ABSTRACT: This text consists of an account of the experience gained over many years of presentations made by the Giz-en-Scène Group, which was founded in 1987 by professors of Classical Philology from UNESP (Latin, Greek) and USP (Sanskrit), during the second national meeting of the Brazilian Society for Classical Studies (SBEC) and which remains active until the present. Throughout its existence, the Giz-en-Scène Group has presented its performances of dramatized readings in conferences, schools, events and even public squares, taking texts of Classical Antiquity to wherever there was interest in receiving them. Its objective is to disseminate ancient texts, with didactic and cultural dissemination purposes. The performances staged by the Giz-en-Scène Group contain scenographic elements and always put a dramatic emphasis to text reading.


“There’s something secret about a beginning. I don’t know how to start.”

Vyasa.

The practical experience of the Giz-en-Scène Group of Dramatized Readings of Classical Texts – or just Giz-en-Scène for short – is strongly based on the theoretical concept of adaptation of ancient texts to modern audiences, which

---

1 Excerpted from the opening scene of The Mahabharata (the opening scene text is available at: http://www.trinitycollege.com/gallery/anthologyonline/download.php?id=260; access on 06/20/2017), a play produced and directed by Peter Brook, from the translation signed by Jean-Claude Carrière. In the opening scene, the old Vyasa tells a boy he has conceived in his mind the integral epic poem The Mahabharata, which he explains him to be the history of all, but also that the poem needed a scribe to register it. At that moment arises Ganesha, the god with elephant’s head, who proposes to transcribe it as long as the old Vyasa narrates it without interruption. In the stage version entitled The Beginning of Everything, already presented by Giz-en-Scène Group but still unpublished, the beautiful translation by Carlos Alberto da Fonseca can be taken here for collating this emblematic sentence: “The beginning of things is always mysterious. I do not know how to start”.
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generally consist of spectators from a university, but which are not always familiar with details from those ancient cultures that have produced them.

The concept of adapting texts has been a standard practice in the history of text reception and, in fact, one may argue that there is no modern approach to a text of the classical antiquity without the adaptation of contents, even unintentionally, so as to understand and communicate cultural differences better. This also happens even when a scholar is totally aware and provided with all data and devices that the best research can provide (be it philological, archaeological, exegetical etc.). That is to say that contemporary readings of ancient texts are therefore forms of adapting contents from Antiquity to the ways in which one can (or wants to) understand them today.

Some fruitful reflections in this regard have already been developed in the academic circles, like those which can be read in the provoking paper *Praise of anachronism in history*, by the historian of ancient Greece Nicole Loraux (2005). Departing from the intrinsic terror of incurring on the cardinal sin of scientific research, that is, the anachronism, always feared by historians and other researchers of Antiquity, the French researcher suggests, in opposition to the most common belief, that anachronism is the most efficient *engine of understanding* and that, therefore, one must have the courage to take a controlled anachronism, which should be guided by an analogical reasoning, aimed to formulate questions that probably subjects and thinkers from the Antiquity would not have asked. The contrast between modern questions and ancient thinking justifies a return to the past to look for answers that ancient societies would have to give and, so that the present would receive a renewed and amplified knowledge, fostered by the ancient sources and ways of thinking and sustained by the various cultures and time periods of the Antiquity.

Loraux’s idea relies on the huge distance that exists between the researcher of the Antiquity and his object of study, a distance that would force him to resort to controlled anachronism and to analogy, in order to give life and substance to facts that otherwise would run the risk of becoming pure form, because they would lack a substantiality capable of generating their necessary understanding (2005, p. 128). Even when they seek to be anchored in postulates and points of view that are distinctive of the Classical Antiquity, modern readings and interpretations of the past are inevitably permeated by a perspective of the present times, which is basically the only one possible. This occurs even when those interpretations lie on the known facts of the ancient world, but these facts also consist – we must recognize it – of a conglomerate of sparse data, as if they were potsherds that a researcher of material culture tries to re-assemble. Even when good scientific practice and the exercising of reason and academic training are used to discover a nexus for them, hypothesis and the positive exercise of well-guided scholarly imagination take an important part in this process.
What the contemporary world considers to be literary art, however, already practiced a kind of controlled anachronism since a long time ago. Perhaps even since the very literature was inaugurated in the Western world. In the Roman world, nothing stopped Virgil, for example, to situate the foundation of the Tyrian colony Carthage contemporaneously to Aeneas and his men fleeing from a flaming Troy. Although, according to some of the latest estimates, the first fact should have occurred sometime at the end of the IXth century BCE, and the second one, somewhat around the XIIth century BCE. It is worthwhile to remember that anachronism has been already defined more as a superposition of different times rather than as a matter of simple confusion of dates (RANCIÈRE, 1996, p. 53-68).

What in the modern world is called tradition is, in fact, almost inevitably made out of some sort and degree of adaptation, because what is transmitted is never a pure form, but a system of values, about the same way as it is understood and conceived by Saussure as a part of the postulates that structured the modern science of language (SAUSSURE, 1980, p. 130-141). It is said here “about the same way”, because, as we know, Saussure considered the transmission phenomenon as something that occurs outside the language, because he thought human language out of the (social) time that employs it and continuously updates it. When extrapolated to the broader field of culture and, in the present case, the literary culture, it is clear that the transmission is always followed by many forms of adaptation. In the phenomenological approach of P. Ricoeour, for example, a tradition is an act or process that is the result of choices made in the past, which remain still active in the present, because it has undergone a transformation in order to allow its permanence. Thus, “traditionalism” in Ricoeur’s thinking is equivalent to the conservation of a value, passed on through inherited meaning contexts (HALL, 2007, p. 50). From the perspective of the modern semiotics of Jacques Fontanille, the only conservation is the one that exists in the transmission process, that is, there is no maintenance other than the one permitted and enabled by a transformation that, somewhat paradoxically, is part of the conservation process (FONTANILLE, 2015). In this sense, protecting the tradition from its inherent social transformation brought about by the social time implies running the risk of losing the value passed on through it over time to time. It is precisely this which gives a status of legitimacy and trustworthiness to literary adaptations.

In the Latin Antiquity, the comediotheatricals whose production reached the present time have vastly explored the adaptation field in the form of contaminatio, (a procedure by which Latin comediographers composed a single play based on the story of two or sometimes more Greek plays), and, as we know, they took as their favorite models the texts produced by the so-called Greek New Comedy. In some prologues of his plays, Plautus says verbatim that he took as his model sometimes a play by Diphilos (in his Casina), sometimes another by Demophilos (in his Asinaria), sometimes one by Philemon (in his Mercator and his Trinummus)
and sometimes he only mentions the Greek name of some other plays of his (as one can see in the *Miles Gloriosus* and in *Poenulus*) (PEREIRA, 1984. p. 72-80).

When put together, all those elements seem to reinforce the thesis that the tradition is perpetuated by adaptation of a form resulting from the transmission of a value system, that goes forward adapting itself to new contexts and social practices. This has also been the distinctive mark of staging plays today, and the most part of the classic texts staged in Brazil – if not all of them – has been guided by some degree of adaptation, be it a comedy or a tragedy or yet another type of literary text from the Antiquity.

Although the Giz-en-Scène Group focuses its work on disseminating ancient texts as accurately as possible, its experience has quickly shown that literary texts require some degree of adaptation to be staged, whatever its purpose may be, either a dramatized reading or a complete theatrical staging.

Throughout its nearly 28 years of existence, the Giz-en-Scène Group has performed dramatized readings to many types of texts, as Latin and Greek comedies and tragedies; ancient Indian farces and light plays; recitals of Sanskrit and Latin poems; modern plays with Graeco-Latin themes; as well as texts belonging to other literary genders adapted for theater, such as epic (e.g., the beginning of the *Mahabharata*; passages of the *Iliad*; the Book IV of the *Aeneid*). But almost since the beginning, the Giz-en-Scène Group realized that its natural vocation is comedy. Though its members have a legitimate fascination with all textual species of Antiquity and in particular with the higher gender of tragedies like Euripides’ *Medea*, they feel more comfortable when preparing and performing texts of a comic nature. This is not due to any prior determination, but rather to the personal inclinations of its members on stage: the Group never had pretensions of being or becoming a theater company, made up of real actors, because it recognizes the intense and visceral work that is required to give life and body to such a striking characters as those seen in the higher genres like tragedy.

The Giz-en-Scène Group emerged spontaneously in 1987, during the 2nd Annual Meeting of the (at that time) newly founded Brazilian Society of Classical Studies (whose acronym in portuguese is SBEC), and has performed on stage at several universities, public schools and cities in Brazil, covering part of the Southern Region and virtually the entire Southeastern Region, having also featured in Natal, in the State of Rio Grande do Norte, in the Northeastern Region. So far, the Giz-en-Scène Group has achieved a total of more than 170 presentations, and it is, as far as we know of, the only group of its kind in Brazil, mostly because it is specialized in dramatized readings of texts from the classical Antiquity (ancient India, Greece and Rome) and in modern theatrical texts containing classic themes.

The name Giz-en-Scène is a kind of pun, in which elements are merged such as the French expression “mis-en-scène”, meaning “to stage” and “acting on stage”, and the portuguese word for “chalk” (giz), which aims to work as an allusive symbol
to identify the fact that it is formed mainly by professors and future professors. The Group has met numerous configurations and it has had collaboration of both undergraduate and post-graduate students of Letters from UNESP in Araraquara-SP – and occasionally even of high school participants – but there has always been a “fixed core”, formed by Greek and Latin Professors from UNESP in Araraquara, and also by a Professor of Sanskrit from FFLCH-USP-SP. That represents a regular troupe, which is always in charge of preparing the texts – translating and in general adapting them – and rehearsing them and getting them to the stage. There has never been a predetermined director in the Giz-en-Scène Group, and the texts themselves, with their prologues, their own settings, the lines and words spoken by their characters are responsible for suggesting ways to stage it. Of course, the professors are those who have always undertaken the task of suggesting ways to scenically present a given text.

So one can say that the Group has a didactic aim, because it intends to disclose texts from Classical Antiquity through dramatized readings. To do that, texts are first translated and afterwards adapted to reading by the researchers that integrate the Group. They also offer, whenever possible, complementary activities in academic events, such as courses on theater and classical culture, and discussions with the audience after stage presentations. Because it is a group of readings, but it also employs scenic resources, its members have coined a neologism to mark this sort of half-way between reading and acting, and so they call themselves readingactors (leatores).

Thus, the Giz-en-Scène Group has formed a repertoire consisting of classical texts of ancient India, ancient Greece and Rome – many of them appear in the Collection Giz-en-Scène, published by the FCL Araraquara-UNESP – and it has also modern texts that recreate themes and situations of the Antiquity, as follows:


3 The source of these data as well as the way they are organized are in Fonseca; Marquetti, 2011, p. 26-28.
Greek Theater:
Aristophanes: *Lysistrata; The Clouds;*
Menander: *Dyskolos or The Grouch or Old Cantankerous;
Euripides: *Bacchae; Medea;*
Sophocles: *Philoctetes; Antigone;*

Latin Theater:
Plautus: *The pot of gold (=Aulularia); Menaechmi; Miles Gloriosus; Amphilias; The Haunted House (=Mostellaria;*

Sanskrit/Indian Theater:
Bhâsa: *Disjunctions* (collage of three small plays depicting scenes from the *Mahabharata;*
Bodhâyana: *The Ascetic and the Courtesan;*
Harsha: *The Pearl necklace;*
Kâlidâsa: *Malavika and the king Agnimitra;* *The king Pururavas and the Nymph Urvachi;*
Mahendravarman: *Binge Drinking Games;*
Râjashekhara: *The Maiden Lotus-Flower or Hillbilly Lótus Blossom;*
Vararuci: *Lovers on a tightrope;*

Modern Theater with Greek-Latin or Sanskrit themes:
Ariano Suassuna: *The Saint and the Sow;*
Guilherme de Figueiredo: *A very curious story of the virtuous Matron of Ephesus (based on the episode of the Matron of Ephesus, from Petronius’ Satyricon); A God slept in my house*
(based on *Amphitryon;*
Paul Foucher: *Oriental Fantasy (= The interior of a harem).*

Texts belonging to other literary genders adapted for theater:
Jean-Claude Carrière: *The Beginning of everything (Mahâbhârata, by Vyâsa);*
Carlos Alberto da Fonseca: *Râmâyana: flowers and thorns; Ramatitudes (scenes of hatred and blood from the Râmâyana, by Vâlmiki;*
Maria Celeste Consolin Dezotti: *Dialogues of the Dead, by Lucian of Samosata;*
Edvanda Bonavina da Rosa: *The Wrath of Achilles* (from Homer’s*Iliad;*
João Batista Toledo Prado: *Dido and Aeneas* (Book IV of Virgilius’*Aeneid*).

Collected poems for recital:
Catullus and Martial: *Epigrams;*
Indian Lyric Poems: *Beads from India;*

The texts belonging to the *Giz-en-Scène* repertoire are, mostly, the final result of a work that always begins with the philological research in the field of translation, then undergoes the academic work of seeking the more accurate textual equivalences in Portuguese to each type of text, bearing in mind a presentation for stages, and then culminates with a practical adaptation, aimed at a smooth and palatable reading, following the modern Portuguese-speaking public tastes and preferences.\(^4\)

\(^4\) It is never enough to remember that the first two of the famous American conferences (*lezioni americane*), prepared by Italo Calvino to be delivered at Harvard, bear the titles/subjects *lightness*
Motivated by the distance that stands between the original cultures in which the texts were created and the ones from our contemporary world, as well as by the need to make interdiscursive, intertextual and cultural references as clear as possible, Giz-en-Scène’s text adaptations follow a sort of protocol that can be summarized as follows:

a) **addition** of information that is relevant to the understanding of the text. Ex.: in Aristophanes’ *Clouds*, trying to learn the art of false reasoning so that he could escape his creditors, the gérōn Strepsiades let himself to be educated by Socrates, who proposes that the old man would conceive an ingenious idea to get rid of a debt of five talents; Strepsiades considers using a crystal lens to melt away the accounting records on the wax tablet of the official that would come to collect the debt; in Giz-en-Scène’s version, Strepsiades explains that the crystal lens was used only by the rich, who could afford it to light the fire; in Socrates’ lines, the philosopher adds that such stone costs more than ten talents, which reinforces the old man’s folly and his inability to reason coherently;

b) **subtraction** of too specific cultural references, without which the text is still understandable. Ex.: in the Act III of Plautus’ *The Braggart Warrior*, Pleusicles’ words to designate a very precious metal mention the fabulous orichalcum (or *aurichalcum*); this cultural information has been converted to scattered references made only to *gold*, which were then assimilated by the lines of other characters, such as the slave Palaestrion’s. Still in this same passage, references to the Calends (*Kalendae*) and the offering of sacrificial entrails to the sacrificer and to his relatives and closest friends were simply eliminated;

c) **switching** of data which are relevant to the narrative flow, and which are explained and / or highlighted in comments embedded into the text. Ex.: a) in Plautus’ *Amphitryon*, Act 3, Scene 3, when Jupiter asks for the true Sosia to go to the ship in order to bring the pilot Blépharo to have lunch with them, Sosia takes his leave saying that he would be back soon bringing Blépharo; in Giz-en-Scène’s version, Sosia concludes his line by telling the audience that he will not return, because “The part of the text that contained my return to this scene with Blépharo is unfortunately lost and has not survived time. So, for all of you who are staying here I say ‘bye-bye’ and ‘Iuppiter vobiscum!’”... and then he leaves for good;

and **quickness**. Although these features take part in the poetic practices belonging to different times, they were chosen by the Italian writer as objectives to be pursued in the literary practice of future generations (cf. CALVINO, 1988, p. 3-54).
d) **compression** of unnecessarily long passages, giving the text a narrative agility which is more consistent with which contemporary audiences are used to. Here are two generic examples: 1) in the Act I of Plautus’ *Menaechmi*, the initial speech of Peniculus the parasite was shortened about 15 verses, in which he talks about the lavishness of the first Menaechmus, his patron; 2) the text of Ariano Suassuna’s *The Holy and Sow* contains more than 40 pages, but they were reduced to nearly 30, by eliminating or curtailing lines with redundant information, as those consisting of discursive expansions only to insist on some character’s behavior, like some character’s recurrent resistance to comply with an order or take determined attitude;

e) **adequacy of sociolinguistic register**, which is motivated in that, existing translations are in general literary ones, a fact that necessarily requires a setting for enjoyment and veri-similitude, when they have to be staged. The adequacy of sociolinguistic register also operates when character’s lines and/or situations in which they are depicted contain elements that suggest a linguistic context potentially diverse from the cultivated variety of the language; in these cases, an adjustment is made by means of popular registers or those of foreigners speaking Portuguese. Here are two eloquent examples of that: 1) the foreign accents of many characters from Plautus’ *Aulularia (The Pot of Gold)*, usually slaves and cooks, consisting of a phonetic-phonological feature not registered in the translated text; 2) the hillbilly language of many members of the Indian Court of Rājashēkhara’s *The Lotus-Flower Maiden* (or even *Hillbilly Lotus-Blossom*), which communicates a reality in which a lower caste, probably formed by Vāishyas who got enriched by

---

5 The remarkable change towards acceleration in the narrative enjoyment of our audiences is readily apparent from constrast to Indian culture. In such a culture, from around the 6th century CE until today, there are representations of the total plot of the *Mahâbhârata* and the *Râmâyana*, using an entire city as a stage. These performances last for many days and nights. The departure of Râma, e.g., with his wife Sîtâ and his brother Lakshmana from capital-city Âyodhya into exile in the forests is made with the participation of the entire population of the city, which holds torches to light the way of the venerable triad and cries and laments their sad condition. The entire city dances and sings in celebration when the same characters return at the end of 14 symbolic years, to re-occupy the throne of the kingdom, and then they all carry lights – according to some critic segments, an epic narrative scene which founds the *Diwâli* (or *Dîpâvali*), the “lights necklace”, that happens in the world of Hindu culture in the fall (for further information, see Buddhachannel’s “Le sens de la fête de Diwali ou Dipavali”, in *References* section of this text). As for the theater made for stages, many dramatic genres ask for 10, 12 or 14 acts in a succession of scenes that tell a long and almost neverending history, in comparison to which even the bold 9 hours of Peter Brook and Jean-Claude Carrière’s *Mahabharata* is a ‘short’ representation (see UNESCO, “The Drama of Sentiment Índia. Kutiyattam Sanskrit Theatre”, in *References* section of this text).

6 For further information, cf. the “Presentation” text that is at the beginning of all volumes of the *Collection Giz-en-Scène*. 
trade, began to affect behavior of a higher caste, perhaps the Kshatariyas, as if those characters were new rich people: full of economic resources but having no sense of the refinement that should guide their words and attitudes. This is a case of adequacy of sociolinguistic register which is documented in the translation of the Sanskrit text into Portuguese.

In addition to all these, in order to make classic texts always clear and palatable, but without avoiding certain textual questions, the Giz-en-Scène Group also gives rise to a certain level of theatrical experimentation. For example:

1) As we know, the manuscript tradition has not bequeathed to us the end of Plautus’ ‘Aulularia.’ To mark this issue of textual transmission, following the latest speeches exchanged between Lyconides and Strobilus, where the master requires his slave to bring the pot of gold he had hidden in a chest, all reading actors on the scene become suddenly frozen; then enters Megadorus who pronounces the following statement:

“— Dear viewers: the manuscripts have not preserved the end of this play. The text of Plautus that came to us stops here. And now remains the question: Strobilus should or should not return the gold? So difficult a situation, right? But here you can call… here you choose the ending. Because here… IT UP TO YOU TO DECIDE! (Rises the music of the Brazilian YOU DECIDE TV show). Okay, so let’s see the end you have chosen”;

2) in the last Act of Plautus’ “Amphitryon,” in order to prevent the real Amphitryon from entering the house in which Jupiter is, Mercury puts a wreath on his head to pretend he has attended to a banquet and that he is now drunk; then he climbs on the roof of the house, to speak to Amphitryon who approaches the front door; then he descends from the roof, having in his hand a long stick and says he will give him a good beating, but when he raises his stick, a huge banner drops down, in which it is read “LACVNA” (a textual “gap”); then the scene freezes and follows a blackout for preparing the outcome of the play. This solution intends to materialize a matter of textual criticism in establishing the Latin text, in order to produce a meta-theatrical as well as a meta-philological effect;

3) in Plautus’ ‘The Braggart Soldier’ final Act, convinced that the courtisan Acroteleutium, who pretended to be the attractive young wife of old Periplectomenus, had completely fallen in love for him, the soldier Pyrgopolinices had entered old Periplectomenus’ house. Brought back to the scene wearing only a modern swimming trunks, Pyrgopolinices is forcibly removed from the house by Periplectomenus’ slaves and one of
them threatens him with a knife; this time the whole scene freezes, and one reading actor costumed as a soldier enters, then stops solemnly before the audience and says “Note...”, then he kneels and completes “... Footnote” and goes on explaining that the context of the scene probably required that Pyrgopolinices were completely naked, but to save the poor reading actor and the entire audience of such an embarrassment, the feature of the “black swimming trunks” was adopted in this scene.

During these nearly three decades of staging texts, the Giz-en-Scène’s dramatized readings have produced bearers and followers who have conducted many theatrical presentations to academic communities. The most recent one took place last year (2014), in which a young professor of Latin at the Federal University of Roraima, in Boa Vista, led her students to study the Latin text of Plautus’ Menaechmi and to prepare a dramatized reading for the stage (SIMÕES, 2015).

For a conclusion, it is expected that the Giz-en-Scène Group of dramatized readings of classic texts can continue still for many years to carry out its work of translation, adaptation and staging texts from the ancient Indian, Greek and Roman cultures, both through the work done by ancient writers who have written and conceived them, and either through thought-provoking modern reinterpretations, such as that one by the Brazilian playwright Guilherme de Figueiredo, entitled The Very Curious Story of the Virtuous Matron of Ephesus and based on the eponymous Milesian tale that can be read in Petronius’ Satyricon.

After all, modern interpretations, like the one by Guilherme de Figueiredo, are legitimate representatives of the ways of appropriation of the distant past, that are put into action by the present-day translations of which adaptations are an integrant part.

This is so because Classical Antiquity, or rather the idea of a Classical Antiquity exists – whatever may be the main culture (ancient Greek or Roman) taken into account or even whatever may be its specific period of time – in the gap between cultural universes that are strongly interrelated and historically interdependent in many respects. This gap, which sometimes brings us closer and sometimes further to the ancient Greek or Roman ways of thinking and conceiving the world, mediates and pervades European languages, cultures and literatures from that time to this one, an easily verifiable fact, for example, in the modern rooms and exhibitions in present-day museums, in which there is a large apparatus for the provision and display of data, such as display cabinets and visual amplification systems, a convenient positioning of items, spotlights for their easy identification, explanatory captions, etc., a fact that was very well reported by authors such as Mary Beard and John Henderson (2000, p. 6-7).

This gap – an indispensable, expected and even desirable fruit of a translation system that takes items from Antiquity and transports them up to the modern
world – has a status comparable to that of adapting texts to present-day readers and/or audiences, whatever their nature and purpose might be. Or, rather, textual adaptation claims its part in the larger universe of that gap, as a component of the same translation system that predicts the possibility of using such a device, which acts as a component of the translation of values it sets in motion.

In this sense, adaptations such as those prepared and staged by the Giz-en-Scène Group represent a genuine form of receiving and maintaining the literary culture of Classical Antiquity in our day, and may well illustrate one of the ways in which the Present works as the most efficient engine to understand the universe in which the ancient man existed and moved, as well as one of the privileged forms of the controlled anachronism modus operandi defended by the above mentioned Nicole Loraux (2005).


**RESUMO:** Este texto consiste em um relato de experiência adquirida depois de muitos anos de apresentações do Grupo Giz-en-Scène, que foi fundado em 1987 por professores de Língua e Literatura Clássicas da UNESP (Latim e Grego antigo) e da USP (Sánscrito), durante o segundo encontro nacional da Sociedade Brasileira de Estudos Clássicos (SBEC) e que permanece ativo até o presente. Ao longo de sua existência, o Grupo Giz-en-Scène apresentou suas performances de leituras dramatizadas em eventos acadêmicos, escolas e mesmo em espaços públicos, apresentando textos da Antiguidade Clássica onde quer que houvesse interesse em recebê-los. Seu objetivo fundamental é disseminar textos antigos com propósito didático e cultural. As encenações levadas ao palco pelo Grupo Giz-en-scène fazem uso de elementos cenográficos, sempre conferindo uma entonação dramática à leitura.
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