Part III
The Renewal of Ancient Drama

The Reception of Ancient Drama in Renaissance Italy

Francesca Schironi

Introduction

The first reception of Classical drama in a modern language occurred in sixteenth-century Italy. Italian neoclassical drama not only served as a basis for the development of European drama—as it provided the theoretical framework and models which were then perfected by the Elizabethan and French dramatists—but also represented a very rich cultural phenomenon in itself. Without aiming to offer a complete analysis of theater in Renaissance Italy, I will here give an overview of its most important characteristics, focusing on why neoclassical drama originated in Italy, on the theoretical debates that this new genre ignited, and on the main trends and themes of Italian "neoclassical" tragedy and comedy as well as their place in the larger Italian cultural milieu. From this survey, I will omit tragedies and comedies written in Latin in the previous centuries, such as Albertino Mussato's *Ecerinis* (1314), a tragedy based on Seneca as a model (especially *Octavia*) and depicting the cruel deeds of Ezzelino III da Romano (1194–1259) against Padua. Even if Latin humanist plays were important predecessors, Italian neoclassical drama was a new phenomenon, which stemmed mostly from the rediscovery of the Latin and Greek originals at the end of the fifteenth century. I will also omit discussing pastoral plays such as Angelo Poliziano's *Orfeo* (c. 1472–1480) or Giovan Battista Guarini's *Il pastor fido* (c. 1580), which are based on Classical myths and are the predecessors of Italian opera.[1]

The "Rediscovery" of the Classics in Italy

The development of neoclassical drama in Europe was a consequence of the "rediscovery" of Classical literature in humanistic and early Renaissance Italy.

To be sure, Greek drama was never lost: in Byzantium, Greek texts were copied and enjoyed; specifically, the three tragedians together with Aristophanes were organized in "triads," as Byzantine scholars had selected three plays of each author to be part of the school curriculum. Yet, in Western Europe, Classical drama was known mainly through Latin authors, especially Terence, but also Seneca and, to a lesser degree, Plautus. The main reason for this was that, even if the knowledge of Greek was never lost in Europe, and especially in Southern Italy, where Greek manuscripts were being copied in the thirteenth century, Europeans generally did not know ancient Greek and thus could not have access to the original texts. After some attempts by intellectuals, such as Petrarch and Boccaccio to learn Greek from the Italo-Greeks Barlaam and Leontius Pilatus, in 1397 the Byzantine Manuel Chrysoloras successfully started teaching Greek at the *Studium* (university) of Florence, at the invitation of Coluccio Salutati, a humanist and chancellor of the Florentine Republic from 1375 to 1406. Another key occurrence was when, after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453, many Byzantine intellectuals fled to Italy, where they taught Greek. They brought Greek manuscripts with them, and through these Greek drama became available to Italian humanists, who themselves searched for Greek and Latin manuscripts in Italy as well as in Europe and Constantinople.

The rediscovery of Classical texts played an important role for Latin drama as well. Seneca *tragicus* became widely known through the efforts of the Paduan humanists, such as Albertino Mussato (1261–1329) and Lovato Lovati (1241–1309), who worked on important manuscripts of Seneca's tragedies and wrote a treatise on Seneca's meters. Similarly, while Terence's plays were known through the Middle Ages, twelve new comedies of Plautus were found by Nicholas of Kues in 1429. As European intellectuals started mastering Greek, Latin translations of Greek texts followed, already in the second half of the fifteenth century in Italy as well as in the rest of Europe. With the spread of printing, editions of Classical drama were published: Terence first appeared in Strasbourg in 1470, Plautus in Venice in 1472, and Seneca's tragedies in Ferrara in 1484. Of particular importance was the work done by Aldo Manuzio (1449–1515) in Venice, as he published for the first time many Greek texts, among which Aristophanes (1498, except *Thesmophoriazousae* and *Lysistrata*), Sophocles (1502), Euripides (1503, except Electra), and Aeschylus (1518, according to a manuscript which had missing pages at the end of the *Agamemnon* and at the beginning of *Choephoroi*, so that the two plays were printed as one drama).

The Theoretical Debate

Among the "new" rediscovered Classics was Aristotle's *Poetics*, whose first Latin translation was published by Lorenzo Valla in 1498, while the Aldine edition of the Greek text appeared in 1508. Another translation into Latin was made (in 1524 but published in 1536) by Alessandro De' Pazzi, while Francesco Robortello composed

a very influential commentary in Latin (1548), the first of many others which followed, both in Latin and Italian. Another important text was Donatus' commentary on Terence, which was rediscovered in 1433 by Giovanni Aurispa. Aristotle and Donatus could now be combined with Horace's *Ars Poetica*, which was known through the Middle Ages, to define a theory of drama "according to the ancients." Italian *literati* hence insisted on the distinction between tragedy and comedy in characters and situations (noble characters and pitiful actions in tragedy; ordinary people and laughable actions in comedy) as well as on the necessity of decorum and unity of action, time, and place—a principle that they traced back to Aristotle, even if such an emphasis on the unity of time and place did not appear in his text. The didactic function of both tragedy and comedy was particularly emphasized, following Horace and Donatus: both types of dramas taught spectators to avoid vices and pursue virtues, the former through pity and fear (as Aristotle taught), the latter through laughter, whose function, according to Donatus, was to censure vices.

Tragedy ignited many controversies, especially because two different models were now available: the newly discovered Greeks and the Roman Seneca. The main supporter of the Greek model was Giorgio Trissino, who composed a treatise heavily dependent on Aristotle's *Poetics* (*Quinta e sesta divisione della poetica*, published posthumously in 1562) and, more importantly, the tragedy *Sofonisba* (written in 1514–1515, published in 1524), which is considered the first neoclassical tragedy in Italy and Europe. *Sofonisba* is about a Roman myth, but is structured according to the Greek models: it is not organized into acts but has a *prologue* and *epeisodia* divided by *parodos*, *stasima*, and *exodos*; moreover, its chorus is always present onstage and engages with actors, as in Greek tragedy. Trissino's Greek model was followed by the first generation of playwrights, such as Giovanni Rucellai, Alessandro Pazzi de' Medici, and Lodovico Martelli.

In 1543 Giovan Battista Giraldi Cinthio, an intellectual at the court of Ercole II at Ferrara, author of tragedies and a collection of tales, wrote the first vernacular treatise on drama (*Discorso intorno al comporre delle comedie e delle tragedie*, published in 1554). Even if formally following Aristotle's outline in the *Poetics*, Giraldi established a new theory for both tragedy and comedy which became the standard for Italian dramatists and beyond. First and foremost, his models were Roman, not Greek: Seneca for tragedy and Terence for comedy (while he criticized Plautus for lacking decorum). For Giraldi, moreover, the Roman dramatic structure should be adopted, according to which a play was divided into five acts, with the chorus leaving the stage between acts. Giraldi further recommended for both comedies and tragedies that the prologue be detached from the rest of the drama, as in Roman comedy. Even if Giraldi accepted many Aristotelian rules, he sometimes departed from them; yet, when that happened, he still tried to show that his own ideas were in fact present in the *Poetics*. For example, drama for him taught moral behavior: comedy through showing models to imitate (i.e., temperate passions—the model being Terence), while tragedy showed what to avoid through "horror and compassion"— which was a very "contemporary" and Christian interpretation of Aristotelian

catharsis. The same awkward relationship to Aristotle is true for the discussion of the plot, in which Giraldi departed from the philosopher's dictates in at least two important areas. First, Giraldi wanted tragedies, like comedies, to have plots based on invented rather than known stories in order to create suspense for the audience; yet he justified this innovation by claiming that Aristotle too allowed for invented stories in tragedies (*Poet.* 1451b19–1451b26). Indeed, Giraldi himself wrote most of his tragedies using the plots of his own *novelle* rather than Greek or Roman myths. Second, Giraldi preferred tragedies with happy endings (*tragedie a lieto fine*) or "mixed" tragedies (*tragedie miste*), that is, tragicomedies. Even here, however, he justified his preference by referring to Aristotle's acceptance of tragedies with a double plot, where the good are rewarded and the evil punished (*Poet.* 1453a30–1453a39). In particular, Giraldi claimed that while tragedies with unhappy endings, like those by Seneca, were the best to read, the happy ending was the best model for staged performances. Giraldi is in fact an exception as a critic and playwright for his attention to performance. This attitude probably stemmed from his own practice, as he used to organize theatrical performances for the Estense court and even at his home, where in 1541 his *Orbecche* became the first "modern" tragedy ever performed in Italy. Giraldi's preferences for tragedies with happy endings, invented plots, and exotic settings, such as Susa, Damascus, London, and Alexandria, were all geared towards pleasing the audience. For the same reason, Giraldi preferred events to be seen onstage rather than reported by a messenger, unless they were particularly cruel deaths, which had to be kept offstage; although in this case he was probably following the model of the "horrific" Seneca, Giraldi nevertheless invoked both Aristotle and Horace to support his preference.

The "Aristotelian" debate over tragedy was rekindled by Sperone Speroni's *Canace*, read at the *Accademia degli Infiammati* in Padua in 1542 and published in 1546. The play—centering on the incestuous love of Canace and her brother Macareus—was harshly criticized by an anonymous treatise (*Giudizio d'una tragedia di Canace e Macareo*, 1550), most likely authored by Giraldi himself (Roaf 1982). The main critique concerned the choice of the story and its characters: Canace and Macareus were evil characters; their tragedy could not, then, arouse terror or pity (and hence "moral" *catharsis*). In his *Apologia* (1554), Speroni replied that Canace and Macareus were not evil but "median" characters and thus tragic; moreover, they were young and sinned for love, sent to them by Venus, and this was pitiful. Later on (*Lezioni in difesa della Canace*, 1558), Speroni also claimed that the real tragic character was in fact their father Eolus.

Italian theorists thus tried to balance the respect for the rules set by the ancients with the desire to please their audiences and write contemporary dramas; some of them, however, challenged the ancients more openly: Ludovico Castelvetro (1505–1571) claimed that the aim of poetry was to please the audience—not to be useful to them or instruct them in some way—while Antonfrancesco Grazzini (1503–1584), a Florentine playwright, in the prologue

Figure 7.1 Baldassarre Peruzzi (1481–1536): perspective for a theater scene. Source: Gabinetto Fotografico.

of his comedies, stated that Aristotle and Horace could not be used as authorities, as his contemporary society was different from ancient Greece and Rome and required new types of drama.

The Content of Renaissance Neoclassical Tragedy[2]

Therefore, even if some innovations were allowed, the theoretical debate, for the most part, promoted either Greek or Roman tragedy as the only viable model to follow. As a result, *all* tragedies written in Renaissance Italy were fundamentally neoclassical, because they formally complied with Classical rules. Their content was more heterogeneous, however. Although many tragedies were based on Greek myths, others used Roman myths or history (e.g., Aretino's *Orazia*, 1546, on the duel of the Horatii and Curiatii and Horatius' murder of his sister), on Jewish or Biblical history (e.g., Dolce's *Marianna*, 1565, based on Flavius Josephus), or on invented stories, often placed in faraway countries (e.g., Giraldi's *Orbecche*, 1541). Despite the different content, these tragedies often focused on blood and revenge

(e.g., *Orbecche*, *Canace*, *Marianna*) or on tragic love stories, such as the three Dido tragedies by Pazzi (1524), Giraldi (1541–1542), and Dolce (1547), or Luigi Groto's *Hadriana* (1578), based on a *novella* about two lovers in Verona—the same story used by Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. Aside from their neoclassical features, these tragedies also followed the Senecan model in often including supernatural elements, ghosts, dark and gory details (like Thyestean meals, or butchered limbs of close relatives or lovers being shown to a distraught heroine), and moralistic *sententiae* about human destiny.

Even if most Cinquecento drama is formally neoclassical, tragedies that used some kind of "Classical" content are especially interesting when discussing Italian Classical reception. We can distinguish three categories, in decreasing order of faithfulness to the ancient models:

1. translations into Italian of an original (Greek or Latin) tragedy;
2. adaptations of ancient (Greek or Latin) tragedies with a more or less high degree of creative freedom;
3. tragedies based on a story that is not Classical or was not used by Greek and Latin dramatists, but is recast following an ancient mythical archetype derived from a famous Greek tragedy.

In what follows, I will review some examples of these three categories.

Translations and adaptations of ancient tragedies

Since the first two categories are sometimes difficult to distinguish, they will be analyzed together. The importance of translations of Classical drama cannot be underestimated: translation was one of the primary media through which the knowledge of Greek and Roman plays was disseminated and thus contributed to the creation of more original neoclassical dramas. Furthermore, translation became an important cultural phenomenon in itself, such as the Italian translation of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* by Orsatto Giustiniani, commissioned for the inauguration of the Teatro Olimpico by Andrea Palladio in Vicenza in 1585.[3] Giustiniani's elegant translation is quite close to the original, and its symbolic and cultural value is especially significant: by 1585 many Italian neoclassical tragedies were available; yet, to inaugurate a theater based on the Vitruvian classical ideal, a translation of a Greek play was chosen, specifically Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, the tragedy that Aristotle promoted as the most perfect. Despite the rather rich production of Italian neoclassical plays, the unsurpassed model remained Greek.

Most of what are often referred to as "translations," however, are quite free renderings of the original, as the distinction between translation and rewriting was tenuous at best. Classical tragedies were often "adapted" for modern audiences by eliminating obscure mythological references, by translating ancient words and

concepts with modern ones (e.g., "castles," "knights," "courtesy," "honor"), and by superficially transposing religious pagan material to a Christian model, so that characters could invoke a just God who defended the oppressed and rewarded the just (Di Maria 2002: 58–78). In addition, scenes could be expanded to increase the pathetic element or the importance of the moment. For example, Giovanni Rucellai's *Oreste* (c. 1515–1520) is a (much longer) adaptation of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, which follows the original drama in its characters and scenes, but expands specific scenes in order to emphasize the sentimental side of the story as well as the theatricality of the play (Di Maria 1996). Similarly, Luigi Alamanni's *Antigone* (written before 1522 and published in 1533) is mostly a translation of Sophocles' *Antigone*, but introduces important changes in the fourth and fifth *stasimon*. While the Sophoclean fourth *stasimon* sings of the mythical stories of Danae, Lycurgus, and the Phineids as an illustration of the inevitability of fate and as examples of family conflict, in Alamanni, it becomes a warning against the vanity of human success. In a similar fashion the original fifth *stasimon*, an ode to Dionysus, is turned by Alamanni into an ode on the instability of Fortune (called "deceiving Goddess," *Dea fallace*). In both cases, then, Alamanni substituted odes full of obscure mythological references with ones dealing with themes dear to Renaissance sensibilities.

Lodovico Dolce is the best representative of this tenuous balance between translation and adaptation of classical texts. Dolce translated many classical texts (among which Seneca's tragedies in 1560) and also composed "original" tragedies. The latter, composed between 1543 and 1567, mostly consist in free translations/ adaptations from Euripides (*Hecuba*, *Giocasta*, *Ifigenia*, *Medea*) and Seneca (*Thieste* and *Troiane*), and in only two original plays, *Didone* (based on Virgil) and *Marianna* (based on Flavius Josephus). In the Euripidean and Senecan adaptations, the degree of faithfulness to the original varies: for example, while *Thieste* follows the Senecan original quite closely, *Troiane* is a much freer interpretation, where Dolce gives a greater role to Polyxena, a silent character in Seneca's play. In his rewritings, Dolce added characters and lines, cut or simplified passages considered unnecessary or containing obscure mythological references. An analysis of his *Giocasta* will illustrate Dolce's approach.

This play is also important for its reception in England, as it was translated by George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmersh in their *Jocasta*, performed at Gray's Inn in London in 1566, which was the first "regular" tragedy in English (Corti 1977; Pigman III 2000: 509–548). Performed and published in Venice in 1549, *Giocasta* is defined by the author as "my own new labor" (*nuovo parto mio*). Dolce used the Latin translation of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* by Rudolf Ambühl-Collinus (Basel 1541), since he most likely did not know Greek (Terpening 1997: 93; Neuschäfer 2004: 228–230). The play (2878 lines long against the 1766 lines of the original) is divided into five acts, according to Giraldi's theory. To accommodate this structure, Dolce combined the *prologue*, the teichoscopy scene between Antigone and the pedagogue, and the *parodos* as parts of the first act. Then he compressed the first and second episodes into the second act, cutting the

first *stasimon*. To follow Giraldi, Dolce also gave his tragedy a Senecan, moralistic atmosphere; in particular, a leitmotif running throughout the tragedy is that there is no fault when one does not know that a sin is being committed. In her opening dialogue with her servant, for instance, Jocasta justifies Oedipus' actions because "the man who, without knowing it, meets some evil which he cannot escape does not sin" (*Gio.*, Act 1, f. 7r). Oedipus himself claims to be a victim of a "cruel destiny" (*crudel destin*) and a "hostile star" (*stella nimica*, *Gio.* Act 5, f. 49r–49v). The theme of adverse fortune afflicting mortals frames the entire tragedy. The prologue (*Gio.*, f. 3r) invites the audience to pity others' misery in the name of common human nature: by realizing that the misfortune of others can afflict us as well, we can be more prepared for it; Jocasta too is a victim of a dire destiny.

In fact, the real protagonist of Dolce's tragedy, as the title suggests, is Jocasta, a *mater dolorosa* who experiences the tragic events with an emotional participation hardly present in the Greek model. Another innovation is the sharp contrast between Eteocles, unequivocally evil, and Polynices, innocent and devoted to his country (Yarrow 1954: 138–139), while in Euripides the brothers are similar and both capable of great hate. To underscore this opposition, Dolce removed any allusion to Polynices' desire to be king: he is simply the victim of Eteocles, who becomes the embodiment of a tyrant.

Dolce introduced many of his changes in Acts 3 and 4 to emphasize the sacrifice of Menoeceus. First, he added a detailed sacrifice scene, following the model of Seneca's *Oedipus* (Montorfani 2006: 733–737), from where Dolce also took the character of Manto, Tiresias' daughter, who describes the ritual to blind Tiresias. Dolce then developed at length the contrast in the original (*Phoen.* 917–920) between Tiresias and Creon in the opposition between love for one's family (prominent in Creon's speech) and love for one's country (the main duty according to Tiresias) into a much longer dialogue (*Gio.*, Act 3, f. 30r):

CREON: Oh! How many evils have you enclosed in a single moment!
TIRESIAS: For you they are evils, for your country blessings.
CREON: Let my country perish. I will not consent to this.
TIRESIAS: One should love one's country above everything.
CREON: Cruel is one who does not love his children.
TIRESIAS: It is good that one only weeps for the common good.
CREON: I do not want to lose what is mine to save what belongs to others.
TIRESIAS: A good citizen does not care about his own self-interest.

The contrast between familial duties and state laws is at the core of Sophocles' *Antigone*, a play which had been revived not long before by Alamanni, and was also preeminent in Renaissance political philosophy. By addressing this theme (taken up again in the following dialogue between Menoeceus and Creon, at *Gio.*, Act 3, f. 31r–33r, and again expanded from the original, *Phoen.* 970–86), Dolce was probably making his *Giocasta* more "contemporary."

Menoeceus is in fact Dolce's hero. While, in Euripides, Menoeceus' death is briefly announced to Jocasta (*Phoen.* 1090–1092), the event is described in great detail by a messenger to his father Creon in Dolce's more tragic rewriting. The scene of Menoeceus stabbing himself in front of Eteocles' army is taken from Statius (*Theb.* 10.756–782), but his proud declaration of patriotic self-sacrifice is Dolce's invention (*Gio.*, Act 4, f. 39v–40r). Menoeceus' death was perhaps also used by Dolce to justify the change in Creon's attitude from being a wise companion of Eteocles to a king who cares little about Oedipus' destiny and bans him from Thebes. This harsh change in Creon's attitude is present in Euripides, but perhaps Dolce found it inconsistent and thus used Menoeceus' death to make it more plausible.

The last act describes the fatal duel between Eteocles and Polynices, Jocasta's suicide, and Antigone's lament for her brother's death, closing with the arrival of Oedipus on stage. Oedipus blames the gods and his enemy star, addressing Creon, who is sending him into exile, as follows (*Gio.*, Act 5, f. 49v):

> But not for this
> Will I beseech you and bow
> Before your feet. Fortune may take away from me
> Whatever she can; but she
> Will not be able to take from me my courageous soul,
> Which I have had for all my life, so that I may yield
> To any cowardly act for fear.
> Do whatever you can: I will always be Oedipus.

This proud declaration translates the original (*Phoen.* 1622–1624): "Yet I will never embrace your knees and seem a coward, for I would not betray my former nobility, not even when I am in such an afflicted state." Still, Dolce's Oedipus becomes the blueprint of the self-confident Renaissance man, who proudly declares: "I will always be Oedipus." The final chorus stresses again the changing fortunes in human lives that the example of Oedipus illustrates, thus framing the tragedy with the Renaissance theme of "dire fortune."

A higher degree of freedom is shown by tragedies based on myths already used by Greek tragedians, but which introduce specific innovations and engage with and almost rival the ancient models, according to the classical doctrine of *imitatio/aemulatio*. One example is Giovanni Andrea Dell'Anguillara's *Edippo* (1556), first performed in Padua in 1560 in the house of Alvise Cornaro. The tragedy describes the story of Oedipus and the fight between Eteocles and Polynices. Acts 1–3 closely follow Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* in describing the discovery of the truth by Oedipus, often translating the model verbatim (insisting perhaps on the pathetic side of the story); Acts 4–5, on the other hand, recount the fight between Eteocles and Polynices and Jocasta's death, loosely following Euripides' *Phoenician Women*. Nevertheless, Anguillara shows a high degree of freedom and invention, which makes his *Edippo* a new and original tragedy. First, he adds three

new characters: Tiresias' daughter Manto (from Seneca's *Oedipus*), a "court gen-
tleman," who will tell of the blinding of Oedipus, and the "Princess of Andro," a
lady of the court, who will announce the death of Jocasta. The most important
Renaissance imprint concerns the portrayal of Oedipus and his sons. Oedipus is
the good king and father. In Act 1 ii (ff. 5r–7v), in a long speech to his sons, he
divides his kingdoms equally: Thebes will go to Eteocles and Corinth to Polynices.
He also arranges suitable royal marriages for his two daughters and gives some
good advice to his sons: they should fear God, not offend people's honor, and must
be "courteous and liberal." These wise recommendations echo Ottaviano Fregoso's
discourse in Book 4 (esp. v–xliii) of Baldassar Castiglione's *Courtier* (1528) in which
he claims that the courtier should teach the prince liberality, justice, and virtue, as
they ultimately profit his power. Eteocles and Polynices learn this lesson well, as
they shut their father in the castle when the truth is revealed and Oedipus blinds
himself, in order "to avoid the shame" which such a tragic spectacle would bring
to their family, depriving them of their honor (Act 4 i, ff. 45v–46r). The importance
of personal honor, external reputation, and appearance is a leitmotiv in Renaissance
ethical and political thought, beginning with Machiavelli's *Prince* (1513) and
Castiglione's *Courtier*.

Along the same lines, the struggle between Eteocles and Polynices is not a
simple opposition between two brothers. They have supporters and enemies
among the people of Thebes, its army, and its Senate, in line with Renaissance
power struggles during the *Signorie*. The chorus of men recognizes that Eteocles is
the elder and therefore has the right to be king. On the other hand, they see
Polynices as the quintessential Renaissance prince: "friendly, liberal, courteous, and
honest" (Act 4 ii, f. 48v), so that in a short time he has made many friends. The two
characters are thus different, but Anguillara does not express a clear preference for
either one. Finally, Eteocles and Polynices arrange their armies (which consist of
both infantry and a navy!) as any Renaissance lord would do. However, right before
the decisive battle, Anguillara changes the myth: Eteocles and Polynices sign an
agreement, according to which they will divide the reign and alternate the king-
ship between themselves every year (Act 5 i, ff. 52v–55r). Again, the contemporary
world intrudes, as the agreement is settled through a formal contract between the
two, written down by Creon and read aloud by Eteocles. The contract describes in
detail the benefits enjoyed by the temporary king: the brothers will divide equally
the kingdom's income, but the king will have additional sources of personal wealth
and honors, while their sisters' dowries and the family's jewelry will be adminis-
tered by Jocasta. The struggle is thus settled, without the death of the two brothers
or of Menoeceus. Still, the tragedy is not over, as the Princess of Andro announces
Jocasta's suicide out of despair for Oedipus' imprisonment, her sons' fraternal
strife, and her two daughters' loss of good marriages—despite Ismene's attempts
to convince the queen that she must live on for her younger daughter, Antigone
(Act 5, iii, ff. 56r–62v). Anguillara thus made fundamental changes to his models:
whereas Oedipus and Jocasta adhere to their classical antecedents, Eteocles and

Polynices have become two contemporary princes who fight for power and need to learn how to behave. The attention to societal manners and royal duties becomes the backbone of this new tragedy, even within the frame of the Oedipus myth.

Original tragedies modeled on ancient mythical archetypes

Despite the admiration for the Classical models, Cinquecento tragedy most often preferred either stories taking place in the Greek or Roman world, but not used in Greek or Senecan tragedies, or stories (often invented) belonging to another place and/or time. In the first category, the most important tragedy is Trissino's *Sofonisba*. Though written in 1514–1515 and published in 1524, the play was first staged only after Trissino's death in 1562 in Vicenza with scenery by Andrea Palladio (who had been a protégé of Trissino). Taken from Livy (30.12–15) and Appian (8.10–28), the story narrates the love between Sophonisba, the wife of Syphax, and Masinissa. Syphax was at war with the Romans and their ally, the Numidian Masinissa. After Syphax was taken prisoner, Sophonisba faced slavery and thus entrusted herself to Masinissa, who promised to take care of her against the Romans' will and married her in secret. When the Romans discovered the truth, they urged Masinissa to resist his passion and hand over Sophonisba to them as a prisoner. Unable to protect her freedom, Masinissa gave Sophonisba poison to commit suicide before becoming a slave. In one important detail Trissino followed Appian (8.10) rather than Livy: his Sophonisba was first promised to Masinissa and then given in marriage to Syphax for political reasons—a change that made the love story between Sophonisba and Masinissa more "natural" and less adulterous, as Syphax was not dead yet. Even if the story is Roman, Trissino's tragedy is unquestionably Greek—not only for the structure (with *epeisodia* interspersed by choral odes and with a chorus always present onstage), but because its tragic models are Greek. Trissino echoes many Greek tragedies (Cremante 1988: 9–10); for example, Sophonisba's death is described using Euripides' *Alcestis* as a model, often with verbatim quotations (cf. *Sof.* 1559–1660 and *Alc.* 158–195; *Sof.* 1835–1915 and *Alc.* 348–405, with additions also from *Alc.* 252–269); more importantly, Sophonisba herself is modeled on Sophoclean heroes, such as Ajax or Antigone, who choose death rather than renouncing their values.

Perhaps the most interesting case of a tragedy combining a Roman story with a Greek tragic model is Lodovico Martelli's *Tullia* (1533). Like Trissino, Martelli used a story from Livy and molded it into a Greek tragedy. According to Livy 1.46–48, Tullia was the daughter of Servius Tullius, the sixth king of Rome. Servius succeeded Tarquinius Priscus (assassinated by Ancus Marcius' sons) and wed Tullia and her sister to Tarquinius' sons, Arruns and Lucius, respectively. Though married to Arruns, Tullia became the lover of Lucius. The two killed Tullia's sister and Arruns before then marrying. Finally, at the instigation of Tullia (called *ferox* by Livy), Lucius Tarquinius took power; Servius was then killed, and Tullia drove her

chariot over her father. Interestingly enough, Martelli recast Livy's story using as his model Sophocles' *Electra* (published by Manuzio in 1502 and translated into Latin by Pazzi in 1527), with the following correspondences: Servius = Aegisthus; Servius' wife (the queen) = Clytemnestra; Lucius = Orestes; Tullia = Electra. The original model is followed in its plot, structure, and characters. In Act 2, for example, Martelli recasts the *parodos* and first *epeisodion* of Sophocles' *Electra*. Tullia / Electra has two exchanges here: the first is with the chorus, the second with her Nurse, who plays the role of Chrysothemis in Sophocles and is bringing offerings from the queen / Clytemnestra to the tomb of Tarquinius / Agamemnon. In these scenes, Tullia / Electra laments her destiny and reveals her hatred of her parents, echoing Electra's feelings against Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. To keep the story faithful to the model, however, Martelli also had to change it: contrary to Livy's narrative (according to which Tullia hired assassins to murder Servius) and in line with the Greek model, Lucius / Orestes returns from exile and kills the usurper Servius / Aegisthus of his father Tarquinius / Agamemnon. Clearly the parallels between the two stories are forced, because the familial relationships are not the same, as Tullia is not the sister of Lucius but his wife. Moreover, Tullia is too violent and ambitious to be a believable new Electra. Yet Tullia is an intriguing tragic heroine: not the young, innocent victim of higher powers (like most Renaissance tragic heroines), she is instead a middle-aged, "Machiavellian" princess—originally mistreated by her parents, but lusting after power no less than they. Martelli also departs from Sophocles' *Electra* by having Servius / Aegisthus killed before the queen / Clytemnestra and by ending the play through Romulus as a *deus ex machina*, who orders the Roman people to accept Lucius as new king. Martelli's tragedy thus re-interprets the Roman mythical past as a Greek drama, and reads it through the contemporary lenses of Machiavellian power struggles, invoking the need for people to accept their rulers to avoid unending bloodshed.

In Renaissance Italy, therefore, tragedy did not need to be based on Greek myth to be structured according to the Greeks, even if the degree of borrowing varies. For example, Giovanni Rucellai based his *Rosmunda* (1516; published in 1525) on a Langobardic legend by Paulus Diaconus, in which Alboin kills king Cunimond, marries his daughter Rosamond and forces her to drink from her father's skull before she eventually has a friend murder Alboin. Rucellai's model is Sophocles' *Antigone* (Cremante 1988: 171–172), as is clear from the very opening where Rosamond wants to bury her father against Alboin's will, preferring death to neglecting her father's body, while her Nurse (like Ismene) tries to dissuade her (*Ros.* 9–61 and *Ant.* 1–77). More importantly, when the king discovers that she has indeed buried her father, the dialogue between Rosamond and Alboin follows the dialogue between Antigone and Creon almost verbatim (*Ros.* 402–448 ≈ *Ant.* 441–443, 446–485), with Rosamond concluding: "I wanted to satisfy those who were dear to me and who did good to me, as they have passed away, and with whom I must live forever, rather than you, from whom I received nothing else but evil" (*Ros.* 449–453),

which echoes the famous words of Antigone to Ismene (*Ant.* 72–76). The model of *Antigone* is followed until this point; rather than accepting her death sentence, though, Rosamond then gets revenge, like Electra, as her former fiancé Amalchid arrives and kills Alboin. A choral ode inviting kings to rule with piety and avoid being cruel to their subjects closes the tragedy with a moralistic tone.

The influence of Classical tragedy and tragic motifs is pervasive in Italy, even although sometimes (especially in later, counter-reformist tragedies) it serves as more of a framework for addressing themes which do not belong to the specific tragedy that is being used as a model. One example is Torquato Tasso's *Torrismondo* (1587), which tells of the love between Torrismondo, king of the Goths, and Alvida, princess of Norway, even if he has promised her to his best friend Germondo, king of Sweden. Alvida is actually Torrismondo's sister, and this truth is revealed in Act 4, which follows very closely, sometimes verbatim, the scenes among Laius' slave, the Corinthian messenger, and Oedipus in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*: as an infant Alvida was entrusted to the servant and sent to Dacia because her father was afraid of certain prophecies; however, during the trip she was captured by Norwegian pirates and eventually given in adoption to the king of Norway. Yet, although the Oedipus-motif is certainly central to this quite complicated plot (even if the incest occurs between siblings, as in Speroni's *Canace*), the main tragic theme is the choice between friendship and love, which makes Torrismondo with his sense of guilt into a truly modern tragic hero.

Ancient Tragic Themes in the Renaissance World

For Renaissance theorists and playwrights, tragedy had a didactic function, as Horace advised. In particular, by staging the fall of tyrants, tragedy could teach rulers how to govern with justice and avoid the dangers of tyranny. Such an idea, already present in Seneca, flourished in the Renaissance with its interest in the art of government and courtly behavior. Moreover, though derived from Seneca, the "tragic tyrant" was a daily reality for a country divided into many *signorie* where the fight for power was unrelenting. In Cinquecento tragedies, tyrants are often ruthless (e.g., Alboin in Rucellai's *Rosmunda*, Sulmone in Giraldi's *Orbecche*) and the many dialogues between the tyrant and his counselor, who often tries to convince the former to limit the use of force and forgo vendettas, might have recalled common situations in Italian courts. Another recurring theme of Italian tragedy linked to the discussion of kingship and power was the instability of human fortune and man's inability to control his destiny. This theme is also present in Greek tragedy, but Renaissance playwrights expanded it, as their audiences were particularly sensitive to it. The chorus' comments on Oedipus' and Jocasta's fates in the tragedies of Dolce and Anguillara as well as the choral odes in Alamanni's *Antigone* show the pervasiveness of this leitmotiv. The meditation on the instability of human fortune can be seen as the tragic interpretation of Machiavellian ideas

on the importance of Fortune and the necessity to exploit it, as expressed in the *Prince*. Renaissance tragedies thus depict Senecan tyrants as Machiavellian princes and rulers—torn like their tragic predecessors between their lust for power and the twists of all-powerful Fortune.

In these tragedies, women are often the polar opposite of tyrants and usually the primary heroines, as suggested by the many titles with a female name. The popularity of honest and virtuous women as tragic protagonists undoubtedly reflects the courtly atmosphere in which neoclassical tragedy developed. Women played a major role in Italian courts and were often urbane intellectuals, keenly interested in theater. Tragedies celebrating the virtues of women were thus an obvious homage to the patronesses of such an art. In addition, many women were active artists: poets such as Vittoria Colonna (1490–1547) and Gaspara Stampa (1523–1554) or painters such as Sofonisba Anguissola (c. 1532–1625) and Artemisia Gentileschi (c. 1593–1653) are the best known but were not the only ones. Women could also be skilled politicians: Isabella d'Este (1474–1539), the daughter of Duke Ercole I of Ferrara, who also had a passion for Classical drama (especially comedy), proved herself an able diplomat and ruler as regent of Mantua when her husband Francesco Gonzaga was away from the city. The elite watching those tragedies was thus used to the presence of strong and intellectually gifted women. On the other hand, Italian playwrights were also carrying on a tradition of poetic celebration of women inaugurated by the poets of the *Stilnovo* and then immortalized by Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. Yet darker heroines, who commit terrible crimes, are also the protagonists of Italian tragedies, such as Tullia and Medea. Whether as victims or active performers of evil, female heroines are at the core of Renaissance Italian tragedy, and this reflects both a literary tradition stemming from the Middle Ages as well as the courtly reality where these tragedies were read or performed.

Tyrants, tragic heroines, and the instability of human destiny thus become central elements of Cinquecento tragedy. It has even been suggested that these playwrights were turning Classical tragedy into an arena to discuss contemporary issues and to influence their audience's opinions of their own patriarchal society, their misogynist attitudes, or their rulers' rights and duties towards their subjects (Di Maria 2002: 79–125); however, censorship and the dependence of the playwrights themselves on the good will and fortunes of kings and local rulers make it unlikely that such criticism could have been so open. On the other hand, women, power, and fortune are also important ingredients of Greek and Roman tragedy. The figure of the tyrant appears already in Aeschylus and becomes paramount in Sophocles and Euripides; at Rome, Seneca focuses on it, and many Renaissance tragic tyrants are indeed very similar to *Octavia*'s Nero or *Thyestes*' Atreus. The attention to women and their feelings is a Euripidean hallmark, but powerful female characters are already present in Aeschylus and Sophocles. Finally, the instability of fortune and the frailty of human lives are a leitmotiv of Greek tragedy and Greek literature in general. Therefore, rather than being an innovation by Renaissance playwrights, these themes seem to be the reason why Classical

tragedy, or at least *some* Classical tragedies, appealed to Cinquecento writers so strongly. Classical drama was fascinating not only because it was "ancient" in an era enthusiastic about the rediscovery of the Classics; more than that, Greek and Roman tragedy addressed many of the same themes that Renaissance intellectuals were debating: power, destiny, and gender boundaries. It is not a coincidence that the most translated and popular tragedies are those dealing with the Theban cycle or the house of Atreus, two myths that focus on the role of fortune in human lives, the nature of kingship, and gender issues between strong women (Clytemnestra, Antigone) and men in power (Agamemnon, Creon). Similarly, incest is a favorite tragic theme: the myth of Canace and Macareus is not only present in Speroni's *Canace* but also in the previous *Canace* by Giovanni Falugi (before 1535), and incestuous siblings are the protagonists of Tasso's *Torrismondo* as well as other minor tragedies, such as Nicola degli Angeli's *Arsinoe* (1594). No doubt, incest is taboo in any society and is at the core of many myths all over the world, but one may speculate whether this focus on incest was due to the Aristotelian preference for Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. In this regard, tragedies which were not popular among Renaissance playwrights provide some clue about the tastes of that period: for instance, the *Bacchae*, with its analysis of human irrationality and its cruel and unmerciful god, was not imitated, probably because it challenged the Renaissance ideal of Greek rationality or because the depiction of a cruel god (albeit a pagan one) was considered improper.

The discussion of power and human destiny, gender boundaries, and the weakness of human nature, prey to passions and desires often in conflict with hidden truths (hence the incest), are thus very common themes in Greek and Roman tragedy; they might even be considered the tragic themes *par excellence*, used over the centuries in Western drama. However, these themes were also particularly attuned to Cinquecento reality, so that the Italian intelligentsia found ancient tragedy even more interesting precisely because it debated the very same problems they were discussing.

The Content of Neoclassical Comedy

While neoclassical tragedy, though following Seneca, is strongly dependent on Greek models, Roman comedy is the sole model for neoclassical comedy. The reason is that the political and often gross humor of Attic comedy was much more difficult to adapt to Renaissance audiences than the family-based humor of Roman comedy. Hence, even if Aristophanes was known and appreciated, Renaissance *literati* looked to Plautus and Terence for their *imitatio*. Indeed, Roman comedy enjoyed many performances in courts and academies in Rome, Florence, and especially at the court of Duke Ercole I of Ferrara, where regular productions of Roman comedies were organized between 1486 (when *Menaechmi* was performed) and 1503. Student performances were also popular, especially in university towns.

The reason for the popularity of comedic performances compared to the tragic ones was partly due to the fact that comedy, with its common characters and scenes from daily life, was much cheaper to stage than lofty tragedies with their grand stage apparatus that only rich princes could afford.

Commedia Erudita: from Translations and Adaptations to Original Plays

In Cinquecento Italy, Classical comedy, like tragedy, was both translated and adapted. While translations could be more or less free, scholars speak of *commedia erudita* for adaptations and original comedies based on classical models. Written in Italian, these comedies aimed at recasting Plautus' or Terence's humor in the contemporary world for their characters and setting. The plot could follow either a specific Roman model or (more often) a new story, while still using the comic patterns inaugurated by ancient comedy. Unlike tragedy, then, Italian neoclassical comedy was essentially a new product, even if the comic situations and stock characters were inherited from the Classical tradition. This is probably due to the nature of these two types of drama as they developed in Greece. Tragedy dealt with known myths, and the interest lay in how the specific author interpreted or slightly changed the known story, so that one myth could inspire endless tragedies. Comedy instead was generally based on invented stories, staged common people as characters, and had a happy ending. Such "rules" did not leave much space for future reworking, especially with a successful comedy: changing the plot or the characters might have spoiled the original comic impact. Thus, when Classical comedy was revived in Italy, two paths opened: either simply translating, more or less freely, the ancients, or composing entirely new comedies, inspired by Plautus or Terence for their comic situations, characters, or solutions.

Translations into Italian were made for court performances (most of them are now lost) or by intellectuals who also wrote original plays, such as Machiavelli, who prepared a close translation of Terence's *Andria*. However, in his late *Clizia* (performed in 1525 but published only in 1537), Machiavelli composed a free adaptation of Plautus: he mostly followed the plot of Plautus' *Casina*, but renamed his characters, set the story in contemporary Florence, and increased the role of the *matrona callida* Sofronia as compared to her Plautine predecessor, Cleostrata. Similarly, Dolce's *Il Marito* (*The Husband*, 1545) is a remake of Plautus' *Amphitruo*, but the reworking is even deeper. Not only is the play set in contemporary Padua, but the plot is significantly altered. Instead of two gods (Jupiter and Mercury) tricking and playing the double against two humans (Amphitruo and Sosia), Dolce had two human couples. Virginia's husband, the general Mutio, and his servant Nespilo are tricked by the young lover Fabritio and his servant Roscio. Substituting two divine figures with human ones turns the play from the original tragicomedy, where two gods take human shape identical to Amphitruo and Sosia, to a rather

odd comedy of errors, where there are two couples of *simillimi* (who, however, are not twins!) and where the victims Mutio and Nespilo think that they have been tricked by the Devil and Lucifer. Such a very unlikely plot is solved by a cunning friar, Fra Girolamo, who convinces Mutio that his wife Virginia is in fact expecting a baby from Mutio himself, because a goblin "stole" his body at night when he was sleeping while away on a military campaign (*Il Marito*, Act 5, ii, ff. 21v–23r). The cunning and corrupt friar is indeed an innovation of Dolce and is typical of Italian Renaissance comedies (the most famous example being Fra Timoteo in Machiavelli's *Mandragola*).

Adaptations of Roman comedies, then, were common in *commedia erudita*, but most plays used invented stories in order to adapt a genre considered a mirror of life to people and situations of contemporary society. Among the first comedies in Italy were those by Ludovico Ariosto, performed at the Este court in Ferrara. Although his *Cassaria* (*The Play of the Strongbox*, 1508) was set in Greece and was heavily dependent on Latin models (especially Plautus' *Cistellaria*), Ariosto's *Suppositi* (*The Pretenders*, 1509) was set in Ferrara and had "modern" characters: Erostrato, a university student, switches roles with his servant Dulippo to be hired as servant in the house of his beloved Polinesta. The atmosphere is closer to Boccaccio's *Decameron*, which was also a source of inspiration for one of the best comedies of the period, Bibbiena's *Calandria* (*The Comedy of Calandro*, 1513), a comedy on identical twins in which the old stupid cuckolded husband is called Calandro, a name recalling Calandrino, the gullible victim of the tricks of Bruno and Buffalmacco in Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Many comedies were composed, with different plots and characters, set in contemporary Italy, but following Roman comedy in outline, stock scenes, and comic devices. Most often the plot involved a couple (or more) of lovers who face obstacles in their love by a blocking character, a father or another suitor, such as a braggart soldier. The latter, a stock character of Latin comedy, became very popular in *commedia erudita* because soldiers, often Spaniards, were a daily, and unwelcome, reality in Renaissance Italy, which made them an easy target of comic humor. The two lovers overcome their difficulties with the support of a servant who helps them by tricking the blocking character. Even if this is the typical outline of a Plautine comedy, *commedia erudita* often failed to recapture the vitality and energy of its model. In particular, the "hero" of Roman comedy, the *servus callidus,* became, with few exceptions, a rather dull servant, who wished to be cunning and witty, but who hardly succeeded (Schironi 2014).

In a world dominated by Roman comedy, it is worth mentioning Machiavelli's lost *Maschere* (*Masks*, 1504). It was a one-act comedy based on *Clouds* and other Aristophanic comedies, but set in contemporary Florence and containing a harsh satire of important Florentine families, perhaps even of Lorenzo de' Medici. The risk involved in such a satire compelled Machiavelli not to finish the play and led his grandson, Giuliano de' Ricci (our source for this lost comedy), to destroy the manuscript.

Ancient comic themes in the renaissance world

Taking its inspiration from Roman comedy, *commedia erudita* often centered on the usual comic polarities, such as young vs. old, or men vs. women. Another favorite theme derived from Roman comedy was the restoration or formation of a regular household through a wedding. Yet, in the more free-thinking atmosphere of Renaissance Italy, comedy accepted (and celebrated) themes once forbidden in Roman comedy, such as the amorous victory of adulterous lovers over the cuckolded husband. Similarly, *commedia erudita* often contained harsh satires of corrupt priests, a theme typical of Italian comedy through the centuries and due to the overwhelming influence of Catholic hierarchies in Italian political and daily life. The celebration of intelligence, an important ingredient of comedy from its origin, was particularly congenial to the Renaissance praise of the human mind; even so, the new erudite comedies were often too stiff to be as intelligent as Plautus' comedies. In fact, the best rewriting of an ancient comedy is one that dared to depart from its models: Machiavelli's *Mandragola* (*Mandrake*, 1518). The play is Classical in structure and outlook, but contemporary in its themes and comic clichés satirized—in the lampooning of corrupt priests, for example, or of false intellectuals. Dry Florentine humor permeates it, transmitting the spirit of comedy to contemporary audiences. Not surprisingly, its author was not an armchair intellectual who only read the classical models, but a philosopher and active politician immersed in the contemporary reality. As the best Renaissance tragedies mirror Machiavelli's *Prince*, so too do the best Renaissance comedies: in the *Prince* (Chapter 18) Machiavelli claims that to beat Fortune one needs to be like a fox, and indeed "fox-like" intelligence is the real protagonist of his *Mandragola*.

   Like tragedy, Italian *commedia erudita* was also translated abroad and thus created a model for non-Italian dramatists. For example, together with Dolce's *Giocasta*, Gascoigne adapted Ariosto's *Suppositi* into English (Supposes, 1566), which was the first neoclassical comedy to be translated in England and was in fact the first comedy written in English.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the sixteenth century. In the following century, with the beginning of the baroque era, two new types of spectacle took the Italian center stage: opera, the "new" Greek tragedy (see Chapter 24), and *commedia dell'arte*, an improvised form of comedy, partly derived from *commedia erudita*, but which lost its Classical imprints in order to gain in popular humor and performativity. Both opera and *commedia dell'arte* were innovative and made Italian theater famous in Europe. For the reception of Classical drama, however, Cinquecento theater cannot be underestimated.

With the exception of Machiavelli's *Mandragola*, whose comic force is certainly similar, if not superior, to the best comedies of Shakespeare and Molière, Renaissance Italy did not produce theatrical masterpieces when reviving Classical drama. Still, its contribution to the development of neoclassical tragedy and comedy is fundamental for at least three reasons. First, Classical authors, especially Greek, were "rediscovered" in Italy, as humanists actively searched for and brought to light original texts mostly forgotten in the previous centuries, while they also started to master ancient Greek. In this way, Classical models circulated again: they were enjoyed, translated, discussed, and made available through new editions, imprinting the rest of European reception. Second, the "rediscovery" of the Classics and, in particular, of Aristotle's *Poetics* gave rise to a theoretical debate on how to write drama and how to engage with the past. Such discussions not only shaped Italian drama but were also exported, influencing European discussions about theater. Third, Italian tragedies and comedies molded on the Classics became a model for European dramatists when they were exported and translated. Classical drama was often discovered through Italian rewritings, and Italian taste and rules became the model to be used and improved upon outside Italy. Thus, even without producing masterpieces, Italian Renaissance dramas became the channel through which the Classics were rediscovered, enjoyed, and given new life in modern European drama.

Notes

1   The latter in fact revived Greek Tragedy in the later Renaissance, see Chapter 24 in this volume.
2   The quotations from and references to the plays discussed are from the following editions: *Le tragedie di M. Lodovico Dolce: cioe, Giocasta, Medea, Didone, Ifigenia, Thieste, Hecuba, di nuovo ricorrette et ristampata,* in Venetia, appresso Domenico Farri, 1566; *Edippo: tragedia di Gio. Andrea dell'Anguillara,* in Padoua, per Lorenzo Pasquatto, 1565; Trissino, *Sophonisba* in Cremante (1988: 3–162); Rucellai, *Rosmunda,* in Cremante (1988: 165–257); *Il Marito. Comedia di M. Lodovico Dolce, di nuovo corretta e ristampata*, Vinegia appresso Gabriel Giolito de' Ferrari, 1560. All translations in this chapter are my own.
3   For a discussion of this production, see Chapter 11 in this volume.

Guide to Further Reading

On Humanism and the rediscovery of the Classics, see Reynolds-Wilson (1991: 122–163); Wilson (1992). On the knowledge of Greek and Greek authors in the Middle Ages and Humanism, see Pertusi (1960, 1963); Weiss (1977); Berschin (1988). On Humanist Latin comedy, see Herrick (1960: 15–25); Stäuble (1968). On Italian Renaissance tragedy, see Herrick (1965); Musumarra (1972); Ariani (1974); Mastrocola (1996); Di Maria (2002); on erudite comedy, see Herrick (1960); Andrews

(1993); Padoan (1996); on tragicomedy, see Herrick (1955). On dramatic theory in Italian Renaissance, see Weinberg (1961); Roaf (1982); Javitch (2011). On tragic heroines in Italian Renaissance tragedy, see Spera (2007). On the comic performances at the Estense Court, see Stefani (1979) and Cruciani, Falletti, and Ruffini (1994). On Giustiniani's *Oedipus*, see Schrade (1960). On Dolce as dramatist, see Terpening (1997: 59–127); Neuschäfer (2001, 2004). On Dolce's *Giocasta*, see Neuschäfer (2004: 252–261); Montorfani (2006). On Anguillara's *Edippo*, see Fabrizio (1995). On Martelli's *Tullia*, see Spera (1998: v–xxx).

References

Andrews, Richard. 1993. *Scripts and Scenarios: The Performance of Comedy in Renaissance Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ariani, Marco. 1974. *Tra classicismo e manierismo. Il teatro tragico del Cinquecento*. Firenze: Olschki.

Berschin, Walter. 1988. *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*. Translated by Jerold C. Frakes. Revised and expanded edition. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

Corti, Claudia. 1977. "A proposito di *Jocasta*: indagine su una rielaborazione elisabettiana." *Rivista di letterature moderne comparate* 30: 85–104.

Cremante, Renzo. 1988. *Teatro del Cinquecento. Tomo I. La tragedia*. Milan: Ricciardi.

Cruciani, Fabrizio, Falletti, Clelia, and Ruffini, Franco. 1994. "La sperimentazione a Ferrara negli anni di Ercole I e di Ludovico Ariosto." *Teatro e storia* 16: 131–217.

Di Maria, Salvatore. 1996. "Towards an Italian Theater: Rucellai's *Oreste*." *MLN* 111: 123–148.

Di Maria, Salvatore. 2002. *The Italian Tragedy in the Renaissance. Cultural Realities and Theatrical Innovations*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press/London: Associated University Presses.

Fabrizio, Richard. 1995. "The Two Oedipuses: Sophocles, Anguillara, and the Renaissance Treatment of Myth." *MLN* 110: 178–191.

Herrick, Marvin T. 1955. *Tragicomedy. Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Herrick, Marvin T. 1960. *Italian Comedy in the Renaissance*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Herrick, Marvin T. 1965. *Italian Tragedy in the Renaissance*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Javitch, Daniel. 2011. "Introduction to Giovan Battista Giraldi Cinthio's *Discourse or Letter on the Composition of Comedies and Tragedies.*" *Renaissance Drama,* New Series 39: 197–206.

Mastrocola, Paola. 1996. *Nimica Fortuna. Edipo e Antigone nella tragedia italiana del Cinquecento*. Torino: Tirrenia Stampatori.

Montorfani, Pietro. 2006. "*Giocasta*, un volgarizzamento euripideo di Lodovico Dolce (1549)." *Aevum* 80: 717–739.

Musumarra, Carmelo. 1972. *La poesia tragica italiana nel Rinascimento*. Firenze: Olschki.

Neuschäfer, Anne. 2001. *"Ma vorrei sol dipingervi il mio core, / e haver un stile che vi fosse grato": le commedie e le tragedie di Lodovico Dolce in lingua volgare*. Venice: Centro tedesco di studi veneziani.

Neuschäfer, Anne. 2004. *Lodovico Dolce als dramatischer Autor im Venedig des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.

Padoan, Giorgio. 1996. *L'avventura della commedia rinascimentale*. Padua: Piccin Nuova Libraria-Vallardi.

Pertusi, Agostino. 1960. "La scoperta di Euripide nel primo Umanesimo." *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 3: 101–152.

Pertusi, Agostino. 1963. "Il ritorno alle fonti del teatro greco classico: Euripide nell'Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento." *Byzantion* 33: 391–426.

Pigman III, George W. 2000. *George Gascoigne, A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reynolds, Leighton D. and Wilson, Nigel G. 1991. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Roaf, Christina. 1982. *Sperone Speroni, Canace e scritti in sua difesa. Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio, Scritti contro la Canace, Giudizio ed Epistola Latina*. Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua.

Schironi, Francesca. 2014. "The Trickster Onstage: The Cunning Slave from Plautus to *Commedia dell'Arte*." In *Ancient Comedy and Reception. Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson*, edited by S. Douglas Olson, 447–478. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Schrade, Leo. 1960. *La représentation d'Edipo Tiranno au Teatro Olimpico (Vicence 1585). Étude suivie d'une édition critique de la tragédie de Sophocle par Orsatto Giustiniani et de la musique des chœurs par Andrea Gabrieli*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Spera, Francesco. 1998. *Ludovico Martelli, Tullia*. Torino: Edizioni Res.

Spera, Francesco. 2007. "Modelli femminili nel tragico cinquecentesco." In *Matteo Bandello: studi di letteratura rinascimentale 2. La novella come tragedia storica*, edited by Delmo Maestri and Ludmilla Pradi, 51–69. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Stäuble, Antonio. 1968. *La commedia umanistica del Quattrocento*. Firenze: Ist. Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento.

Stefani, Luigina. 1979. "Sui volgarizzamenti plautini a Ferrara nel tardo quattrocento." *Paragone* 30(358): 61–75.

Terpening, Ronnie H. 1997. *Lodovico Dolce, Renaissance Man of Letters*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weinberg, Bernard. 1961. *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*. 2 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weiss, Roberto. 1977. *Medieval and Humanist Greek: Collected Essays*. Padua: Antenore.

Wilson, Nigel G. 1992. *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. London: Duckworth.

Yarrow, Philip J. 1954. "The Theban Brothers in Italian Tragedy." *Orpheus* 1: 137–148.