophy, Rhetoric.

Gherardo Ugolini è Professore Associato di Filologia classica presso l’Università di Verona. Dopo gli studi all’università di Pavia ha conseguito il dottorato di ricerca in Filologia Classica all’Università di Monaco di Baviera e il dottorato di ricerca in Scienze Storiche presso la Scuola Superiore di Studi Storici dell’Università di San Marino. È stato docente all’università di Heidelberg (1993-1999) e alla Humboldt-Universität di Berlino (1999-2008). È membro della redazione di *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*. I suoi interessi scientifici riguardano in modo particolare i seguenti campi: la tragedia greca antica e le sue interpretazioni, il giovane Nietzsche studioso della cultura greca, la fortuna dell’anti-

co nella tradizione letteraria moderna, la storia degli studi classici. Ha pubblicato tra l'altro le seguenti monografie: *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sehers Teiresias* (Narr 1995), *Sofocle e Atene* (Carocci 2000), *Guida alla lettura della "Nascita della tragedia" di Nietzsche* (Laterza 2007), *Jacob Bernays e l'interpretazione medica della catarasi tragica* (Cierre Grafica, 2012). Ha curato il volume miscelaneo *Die Kraft der Vergangenheit. Mythos und Realität der klassischen Kultur* (Olms 2005) e il numero speciale della rivista *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies* (2.1, 2016), sul tema *Catharsis, Ancient and Modern*. Il volume che ha curato insieme con Diego Lanza, *Storia della filologia classica* (Carocci 2016), ha conseguito il Premio Nazionale Editoria Accademica, edizione 2016.

Paola Volpe, Professoressa Ordinaria di Lingua e Letteratura greca presso l'Università degli studi di Salerno, è Presidente della International Plutarch Society e socio dell'Accademia Pontaniana. Tra i temi della sua ricerca si segnalano i *Moralia* di Plutarco, la tragedia greca, la ripresa dei motivi tragici in età umanistica, moderna e contemporanea. Oltre a numerosi saggi apparsi su riviste e in Atti di convegni nazionali e internazionali, ha pubblicato *Giovanni Crisostomo, Omelia per la natività* (Associazione di studi tardoantichi 1980), *Plutarco, L'eccessiva arrendevolezza*, introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento (D'Auria 1994), *Toma Magistro, La regalità*, testo critico, introduzione e indici (D'Auria 1997), *Poesia al femminile nell'Antologia Palatina* (Metis 1999), *L'eredità di Plutarco. Ricerche e proposte* (D'Auria 2004), *Torquato Tasso, Risposta di Roma a Plutarco e marginalia*, con una nota di Marcello Andria (Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura 2004), *Il dolore di Fedra tra passato e presente* (Edizioni Università di Trieste 2014).

Marco Zanolla sta attualmente completando il Dottorato di ricerca presso l'Università degli studi di Verona con una tesi dal titolo "L'Alcmena e l'Auge di Euripide" (Tutor Prof. Guido Avezzi). Già professore di ruolo al Liceo Classico, nel giugno del 2017 ha partecipato come relatore al Seminario Dottorale "Omero, il sole ra-

dioso. Episodi della ricezione omerica”, con un intervento dal titolo: “Il Ciclope in Omero e in Euripide: metamorfosi di un mostro?”. Nell’ottobre del 2017 ha presentato una relazione intitolata: “Did Amphytrion take vengeance on Alcmena? The treatment of traditional myth in Euripides’ *Alcmene* (fr. 90 Kn.)” alla nona edizione dell’Athens Postgraduate and PhD Candidate Conference presso la National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Il lavoro è stato recentemente pubblicato negli atti del Convegno.

Appendix

Guido Avezzù's Publications (1973-2018)

"Hecuba's Rhetoric", in Andreas Markantonatos and Eleni Volonaki (eds), *Poet and Orator: A Symbiotic Relationship in Democratic Athens*, Berlin: De Gruyter (forthcoming).

2018

"Reticence and *Phobos* in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*", *Comparative Drama*, Special Issue *The Tyrant's Fear*, Part 2, 52 (1-2): 23-53.

"Collaborating with Euripides: Actors and Scholars Improve the Drama Text", *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, Special Issue *Transitions* 4 (1): 15-37.

2016

"'It is not a small thing to defeat a king'. The Servant/Messenger's Tale in Euripides' *Electra*", *Skenè Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, Special Issue *Diegesis and Mimesis* 2 (2): 263-86.

2015

"Mediazioni angeliche nella tragedia attica", *Micrologus* 23: 13-32.

"Emulazione e antagonismo nella produzione tragica ateniese", *Dionysus ex Machina* 6: 137-56.

(Ed.) *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, Special Issue *The Chorus in Drama* 1 (1).

"Introduction", *Skenè. Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, Special Issue *The Chorus in Drama* 1 (1): 5-36.

“Friedrich Schiller: *Über den Gebrauch des Chors in der Tragödie / On the Use of the Chorus in Tragedy*” (translation and notes), Skenè. *Journal of Theatre and Drama Studies*, Special Issue *The Chorus in Drama* 1 (1): 140-66.

“Classical Paradigms of Tragic Choice in Civic Stories of Love and Death”, in Silvia Bigliazzi and Lisanna Calvi (eds), *Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, and Civic Life. The Boundaries of Civic Space*, New York and London: Routledge, 45-65.

2014

“Lexis drammatica e critica del testo”, *Lexis* 32: 143-61.

2013

“Considerazioni sui drammi satireschi di Sofocle”, in Guido Bastianini e Angelo Casanova (eds), *I papiri di Eschilo e di Sofocle. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi*, Firenze: Florence University Press, 53-64.

“Fetonte a Weimar”, in Sandra Pietrini (ed.), *Picturing Drama. Illustrazioni e riscritture dei grandi classici, dall'antichità ai nostri giorni*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 3-16.

2012

“Commiato da Edipo e da Sofocle”, in Francesco Citti e Alessandro Iannucci (eds), *Edipo classico e contemporaneo*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York: Olms (Spudasmata 149), 31-46.

“Text and Transmission”, in Andreas Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 39-57.

2009

“Scena e politica in Eschilo”, in Jacques Jouanna e Franco Montanari (eds), *Eschyle à l'aube du théâtre occidental*, Genève: Fondation Hardt, 165-203.

“Tradurre il teatro”, in Camillo Neri e Renzo Tosi (eds), *Hermeneuein: tradurre il greco*, Bologna: Pàtron, 67-82.

“Un bilancio provvisorio” (*Atti del Seminario di studi su Richard Porson*, Salerno 5-6.12.2008), *Lexis* 27: 229-40. Reprinted in Paola Volpe Cacciatore (ed.), *Seminario di studi su R. Porson*, Napoli: D'Auria 2011, 9-20.

2008

“Sofocle, *Edipo a Colono* 9-11”, *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 11: 223-7.

Sofocle. Edipo a Colono, testo critico a cura di Guido Avezzi: “Nota al testo”, xlvii-lxxxiv; “Testo critico”, 3-195, Milano: Mondadori (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla).

(Ed.) *DIDASKALIAI 2. Nuovi studi sulla tradizione e interpretazione del dramma attico*, Verona: Fiorini.

(Ed.) *Sofocle, Seneca, Dryden-Lee, Cocteau: Edipo. Variazioni sul mito*, Venezia: Marsilio.

“Introduzione”, in Avezzi, Guido (ed.), *Sofocle, Seneca, Dryden-Lee, Cocteau. Edipo. Variazioni sul mito*, Venezia: Marsilio, 7-51.

2007

“Esegesi e annotazioni drammaturgiche negli *scholia vetera* sofocli”, in Emanuele Dettori e Roberto Pretagostini (eds), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione*, Roma: Quasar, 223-32.

2006

(Ed., con Paolo Scattolin) *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali* (Atti del Convegno, Rovereto 20.10.2006), Rovereto: Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati.

2004

“Mappe di Argo, nella tragedia”, in Paola Angeli Bernardini (ed.), *La città di Argo. Mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche*, Pisa-Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 149-61.

2003

Sofocle, Filottete, testo critico a cura di Guido Avezzù: “Nota al testo”, li-lxxxvii; “Testo critico”, 3-150; “Appendice metrica”, 329-36, Milano: Mondadori (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla).

Il mito sulla scena. La tragedia ad Atene, Venezia: Marsilio.

(Ed.) *Il dramma sofocleo: testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Atti del Seminario Internazionale, Verona 24-26.1.2002), Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler (Drama Beiträge 13).

“Sofocle drammaturgo della situazione”, in *Il teatro e la città. Poetica e politica nel dramma attico del quinto secolo* (Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Siracusa, 19-22.IX.2001), *Quaderni di Dioniso* 1: 42-61.

“Eschilo, *Eumenidi* 522-525”, *Studi Trentini di Scienze Storiche* 82: 75-7.

“Monica Centanni, *Eschilo. Le tragedie*”, (book review), *Eikasmós* 14: 467-77.

2002

(Ed.) *Sofocle, Euripide, Hofmannsthal, Yourcenar. Elettra. Variazioni sul mito*, Venezia: Marsilio.

“Lontananza di Elettra”, in Guido Avezzù (ed.), *Sofocle, Euripide, Hofmannsthal, Yourcenar: Elettra. Variazioni sul mito*, Venezia: Marsilio, 7-22.

(Ed.) *Gregorio di Tours – Fozio. I Sette Dormienti. Una leggenda fra Oriente e Occidente*, Milano: Medusa.

“Introduzione”, in Guido Avezzù (ed.), *Gregorio di Tours – Fozio. I Sette Dormienti. Una leggenda fra Oriente e Occidente*, Milano: Medusa, 7-18.

“L'impossibile ritorno dal Fronte Occidentale (E.M. Remarque, L. Milestone e *Odissea* I, v. 1)”, *Kleos* 7: 7-10.

“Tragedia e storia, e storia della tragedia: Enzo Degani storico della tragedia attica”, *Odeo Olimpico* 24 (1999-2002): 259-69.

2001

“Eschilo e *l'ars critica* di Pier Vettori”, *Lexis* 19: 93-107.

2000

“La ‘ninna-nanna’ di Filottete (Sofocle, *Filottete* 827-864)”, in Maria Cannatà Fera e Simonetta Grandolini (eds), *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, Napoli: E. S. I., 51-61.

2000

“Il teatro di una città: leggere la tragedia greca oggi”, in Eugenio Amato, Angelo Capo, e Donato Viscido (eds), *Weimar, le letterature classiche e l'Europa del 2000*, Salerno: Helios Editrice, 213-27.

“A proposito di *L'irrazionale nella letteratura*”, in Alberto Cavarzere e Gian Maria Varanini (eds), *Giuseppe Fraccaroli (1849-1918). Letteratura, filologia e scuola fra Otto e Novecento*, Trento: Università degli Studi: Dipartimento di Scienze Filologiche e Storiche, 49-58.

“Vedere ed essere visto. A proposito di Sofocle, *Aiace 379*”, *Lexis* 18: 103-15.

“Odisseo che vede ogni cosa (Sofocle, *Aiace 379*)”, in Anna Maria Babbi (ed.), *Ulisse da Omero a Pascal Quignard*, Verona: Fiorini, 117-34.

1999

(Ed.) *DIDASKALIAI. Tradizione e interpretazione del dramma attico*, Padova: Imprimitur (Studi, testi, documenti – Dipartimento di Scienze dell'antichità, Università di Padova, 9).

“Tradizione filologica e critica del testo (Eur. *Hcl.* 21-22)”, in Guido Avezzù (ed.), *DIDASKALIAI. Tradizione e interpretazione del dramma attico*, Padova: Imprimitur, 243-52.

(Ed., con Emilio Pianezzola), *Sicilia e Magna Grecia: spazio reale e spazio immaginario nella letteratura greca e latina*, Padova: Imprimitur (Studi, testi, documenti – Dipartimento di Scienze dell'antichità, Università di Padova, 10).

“*Soph. Phil.* 830: ἀντέχους, probat scholium vetus”, *Lexis* 17: 191-4.

Entries “Alcidamante”, “Aristotele”, “Commedia greca”, “Coro (tragico)”, “Democrito”, “Diogene Laerzio”, “Empedocle”, “Esiodo”, “Grecia/Greci”, “Protagora”, “Sofisti/Sofistica”, “Talete”, “Teognide”, “Tucidide”, in Giorgio Penzo (ed.), *Nietzsche. Atlante della sua vita e del suo pensiero*, Santarcangelo: Rusconi Libri.

1998

“Il teatro tragico. Annali della tragedia attica”, in Italo Lana e Enrico V. Maltese (eds), *Storia della civiltà letteraria greca e latina*, Torino: UTET, vol. 1: *Dalle origini al IV secolo a.C.*, Sezione 2: *La letteratura greca del V secolo*, cap. 2, 236-95, e cap. 3, 296-457.

“Sulla ricezione di Lisia nel Rinascimento. Due note”, *Eikasmós* 9: 347-64.

1996

“Una corona per Esiodo. Pascoli, Esiodo e l'almanacco”, *Aevum antiquum* 9: 235-42.

1995

“Evoluzione del prologo nella tragedia attica”, in Gianfelice Peron (ed.), *Strategie del testo. Preliminari, partizioni, pause*, (Quaderni del Circolo Filologico-Linguistico Patavino 16), Padova: Esedra, 81-93.

“Le fonti greche di Copernico”, in *Copernico a Padova. Atti della Giornata Copernicana nel 450° della pubblicazione del De revolutionibus orbium coelestium (10.XII.1993)*, Padova: CLEUP, 123-47.

“Su un recente convegno trentino d'interesse bizantinistico-umanistico”, *Atene e Roma* 1995: 115-9.

1993

“Papyrus Hibeh I. 13: *Anonymi Fragmentum De musica*”, *Musica e Storia* 2: 3-31.

1992

Lisia, Contro Eratostene, ed. critica e introduzione a cura di Guido Avezzù, Padova: Imprimerie (Studi Testi Documenti – Dipartimento di Scienze dell'antichità, Università di Padova, 1)

“L'oratoria giudiziaria”, in Giuseppe Cambiano, Luciano Canfora e Diego Lanza (eds), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, Roma: Ed. Salerno, vol. 1, 397-417.

1991

Lisia. Contro i Tiranni, (Or. XII), introduzione, testo greco, traduzione e note a cura di Guido Avezzù, Venezia: Marsilio (II ed. 1998).

1990

“Contributi al testo di Lisia, *Contro Eratostene* 65-66 e 69”, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* III S. 8: 153-65.

“ΑΝΔΡΟΝΙΚΙΑ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ: per l'identificazione di Andronico Callisto copista. Con alcune notizie su Giano Lascaris e la biblioteca di Giorgio Valla”, *Atti dell'Accademia Patavina* 102 (1989-1990), Parte III: 75-93.

1989

“Progetto e tecnica del meraviglioso: Ione di Chio e la spettacolarità”, in Diego Lanza e Oddone Longo (eds), *Il Meraviglioso e il Verosimile tra antichità e medioevo*, Firenze: Olschki (Biblioteca dell'Archivum Romanicum Serie I, 221), 153-62.

1988

Il ferimento e il rito. La storia di Filottete sulla scena ateniese, frammenti e testimonianze raccolti e presentati da Guido Avezzù, Bari: Adriatica (Studi e commenti 7).

“Temistocle e Mironide nell’*Epitafio* di Lisia (Lysias. *Or.* II 42 e 52)”, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* III S. 5: 58-65.

“Pier Vettori editore di testi greci: la *Poetica* e altro, *Atti dell’Accademia Patavina* 100 (1987-1988), Parte III: 1-19.

“M.L. Sosower, *Palatinus Graecus 88 and the Manuscript Tradition of Lysias*”, (book review), *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 116: 215-23.

1987

“Filottete sulla scena attica. A proposito d’una recente raccolta”, *Materiali e Discussioni* 19: 131-42.

1985

Lisia. Apologia per l’uccisione di Eratostene. Epitafio, introduzione e testo a cura di Guido Avezzù, Padova: Antenore (Proagones Testi 3).

“Note sulla tradizione manoscritta di Lisia”, *Museum Patavinum* 3: 361-82.

1984

“*Musaeus. Hero et Leander*, ed. H. Livrea adiuv. P. Eleuteri”, (book review), *Museum Patavinum* 2: 195-6.

1982

Alcidamante. Orazioni e frammenti, testo, introduzione, traduzione e note a cura di Guido Avezzù, Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider (*Boll. Ist. Filologia Greca Suppl.* 6).

1980

“Per la storia dell’*Epitafio* lisiano”, *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 5 (1979-80): 71-88.

1979

“Gli scolii demostenici e l’*Epitafio* di Lisia nel Ms. Marc. Gr. 416”, *Bollettino per l’Edizione nazionale dei Classici*, n.s. 27: 51-67.

1978

“Nuovi papiri della missione archeologica Anti-Bagnani a Umm El Breighât (Tebtynis)”, *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 4 (1977-78): 192-6.

1976

“Il Ms. Vat. Gr. 2207 nella tradizione dell’*Epitafio* lisiano e degli oratori attici minori”, *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 3: 184-220.

1975

“Note in margine ad Aristotele, *Retorica* III 3”, *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 2: 7-33.

“I. Labriola, *Giuliano ‘l’Apostata’. Autobiografia*”, (book review), *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 2: 310-3.

1974

“Per una ricerca sull’uso di ripetizioni nei tragici”, *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 1: 55-69.

1973

“Un inedito di B. Maranta: Note sulla *Poetica* di Aristotele (c. 1562)”, *Atti Istituto Veneto* 131 (1972-73): 305-29.

Συναγωνίζεσθαι, the ancient Greek verb chosen as the title of this volume, belongs to the jargon of dramaturgy as employed by Aristotle in *Poetics*, where he emphasizes the function of the Chorus as an active co-protagonist in the dynamics of drama. Here it suggests the collaborative nature of this *Festschrift* offered to Guido Avezù in the year of his retirement by friends and colleagues. The volume collects a wide selection of contributions by international scholars, grouped into four sections: Greek Tragedy (Part 1), Greek Comedy (Part 2), Reception (Part 3), and Theatre and Beyond (Part 4).



The Authors

A. Andrisano, P. Angeli Bernardini, A. Bagordo, A. Bierl, S. Bigliuzzi, M. G. Bonanno, S. Brunetti, D. Cairns, G. Cerri, V. Citti, A. T. Cozzoli, F. Dall'Olio, M. Di Marco, M. Duranti, S. Fornaro, A. Grilli, S. Halliwell, E. M. Harris, O. Imperio, P. Judet de La Combe, W. Lapini, V. Liapis, L. Lomiento, F. Lupi, A. Markantonatos, G. Mastromarco, E. Medda, F. Montana, F. Montanari, C. Neri, E. Nicholson, R. Nicolai, H. Notsu, G. Paduano, N. Pasqualicchio, M.P. Pattoni, A. Provenza, J. Redondo, A. Scafuro, S.L. Schein, A. Sidiropoulou, R. Tosi, P. Totaro, M. Treu, M. Tulli, G. Ugolini, P. Volpe, M. Zanolla.

Cover:

Brygos Painter, Dionysus surrounded by satyrs, ca. 480 BCE (Louvre Museum);

Mask of Dionysus from Myrina, 2nd-1st century BCE (Louvre Museum).