



Chapitre de livre

2005

Open Access

This version of the publication is provided by the author(s) and made available in accordance with the copyright holder(s).

Lamentable Tragedy or Black Comedy? Friedrich Dürrenmatt's Adaptation of Titus Andronicus

Erne, Lukas Christian

How to cite

ERNE, Lukas Christian. Lamentable Tragedy or Black Comedy? Friedrich Dürrenmatt's Adaptation of Titus Andronicus. In: World-Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance. Massai, Sonia (Ed.). London : Routledge, 2005. p. 88–94.

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:14614>

11 Lamentable tragedy or black comedy?: Friedrich Dürrenmatt's adaptation of *Titus Andronicus*

Lukas Erne

In 1970, the Swiss dramatist Friedrich Dürrenmatt (1921–90) undertook a dramatic adaptation of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* which has hitherto suffered from critical neglect and still awaits its first translation into English.¹ The same applies to his earlier adaptation of Shakespeare's *King John*.² Despite the world-wide fame Dürrenmatt acquired in the course of his career, Dürrenmatt's dramatic practice, both in general and, more specifically, in his response to Shakespeare, is emphatically 'local' as defined in the introduction to the present volume (pp. 3–11). Yet just what local position his adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* occupies is perhaps less easy to determine.

Dürrenmatt was born and always lived in Switzerland, a country with four national languages and linguistic communities – German, French, Italian and Romansh – making problematic the notion of a 'national audience'. Even if we focus on the roughly two-thirds of Switzerland's inhabitants who are German speaking, linguistic and national identity remains an issue. Dürrenmatt memorably called German his 'father tongue' – the language Swiss Germans use, hear or read in the public realm, at school, on television or in the newspapers – to distinguish it from his 'mother tongue', Swiss German, the language of the private sphere in which Swiss Germans feel most intimately at home. Dürrenmatt once pointed out that he would have liked to write his plays in the Swiss dialect.³ Yet this, as he well knew, would have prevented the spread of his fame beyond the boundaries of Switzerland where only just some four million speakers of German reside, as opposed to roughly eighty million in Germany. As Dürrenmatt succinctly put it, 'Ich lebe in der Schweiz, aber nicht von der Schweiz' (Dürrenmatt 1996: 2.273), I live in Switzerland, but not off Switzerland. Dürrenmatt elsewhere suggests that his *Titus Andronicus* does not exclusively address a Swiss audience. His play, he wrote, 'represents an attempt to render Shakespeare's chaotic early work fit for the German stage without having the Shakespearean atrocities and grotesqueries passed over in silence'.⁴ 'German' serves here to delimit the German-speaking linguistic community (Germany, Austria and a large part of Switzerland) rather than a nation. Nevertheless, it deserves pointing out that Dürrenmatt's *Titus* premiered not in his native Switzerland but in Germany.⁵

Before investigating what specifically it is about Dürrenmatt's adaptation that allows us to characterize it as a 'local' response to Shakespeare, it will be necessary to come to an understanding of the nature of Dürrenmatt's adaptation. Ruby Cohn (1976: 34) has written that Dürrenmatt is 'fairly faithful to Shakespeare's events', and Jonathan Bate (1995: 60) goes even further, maintaining that Dürrenmatt's *Titus* 'is very close to the original'.⁶ These statements require scrutiny and refinement.

According to most modern editions, Shakespeare divides his play into fourteen scenes which Dürrenmatt reduces to nine.⁷ Six of Shakespeare's scenes, 1.1, 4.2 to 4.4, 5.1 and 5.2, have corresponding scenes in Dürrenmatt (Scenes 1 and 5 to 9). Two disappear entirely, 3.2 (the so-called 'Fly-scene' which was first printed in the Folio of 1623) and 5.1, dramatizing Aaron's defiance after his arrest. Dürrenmatt condenses the six remaining scenes into two: 2.1 to 2.4 becomes a continuous sequence in Dürrenmatt (Scene 2) in the course of which Chiron and Demetrius murder Bassianus and rape and mutilate Lavinia. And 3.1 and 4.1 are reduced to one scene (Scene 3) in which Titus, hoping in vain to save his sons Quintus and Martius, is tricked into cutting off his own hand, and ends with Lavinia revealing the identity of her ravishers. This leaves one of Dürrenmatt's nine scenes unaccounted for, Scene 4, which has no equivalent in Shakespeare. In it, Lucius, who has left Rome to raise an army from among the Goths, is shown in dialogue with Alarich, their leader. To sum up, Dürrenmatt's play begins with three long scenes, roughly corresponding to the action up to 4.1, and ends with six shorter scenes, covering the rest of Shakespeare's play.

Dürrenmatt thus transforms the overall shape of Shakespeare's play without radically departing from it. But how specifically does Dürrenmatt, who read Shakespeare's play in the early nineteenth-century translation of Wolf Graf von Baudissin, adapt the text of *Titus Andronicus*? The relationship of Dürrenmatt's play to the original radically changes in the course of the play. A brief look at the first scene will serve as a representative example. Some passages are very close to the original, indeed identical. The first seventy-two lines, for instance, correspond word for word to Baudissin's text. After this opening sequence, Dürrenmatt's departures from the original are at first minor: Tamora's initial speech loses two lines and shows local substitutions and rearrangements of words. Titus's opening speech is abridged and partly rewritten. Of Lucius's three-line speech at 1.1.130–2, only the first three words remain. A little later, Dürrenmatt for the first time allocates a speech to a different character, substituting a six-line speech by Aaron for a speech of the same length by Lucius. Less than half-way through the scene, Dürrenmatt entirely reconceives a short dramatic movement (1.1.191–256; Dürrenmatt 1980a: 124–5).⁸ A little later still, Dürrenmatt first expands a short Shakespearean passage into a much longer one of his own (1.1.291–6; Dürrenmatt 1980a: 127–9). By the time Dürrenmatt reaches the end of the scene, next to nothing is left of the original language or action. Whereas the original scene ends on a precariously – and provisionally – restored order as Saturninus and Tamora seem to forgive Titus and plan to hunt together the next day, Dürrenmatt shows Titus in total isolation, all characters leaving him one by one until he is left alone to bury the son he has previously killed. Some later scenes revert to a much closer correspondence between adaptation and original. Much of Scene 8, for instance, follows Shakespeare almost speech by speech, even though most speeches are abridged and many are rewritten. Nevertheless, Dürrenmatt's departures from the original are such that his adaptation can hardly be described as 'very close to the original'.

Every adaptation is an interpretation. How then does Dürrenmatt *reinterpret* Shakespeare's play? The question of genre is central to Dürrenmatt's adaptation. In an oft-quoted essay, Dürrenmatt argued that comedy is the only genre that suits our modern world: 'Tragedy presupposes guilt, measure, overview, responsibility. In the muddle of our century, in this clean sweep of the white race, no one is responsible any more. No one can help it, and no one wanted it. Everyone can be done without. ... Only comedy does

us justice'.⁹ Accordingly, Dürrenmatt turns Shakespeare's tragedy into a grotesque black comedy. Whereas the original title page of *Titus Andronicus* referred to the play as a 'Lamentable Roman Tragedy', the subtitle of Dürrenmatt's adaptation reads 'Eine Komödie nach Shakespeare', a comedy after Shakespeare.

The fate of Aaron, the villain, illustrates this generic shift: in Shakespeare, his two appearances in the last act are of central importance for the restoration of order as required by tragedy. Taken prisoner by a Goth who leads him to Lucius, the villain is made to reveal all his misdeeds. In the final scene, punishment is meted out to the unrepentant Aaron. Through the dramatization of Aaron, Shakespeare produces the meaning that is proper to tragedy, with both the intrigue and the moral drama thus finding their resolution at the play's close. In Dürrenmatt, by contrast, Aaron has his final appearance as early as Scene 5 in which he is presented with the Queen's bastard son whom he has fathered.¹⁰ As in Shakespeare, Aaron kills the nurse who brought the babe. Yet unlike Shakespeare, Dürrenmatt, a few lines later, has Aaron declare his intention of leaving Rome and of returning to Africa where he and his son will be 'Nicht Sklaven Roms, doch freie Kannibalen' (169), not 'Rome's slaves but free cannibals'. Dürrenmatt's Aaron thus not only fails to disclose his villainies and escapes unpunished, but even the killing of the nurse – duly motivated in Shakespeare by his desire to rid himself of potential witnesses against him – appears grotesque and gratuitous in light of his and his son's imminent departure to Africa.

Dürrenmatt sometimes achieves a comic effect through language, as when Titus, at the beginning of the final scene, offers to serve Saturninus 'another little kidney, liver, brain or rib'.¹¹ Much of the time, however, the laughter Dürrenmatt strives to provoke arises from his dramatization of scenes of violence. The adaptation, in other words, treads a fine line between laughter and horror. This is particularly true at the end of the play. It may be tempting to argue that the speed at which the various characters are killed creates a comic effect: Titus kills Lavinia and Tamora before being stabbed by Saturninus who, in turn, is killed by Lucius, all in little over twenty lines of dialogue. But, in fact, the killings in Shakespeare's play are no less but even more condensed. What is different in Dürrenmatt, however, is that he adds one more killing: Lucius has returned to Rome with an army of Goths led by Alarich who, as we have seen, Dürrenmatt introduced in Scene 4. Once all the other main characters have been killed, Alarich stabs Lucius and commands his soldiers to kill all Romans. In Alarich's chorus-like concluding speech, he comments that 'im stupiden Lauf der Zeit' (197), 'in the stupid course of time', revenge will lead to further revenge, that after he and his fellow Goths will have destroyed the Romans, others, the Huns and the Turks, will come and destroy the Goths, leading to more and more pointless violence in a pointless world. The killings in the last scene are thus grotesque not because they happen in quick, mechanic succession, but because they turn out, contrary to those in Shakespeare's play, to serve no purpose, to lead to more killings which lead to more killings. In the original *Titus*, by contrast, Marcus announces the restoration of order immediately after Tamora, Saturninus, and Titus have been killed: 'O let me teach you how to knit again/This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf,/These broken limbs again into one body' (5.3.69–71). Before the end of the scene, since 'The common voice do cry it shall be so', Lucius is crowned 'Rome's royal emperor' (5.3.139–40). It may thus be argued that popular consensus and the visible centre of Rome's unity are carefully restored before the play concludes.

Yet Dürrenmatt's comedic adaptation is more than an idiosyncratic response by the Swiss playwright. Dürrenmatt's *Titus Andronicus* is in fact related to a distinctive stance in the reception history of Shakespeare's play. Peter Brook's immensely successful 1955 production, starring Laurence Olivier, was both indicative and constitutive of a revival of interest in Shakespeare's earliest tragedy, but a traditional view of the play as extremely crude if not downright grotesque lingered on. At the same time as Antonin Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty, Beckett and Ionescu's Theatre of the Absurd and Jan Kott's *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* provided a context within which *Titus* fitted better than ever since the sixteenth century, this context also favoured a certain kind of reading of Shakespeare's play, exemplified by Dürrenmatt's adaptation and prominent in contemporary criticism of Shakespeare's play. For instance, when J. Dover Wilson edited the play for the New Cambridge Shakespeare series in 1948, he argued that the excessive violence had been dramatized with a burlesque intention.¹² Even though disagreeing to some extent, J. C. Maxwell (1953: xli), editing the play for the Arden Shakespeare, second series, in the following decade, similarly held that 'it would be rash to say that a uniform attitude of deadly seriousness is presupposed'.

That this attitude was still alive when Dürrenmatt came to write his adaptation is best illustrated by an article Daniel Scuro wrote in 1970 – the year of Dürrenmatt's *Titus*. A retrospective appreciation of the achievement of Peter Brook's 1955 production, Scuro's article has recently been reprinted in the Garland collection of critical essays on *Titus Andronicus*. According to Scuro, Brook's production turned dross into gold by 'cutting the text and ordering the stage so that bathos was never allowed to enter' (Scuro 1995: 402). Scuro's view of Shakespeare's play transpires even more clearly when he writes that the 'grotesqueries of the original text (Act III, Scene ii; Act IV, Scene i) were tastefully edited' (403). The possibility that Brook's *Titus* might have been a success because of, rather than despite, the original text nowhere enters Scuro's discussion. His argument is affected throughout by the presupposition that Shakespeare's play in and of itself is grotesque. Peter Brook (1987: 72), for one, begged to disagree, commenting that 'When the notices of *Titus Andronicus* came out, giving us all full marks for saving [Shakespeare's] dreadful play, I could not help feeling a twinge of guilt. For to tell the truth, it had not occurred to any of us in rehearsal that the play was so bad'. A whole strand of criticism on *Titus Andronicus* from Dover Wilson to Scuro thus suggests that when Dürrenmatt wrote his adaptation in 1970, many students of Shakespeare's play must have felt that the Swiss dramatist was only following Shakespeare in choosing to write a black comedy rather than a tragedy. As we have seen above, Dürrenmatt subtitled his *Titus* 'eine Komödie nach Shakespeare', which can be understood as meaning either that the play (a comedy) is adapted from Shakespeare or, more specifically, that the object of the adaptation is a comedy by Shakespeare. In view of certain critical tendencies in the course of the twentieth century, the latter reading should not be discounted.

The similarities between readings offered by various critics and the reading implicit in Dürrenmatt's adaptation calls for a consideration of the relationship between adaptation and original on the one hand and between the subject and object of literary criticism on the other. An adaptation that omits, changes, adds, transforms, deflates and highlights parts of the original may be a way of assessing the specific inflection of a local critical appropriation. Dürrenmatt, trying to show how grotesque the world of *Titus Andronicus* is, alters the original in significant ways. What reading adaptation and Shakespearean original side by side can therefore provide is insights into the exact nature

of a critical reception that adopts a view of Shakespeare's play that is similar to that inherent in the adaptation.

This analytic method can best be illustrated by a brief examination of the character of Lavinia. What this examination shows is that if Dürrenmatt's reinterpretation of *Titus* crystallizes in the generic shift from 'lamentable tragedy' to dark, or grotesque, comedy, then his main device for achieving this shift is the foreclosure of the play's potential emotional impact by discouraging any empathetic engagement with the main characters. Significantly, Lavinia, who is the emotional centre of Shakespeare's play in most recent productions, is reduced to a relatively minor character, appearing only in the first three and the last two scenes. In 3.1 of Shakespeare's play, an extensive sequence, from the entrance of Marcus with the mutilated Lavinia to the entrance of Aaron almost a hundred lines later, dramatizes the empathetic response of Titus, Lucius and Marcus to Lavinia. The grief is physically enacted in a variety of ways, with Lucius 'falling to his knees' and Marcus and Titus in tears, all dramatically expressing what Titus calls 'a sympathy of woe' (3.1.149) in what is potentially Shakespeare's most moving and intimate family scene before *Hamlet*. Dürrenmatt omits nearly the entirety of this sequence and, in what remains, radically alters Titus's emotional response to his daughter. To Lucius's interjection 'Ihr Anblick tötet mich!', 'The sight of her kills me!', he responds 'Ihr Anblick tröstet mich' (152), 'The sight of her comforts me', and goes on to explain to Lucius that his mutilated daughter is a reassuringly appropriate expression of the world's overall corruption. Dürrenmatt seems to introduce Lavinia only as a pretext to move on immediately to the symbolic significance of her role. Dürrenmatt uses Lavinia to make a point, to explain; Shakespeare makes her an icon of suffering and spends considerable time and ingenuity in dramatizing the on-stage audience's response to her, thereby facilitating and directing the empathetic response of the off-stage audience.

A further device used to bring about this response is direct address. In three speeches and a total of some forty lines, Shakespeare's Titus interacts with and speaks to his daughter. Dürrenmatt's Titus, by contrast, never addresses but only speaks about her. The contrast is all the more striking as Dürrenmatt here introduces another character – absent from Shakespeare – to whom Titus talks instead: Publius, who fought as one of Titus's soldiers against the Goths and, when he lost a leg in battle, was excluded from the army 'ohne Pension' (153), with no pension. Publius, down-to-earth and skeptical of Saturninus's intentions, serves as a foil to Titus. As a powerless victim of the war, he has none of the illusions to which Titus is still subject. Instead of dramatizing Titus's emotional response to his daughter, which humanizes both Lavinia and her father, Dürrenmatt engages Titus in a conversation in which intellectual responses to the casualties of war are contrasted.¹³

These and many other changes seem ultimately to reinforce one main point which the adaptation is meant to illustrate: the futility of patriotism. In Shakespeare's play, Titus, despite his initial foolishness and brutality, is now usually seen as a tragic character, more sinned against than sinning, deserving of our empathy. Yet in the adaptation, Titus grotesquely clings to his flawed beliefs about Rome, the 'fatherland', and about the 'justice' meted out by those in power. Dürrenmatt misses no opportunity to highlight these issues. For instance, Titus's first speech ends on 'Schlaf friedlich, Sohn! Du starbst fürs Vaterland' (120), Baudissin's translation of 'And sleep in peace, slain in your country's wars' (1.1.94). The word 'Vaterland', 'fatherland', has of course rather different

connotations from the more general 'country' in the original. Dürrenmatt preserves Baudissin's word, but gives it further prominence by placing it at the very end of Titus's opening speech. Throughout the adaptation, Dürrenmatt's changes in fact serve to stress the absurdity of Titus's lofty ideal of dying for one's country.

The futility of patriotism which Dürrenmatt is at pains to stress leads us back to the question of how his adaptation constitutes a *local* response to Shakespeare, a response that is embedded in the cultural position from which Shakespeare was approached and adapted. And it leads us to understand to what extent Dürrenmatt's position is specifically Swiss rather than German or, more generally, Germanic. Whatever the lingering sympathies for the aspirations of the Third Reich may have been, patriotism, in the decades immediately following World War II, was not a common topic of public debate in Germany. In Switzerland, the situation was altogether different. Having emerged more or less unscathed from the ravages of the war in which the surrounding countries had been involved, Switzerland, in the eyes of many, had profited more from the war than it had suffered. In such a situation, the judgement posterity passed on the role Switzerland had played during the war was bound to be politically explosive. Judgements were multiple but can, for the sake of the present purpose, be grouped around two opposing poles. The political establishment, on the one hand, engaged in various degrees of retrospective mystification and glorification, imputing the country's escape to the quality of its politics and Germany's failure to invade Switzerland at least partly to the dissuasive effect of the Swiss army. The anti-establishment, by contrast, accused the Swiss government of opportunism and full-scale collaboration with Nazi Germany.¹⁴

Now for Dürrenmatt, defenders and critics of Swiss politics during World War II represented the two sides of the same coin as both depended on the ideological constructions of patriotism and fatherland to which he objected. One side did so by claiming that Switzerland had lived up to the standards of these ideological constructions, the other side by holding that it had failed to do so. In other words, the standards the two sides employed were identical. In his non-fictional writings as well as in interviews, Dürrenmatt touches on this subject on several occasions,¹⁵ but it emerges most clearly in an interview he gave four years before completing *Titus Andronicus*:

Retrospectively, Switzerland no longer dared to adhere to its former self; it thought of the plight in which it had found itself during the war as shameful and reconceived of itself no longer as human but as either heroic or diabolic. The truth is that we had no choice. We certainly made many mistakes during the war, but essentially our politics were human. Politicians cannot be expected to be heroic. We have no right to cast stones at our former politicians. They achieved their political aim, keeping Switzerland out of war. They often achieved it with morally insufficient and even alarming means. ... In unworthy times, an entirely worthy attitude is impossible. To ask retrospectively for heroism from our politicians is inappropriate.¹⁶

Dürrenmatt holds that the ideology of patriotism and fatherland is dangerous, indeed potentially destructive, in that it is in its name that innocent people get killed. This applies both to recent history – World War II – and to fictionalized history as in his *Titus Andronicus*. What motivates Dürrenmatt's writing is therefore the unmasking of these insidious ideological concepts. From this perspective, the raped and mutilated Lavinia is no more than another illustration of the point that Titus's patriotism is flawed.

And what Dürrenmatt's Titus is deprived of in the course of the play are not dearly beloved relatives, but ideological concepts, belief in justice and the fatherland which, Dürrenmatt holds, serve to establish and perpetuate power. As he put it in his 'Notes on *Titus Andronicus*', 'patriotism is only believed in by those who profit from it, the powerful, and justice serves to legitimate their power'.¹⁷

What emerges from the above is the extent to which Dürrenmatt's dramatic adaptation constitutes in fact a 'readerly' response to *Titus Andronicus*. Arguably, few of Shakespeare's plays and none of his tragedies need performance as badly as *Titus Andronicus* to achieve their true impact. Pageantry pervades the play from the beginning as Titus and his army enter, an aspect of Shakespeare's play that is all but lost on the page. Moreover, even though a reader can be intellectually aware of Lavinia's presence on stage after her rape and dismemberment, this awareness is no substitute for the effect her glaring, albeit silent, presence on stage has on a spectator. One of the most eloquent 'speaking pictures' in all of Shakespeare, the mutilated Lavinia, a 'map of woe' (3.2.12), can move spectators, move them to emotions and tears as perhaps no earlier play had done, with the exception of Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*. The predominantly intellectual activity of readers does not expose them to the same emotions. Significantly, Dürrenmatt heavily abridges the role of Lavinia. A 'reading' of *Titus Andronicus* can thus easily result in the view that the play is absurd or grotesque. As Kott (1965: 281) put it, 'In reading, the cruelties of *Titus* seem childish. I have recently re-read it, and found it ridiculous'. Even though responding to *Titus* by means of a dramatic adaptation, Dürrenmatt's view of Shakespeare's play is very much that of a reader, a fact that may at least partly account for the lack of success Dürrenmatt's adaptation has hitherto had on stage.

Turning Shakespeare's 'lamentable tragedy' into a grotesque comedy, Dürrenmatt arguably tries to legitimate the views his play advances – notably that of the futility of patriotism – by means of the label 'Shakespeare' of which neither spectators nor readers could possibly have remained unaware. While Dürrenmatt's adaptation can be shown to conform in significant ways to the critical reception history of *Titus Andronicus*, he participates in this history not by writing criticism but by means of an adaptation which can serve to diagnose the nature of the reception of which it is a part. Ironically, reading *Titus* with Dürrenmatt and his understanding of the absurd and the grotesque in mind can help us perceive both Dürrenmatt's adaptation and certain critical interpretations as fascinating misreadings of the Shakespearean original that are profoundly and inevitably local.

12 Subjection and redemption in Pasolini's *Othello*

Sonia Massai

Pier Paolo Pasolini adapted and directed a short cinematic version of Shakespeare's *Othello* in 1967. *Che Cosa Sono Le Nuvole?* (*What Are Clouds Like?* henceforth *Nuvole*) was initially conceived as one of the episodes of a feature film called *Capriccio all' Italiana* (1968) but has since been shown as a short film in its own right and is often included in retrospectives on Pasolini's career as a film-maker.¹ Pasolini's work is better known abroad than in Italy, where his sexuality, his uncompromising political views and the controversial circumstances of his death in 1975 still overshadow his artistic stature. However, *Nuvole* is still largely unknown even among Shakespearean scholars, partly because a long and unresolved copyright dispute has prevented it from being re-released, and partly because Pasolini himself may have regarded it as a fragment of a larger project, a sequence of short films which he never completed. And yet, even as a fragment, *Nuvole* represents a groundbreaking appropriation of *Othello* and deserves more visibility than it has been accorded so far. Like the other local Shakespeares discussed in this volume *Nuvole* represents a significant 'new position' within the field, which, as Bourdieu puts it, 'by asserting itself ... determines a displacement of [its] structure' (1993: 58).

Since Pasolini shot *Nuvole* in 1967, the critical reception of *Othello* has been dominated by issues of gender, sexuality and race.² Pasolini's appropriation is worth critical attention because it anticipated in interesting ways the work of later critics, directors and adapters, by exposing the patriarchal and racist views associated with the play and its reception. Even more crucially, though, roughly thirteen years before Stephen Greenblatt focused on Iago's ability to turn the other characters into recognizable (or stereotypical) subject-positions (1980: 222–54), Pasolini established a connection between Iago's fashioning powers and the impact of discursive formations, including the works of canonical authors like Shakespeare's *Othello*, on their recipients. While Greenblatt glamorized Iago by identifying him as 'the principle of narrativity itself' (1980: 236) and by comparing his improvisational skills to Shakespeare's own 'limitless talent for entering into the consciousness of another, perceiving its deepest structures as a manipulable fiction, [and] reinscribing it into his own narrative form' (1980: 252), Pasolini used meta-theatrical and meta-cinematic devices to show his audience how to resist the influence of familiar patriarchal and racist narratives embedded both in Iago's improvisational strategies and in the play as a whole.

Pasolini's exploration of the ideological power associated with the legacy of canonical authors is not confined to *Nuvole*. Adaptation was his favourite mode of artistic expression. Most of his better-known films rework seminal texts at the heart of Western culture, including *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (1964), *Oedipus Rex* (1967), *Medea*

to perceive the play as a comedy, 'readers and viewers ... must minimize the violence, and, at the same time, justify its use' (1997: 274). Shirley Garner points out that, in this context, the audience must accept 'the premise... that a shrewish woman is less than human... [and] so may be treated as an animal'. Garner asks: 'Could the taming of a "shrew" be considered the proper subject of farce in any but a misogynist culture? How would we feel about a play entitled *The Taming of the Jew* or *The Taming of the Black*? I think we would be embarrassed by anti-Semitism or racism in a way that many of us are not by misogyny' (1988: 109–10).

- 3 This and following translations from Czech are mine.
- 4 The results of the study showed, for instance, that one in six people have experienced domestic violence, and that 61% have witnessed it; 47% were uncertain whether they would respond to neighbours screaming and crying or whether they would ignore them, and 29% thought that domestic violence should be tolerated and resolved within the family (Dolanský 2001b). In some areas nearly half of the population (46%) did not know the meaning of the term 'domestic violence' (A.V.O. and T.O.F. 2001: 1). The research further pointed out that there is very little in place in terms of a network for victims of domestic violence (L.D.S. 2001: 1).
- 5 For an overview of the debate, see, for example, Thompson (2003: 17–24, 42–9). All subsequent references from *The Taming of the Shrew* are from this edition.
- 6 To understand the class-based differences in domination of women as reflected in Shakespeare's *Taming*, I find Detmer's 'Civilizing Subordination' particularly useful. Using early modern domestic manuals, which document a shift in the perception of the proper response of a husband towards an unruly wife from beatings and other violent acts of forced subordination perceived as common or lower class practices to a 'modern', more psychological, form of domination worthy of gentlemen, Detmer argues that Petruchio participates in the newly evolving 'tradition that accepts coercive bonding and oppression as long as they are free of physical violence' (1997: 274, 289).
- 7 In this specific form of domestic abuse the victim, much like a hostage isolated from others and afraid for her/his safety, responds positively to any show of kindness from the captor/abuser, and 'finds [that] the key to survival [is] to actively develop strategies for staying alive... [since] alternating coercive threats and kindness sets up situations where victims actively look for ways to please rather than upset their captors' (Detmer 1997: 284, 287).
- 8 'Ona je má, můj nábytek, mé zboží,/můj dům, můj dvůr, má stodola, mé pole,/můj kůň, můj vůl, můj dobytek, mé všechno!'
- 9 'to on se pořád o tebe jen stará,/riskuje život na moři i souši,/zná noční bouře, třeskutý mráz snáší,/Když ty si hoviš v bezpečí a v teple.'
- 10 'Jen do ní, Káčo!/Hortensio: Nedej se, vdovičko!'

10 *Shooting the Hero: The cinematic career of Henry V from Laurence Olivier to Philip Purser*

- 1 In the film version, Fluellen's statement at the end of the scene, namely that they will resume the interrupted discussion later, is cut (3.2). It suggests that the conflict with the French unites the representatives of Britain. With Macmorris, Olivier would seem to argue that war 'is no time to discourse' (3.2.106).
- 2 Asked later for the secret of his success in the cinematic role of Henry the Fifth, Olivier would reply: 'I don't know – I'm England, that's all' (Spoto 1991: 96).
- 3 Spoto recalls how Alexander Korda, in an attempt to please Churchill, used *Lady Hamilton* to drive home the parallel between Napoleon and Hitler vs. Nelson and Churchill (1991: 133).
- 4 All references are to Craik 1995.
- 5 Emphasis on this controversial issue may be found in recent academic writing on Olivier's film. Peter Drexler (1995: 132) shows how these two films reveal 'similarities in the handling of symbolic codes', suggesting, for example, that the patriotism of Olivier's film is best measured in comparative terms against the contemporary output of the German film industry. See also Anthony Davies (2000: 167–8).

11 *Lamentable tragedy or black comedy?: Friedrich Dürrenmatt's adaptation of Titus Andronicus*

- 1 Dürrenmatt's adaptation has been briefly discussed in Kolin (1995: 505–8) and in Cohn (1976: 29–37); see also Mehlin (1972: 73–98). As I refer throughout this essay to the sixteenth-century tragedy as 'Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*', a word concerning the play's authorship seems in order. Brian Vickers (2002: 148–243) has recently advanced forceful reasons to believe that George Peele wrote the play's long opening scene and, possibly, three further scenes, 2.1, 2.2 and 4.1. Vickers' case seems convincing, and he may well be correct. Even if Peele contributed to *Titus Andronicus*, however, the greatest part of the play is still by Shakespeare; for the sake of convenience, I will therefore refer to the play as his.
- 2 For Dürrenmatt's adaptation of *King John*, see Reber (1976: 80–9). For Dürrenmatt's projected adaptation of *Troilus and Cressida*, see Bloch (1972: 67–72).
- 3 'Er erzählte ..., dass er seine Stücke am liebsten in Dialekt geschrieben hätte' (Weber and von Planta 1994: 78). See also Dürrenmatt (1980c: 120–4).
- 4 *Titus Andronicus* 'stellt den Versuch dar, das berühmte, chaotische Jugendwerk Shakespeares für die deutsche Bühne spielbar zu machen, ohne die Shakespearschen Grausamkeiten und Grotesken zu vertuschen' (Dürrenmatt 1980b: 158). Unless otherwise stated, the translations are mine.
- 5 Schauspielhaus Düsseldorf, 12 December 1970.
- 6 I quote from Bate's 1995 edition throughout this chapter.
- 7 Note that Bate's Arden three edition breaks with editorial tradition by printing as one continuous scene what previous editors had divided into 1.1 and 2.1.
- 8 I refer to and quote from Dürrenmatt (1980a).
- 9 'Die Tragödie setzt Schuld, Not, Mass, Übersicht, Verantwortung voraus. In der Wurstelei unseres Jahrhunderts, in diesem Kehraus der weissen Rasse, gibt es keine Verantwortlichen mehr. Alle können nichts dafür und haben es nicht gewollt. Es geht wirklich ohne jeden. ... Uns kommt nur noch die Komödie bei' (Dürrenmatt 1966: 122).
- 10 Whereas Edward Ravenscroft's adaptation in the late seventeenth century emphasized and enlarged the Moor's character, Dürrenmatt thus does the opposite.
- 11 'Noch/Ein Nierchen, Leber, Hirn, ein Rippenstück' (193). This kind of black humour is of course also present in Shakespeare's play, as exemplified by Titus' puns on hands: 'Come hither, Aaron. I'll deceive them both:/Lend me thy hand and I will give thee mine' (3.1.187–8); 'Speak, Lavinia, what accursed hand/Hath made thee handless in thy father's sight?' (3.1.67–8); 'O handle not the theme, to talk of hands,/Lest we remember still that we have none' (3.2.29–30).
- 12 By contrast, a Stratford production of 1923 still dissolved in audience laughter (see Cohn 1976: 35).
- 13 Here and elsewhere, it is easy to perceive the influence the work of Bertolt Brecht exerted on the Swiss dramatist.
- 14 Recently, the specific question of dormant Swiss bank accounts Nazi victims sparked an international debate leading to a full-scale investigation into the economic facts of the Holocaust by the Swiss Independent Commission of Experts, known as the 'Bergier Commission', from 1997 to 2002. Its findings were published in Bergier Commission (2002). See also Wylie (2003: 300–31).
- 15 See, for instance, Dürrenmatt (1969: 62–73).
- 16 'Die Schweiz wagte jedoch nachträglich nicht mehr zu sich selber zu stehen, sie empfand die Notlage als schändlich, in der sie sich während des Krieges befand, und dichtete sich dann vom Menschlichen ins Heldische oder ins Teuflische um. Die Wahrheit ist, daß wir keine Wahl hatten. Wir haben sicher im Krieg viele Fehler gemacht, aber im wesentlichen war unsere Politik menschlich. Man kann von den Politikern nicht das Heldische fordern. Wir haben kein Recht, auf unsere damaligen Politiker Steine zu werfen. Sie haben ihr politisches Ziel erreicht, nämlich die Schweiz aus dem Kriege herausgehalten. Sie haben es mit moralisch oft ungenügenden und sogar bedenklichen Mitteln getan. ... In einer unwürdigen

Zeit ist keine rein würdige Haltung möglich. Nachträglich zu verlangen, unsere Politiker hätten Helden sein sollen, geht nicht an' (Dürrenmatt 1996: 252–3).

- 17 'An den Patriotismus glauben nur jene, die von ihm profitieren, die Mächtigen, und die Gerechtigkeit dient dazu, deren Macht zu legitimieren' (Dürrenmatt, 1980a: 210).

12 Subjection and redemption in Pasolini's *Othello*

- 1 Pasolini's films, including *Nuvole*, were recently shown in London at the French Institute (12–24 March 2004), in collaboration with the Italian Institute (London) and the Fondazione Pier Paolo Pasolini (Rome).
- 2 See, for example, Neill (1989), Parker (1994: 84–100), Petcher (1996), Adelman (1997) and Callaghan (2000: 75–96).
- 3 'I maestri son fatti per essere mangiati in salsa piccante.' All translations from Italian primary and secondary sources are mine.
- 4 This poem was included in *Poesia in Forma di Rosa* (1961–4); see Chiarcossi and Siti (1999: 721–35).
- 5 Line references are to Honigmann (1997).
- 6 'Ah, /uccellaccia nera, che ti fingi bianca.'
- 7 'tu/dormi,/dove e come non so, verso di Shakespeare, ritornato/per istinto stagionale/da terre che non hanno nulla/a che fare con noi.'
- 8 'Tutto ciò che ho saputo, per grazia/o per volontà, smetta di essere sapienza. ... E, per un po' di scienza della storia che mi dà esperienza/... mi prendo tutta l'innocenza della vita futura!'
- 9 'Otello, apri l'occhi!'; 'È stato Jago a dà a Cassio quel fazzoletto'; 'Cassio non parlava de Desdemona! Parlava de Bianca! A disgraziato pure a te! Magara tocchi Desdemona te facciamo vede noi!'
- 10 'Povera bambina, /è morta per amor/povera bambina/è morta per amor./La gente che qui passa/le getterà un bel fior.'
- 11 'Sì, mio signore ... (lo schiaffo ricevuto ha aumentato il suo rispetto e il suo amore) però che schiaffo m'avete date! E il primo schiaffo che piglio! Se volete darmene un altro ... (ha un ambiguo sorriso di sottomissione).'
- 12 'Burattinaio: Forse ... sei tu che vuoi ammazzar[la]./Otello: Come? Me piace ammazzare? E perchè?/Burattinaio: Forse ... perchè a Desdemona piace essere ammazzata./Otello: Ah! È così? (ha una faccia sconvolta dal terrore e dalla meraviglia).'
- 13 'Marrano, tu insidi le nostre ragazze ...'
- 14 'Egli insidia l'onore delle nostre donne, signor Governatore! Scandalo! Scandalo!'
- 15 I am grateful to Douglas Lanier, who has pointed out how films which use the motif of players rehearsing or re-enacting *Othello* have a long history in the Continental European and in the Anglo-American traditions. The first film was a Danish two-reeler, *Desdemona* [*For Åbent Tæppe*], directed by August Blom (1910), and it was followed by: *A Modern Othello, aka The Shadow of Night, The Lash of Jealousy, and The Mad Lover* [*Een Moderne Othello*], a full-length Pathe film scripted by Leonce Perret and produced by Harry Rapf in 1917; *Carnival*, directed by Harley Knowles in 1921 (from the play by Alexander Matheson Lang and H.C.M. Haringe); *Carnival: Venetian Nights*, a sound remake of the Knowles film directed by Herbert Wilcox in 1931; *Men are not Gods*, directed by Alex Korda in 1937; *The Strangler*, directed by Harold Huth in 1940; and *A Double Life*, directed by George Cukor in 1947.
- 16 'un sogno dentro ad un sogno'
- 17 For more details on the four posters and on the role of a further painting by Velasquez, 'Venus and Cupid', which is posted, as an unlikely pin-up, to the garbage collector's van, see Pistoia (1990) and Iafrate (1990).
- 18 Alberto Marchesini reports that 'la critica è propensa ad associare la scoperta di Velasquez alla lettura di Foucault' (critics tend to relate [Pasolini's] discovery of Velasquez to his reading of Foucault; 1994: 15n). Marchesini may be wrong, because Pasolini visited El Prado in 1964, when, as his poem 'Patmos' reveals, he was fascinated by Velasquez's paintings.

Francesco Galluzzi, on the other, hand, is right when he establishes a connection which my essay explores in detail. 'Tutta la critica', he explains, 'ha rilevato la dipendenza di questa scelta pasoliniana dall'analisi del dipinto condotto da Michel Foucault in *Les Mots et les Choses*, ... dove *Las Meninas* viene definito "una sorta di rappresentazione della rappresentazione classica" (critics have established the origin of Pasolini's choice in Michel Foucault's analysis of the painting in *Les Mots et les Choses*, ... where *Las Meninas* is referred to as 'a sort of representation of classical representation'). See Galluzzi (1994: 64).

- 19 'A questo pubblico che prende parte alla vicenda se ne affianca un altro mutevole e irraggiungibile: noi che guardiamo il cortometraggio. Noi coincidiamo con il pubblico del teatrino durante la rappresentazione dell' *Otello*, e di conseguenza gli ammiccamenti di Jago sono rivolti contemporaneamente a due pubblici diversi. ... Lo sguardo di Jago, che è perfettamente consapevole della nostra complicità, partecipa della stessa natura vincolante del pittore all'interno del quadro, della cui traiettoria siamo prigionieri.'
- 20 'Il potere mercifica il corpo, riducendolo a "cosa" e mai, come durante il nazi-fascismo, questa cosa è stata anche visiva, concreta, fisica. Il potere oggi, secondo me, manipola più profondamente le coscienze.'
- 21 'È coinvolto anch'esso/nel mondo della nostra ricchezza, /e pur guardando fuori del quadro ne è dentro!'
- 22 'Velasquez è in prigione perché ha un corpo.'
- 23 'La società chiusa, squallida degli spettatori, in cui sussiste l'obbligo di agire secondo un ruolo prestabilito da altri ... è un vero inferno, il cui braccio armato è la scempiaggine del pubblico-massa che reagisce solo in base alla schematizzazione di ciò che vede, esteriormente, accadere. Il pubblico entra nell'opera e lo fa a pezzi ed è solo questo che può fare nella sua somma inconsapevolezza, nel suo abbruttimento sociale, nell'accamento che nasce dal non comprendere ciò che si consuma, e da cui si pretende, in quanto paganti, la soddisfazione delle proprie aspettative, borghesemente "etiche".'
- 24 Only a year before *Nuvole*, Pasolini directed *Hawks and Sparrows* (1966), a clear homage to Roberto Rossellini's *Francesco Giullare di Dio* (1950).
- 25 'serio e dolce, un vecchio, paziente filosofo'
- 26 'Lo specchio di Velasquez e il sogno pasoliniano, nel comune tradimento della mimesi, intrecciano al motivo della visione, quello più inquietante dell'elusione, quel non detto che rappresenta la cifra più autentica dell'esistenza dei burattini.'
- 27 'Oh, straziante, meravigliosa bellezza del creato.'
- 28 'Le ciliege del peccato'
- 29 'Una sola finestra ... , piccola come una feritoia'

13 'Meaning by Shakespeare' south of the border

- 1 'At first he thought that everyone else was like him, but the look of surprise from a colleague with whom he started to discuss such trifle made him realize his mistake...' (my translation). With love to Mónica, Sarah, Dina and Mayté. My gratitude to Sonia, another Sonia, and Bernice.
- 2 For instance, Denis Salter's view that 'the Shakespearean text will have to go on being enacted elsewhere – but not (and not ever again?) in postcolonial space' (1996: 129) is debatable. As an English-speaking post-colonial subject who assumes that he *must* deal with Shakespeare exclusively in his original language, Salter may justifiably feel that his linguistic and artistic practices are constrained. But he altogether rejects the possibility of employing what, with or 'without his language', remains a valuable vehicle for locally significant, transformative initiatives, although he acknowledges that 'Québécois actors do have a greater degree of freedom, partly because they can perform Shakespeare in their own language' (1996: 125).
- 3 Throughout, my uses of 'tactic' refer to de Certeau (1984), and those of 'transformation' and 'interpolation' to Ashcroft (2001).
- 4 'Cannibalization' refers to de Campos (2000a).