

SCRIPTS AND SCENARIOS

THE PERFORMANCE OF COMEDY IN RENAISSANCE ITALY

RICHARD ANDREWS



SCRIPTS AND SCENARIOS

The performance of comedy in Renaissance Italy

RICHARD ANDREWS

*Professor of Italian,
University of Leeds*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521353571

© Cambridge University Press 1993

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1993
This digitally printed first paperback version 2007

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Andrews, Richard, Professor of Italian.
Scripts and scenarios: the performance of comedy in Renaissance
Italy / Richard Andrews.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0 521 35357 2

1. Italian drama – To 1700 – History and criticism.
2. Italian drama (Comedy) – History and criticism.
3. Theater – Italy – History – 16th century. I. Title.

PQ4149.A48 1993

852'.05230903 – dc20 92-23446 CIP

ISBN-13 978-0-521-35357-1 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-35357-2 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-03415-9 paperback
ISBN-10 0-521-03415-9 paperback

Preface

Theatre historians recognize in general terms that it was the Italians, in the early sixteenth century, who took the first steps towards a modern European concept of theatre – paradoxically, by reviving models which were sometimes two thousand years old. But the plays which were produced in the process – initially almost always in the form of comedy – are relatively neglected outside Italy. In English they tend to be treated either dismissively, or with emphasis on their sources rather than their qualities as an innovative, if sometimes immature, form of theatre. This can leave behind a misleading picture, both of scripted ‘erudite’ comedy as such, and of the extent to which *commedia dell’arte* (better known, and more romantically approved of) actually depended on *commedia erudita* for its raw material and its very existence. One of the aims of the present study is to give a simple account of this whole seminal process, taking things as much as possible in their chronological order. In the writing, it emerged that the story was too long for one book. This one can claim to cover with reasonable thoroughness the period from 1500 to the 1550s, a decade which it is convenient to treat as a watershed. *Commedia dell’arte* had probably begun by then to take on a separate identity; and other cultural changes were in process which can be seen as concluding what can usefully be called the ‘Renaissance’ in Italy. Hence I can justify the use in the sub-title of the term ‘Renaissance’, rather than the ‘sixteenth century’ which had originally been proposed.

However, as well as retelling facts which are already known at least to Italian scholars and readers (and for which I am heavily indebted to Italian secondary sources), I have tried in this book to emphasize aspects of the story, and of the plays, which have previously been explored in less detail or in no detail at all. Italian critics have been used to treating Renaissance drama as literature,

and are skilled in analysing its literary qualities. In addition, more recently, they have produced impressive large-scale accounts of Renaissance theatre in general as a cultural, social and even semiotic phenomenon. What has been infrequent so far, in studies of *commedia erudita*, has been the close theatrical analysis of individual plays. There has been little attempt to look closely at dramaturgical techniques; or at how such comedies might have functioned, scene by scene, in the face of a live audience. The standpoint, in other words, has been that of a reader: rarely that of a spectator, and almost never that of a theatre practitioner. In missing these lines of inquiry, Italian scholars have also tended to underestimate how the early writers of Humanist comedy were working entirely without any supporting tradition of performance in their new genre, and how almost every aspect of their dramaturgy was an experimental shot in the dark. Admittedly, that statement applies to methods of composition more than to the choice of plot material. Italy at this time possessed a substantial common stock of fictional and narrative *topoi*, which were used indiscriminately in texts for reading and in texts for performance. This should not blind us, though, to the fact that dramatic artefacts differ substantially from literary ones in their compositional technique. The 'early modern' dramatists of sixteenth-century Italy were rather like people attempting to produce a brand new style of three-dimensional sculpture, basing themselves mainly on two-dimensional paintings.

Throughout this book, therefore, I have tried systematically to foreground those aspects of dramatic texts which are *not* shared by a work of fiction intended just for reading; and to bear in mind, within the limits of my admittedly amateur experience, the practical aspects of turning a script into performance. Such an approach can be one-sided in its turn: it means airily waving away a number of legitimate lines of inquiry, especially in relation to authors who have an established literary personality and who wrote also in non-dramatic genres. If Ariosto, Machiavelli, Aretino and Bruno have been treated superficially in this volume, I apologize to their ghosts – but they have suffered only a temporary snub in the cause of treating theatrical texts as theatre, and of giving the 'text–audience' relationship priority (for once) over the 'author–text' one which has traditionally been addressed. If there are any unifying themes in this book, they will be found in the attention paid to the techniques of composing comic dialogue for the stage, on the level of the indi-

vidual scene; and in my speculations on the particular comic experience offered to contemporary audiences, first by *commedia erudita* and then by *commedia dell'arte*. Both of these contribute to a study of what Italians might call the 'constituent elements' of the European comic stage, in a period when those elements were being created, sometimes rather tentatively, for the first time. They are presented here primarily as part of a continuing collective process, by which modern comedy was built – and only secondarily as discrete achievements by individual talents.

This book in its turn also comes from efforts which were not purely solitary, and some acknowledgements must be recorded. With the working conditions currently prevalent in British universities, the volume might never have been completed without a grant from the Leverhulme Trust, which liberated me for the whole of the academic year 1990–1. As well as my deep gratitude for this, I must express thanks to friends who have read portions of the text and given perceptive advice – most notably Professor Peter Brand, Ann and Michael Caesar, Christopher Cairns, Maria Rees, and my close colleague Brian Richardson. Sarah Stanton of Cambridge University Press has exercised some necessary control, but also shown a notable amount of tolerance. My wife and children are in these pages somewhere – partly because they too have commented on bits of the text and helped with the index, but mostly because they are part of the way I think. The dedicatees know, I hope, how important they are in everything. If I have been foolish enough to ignore the contributions, explicit and implicit, of any of these people, then the fault and the errors are mine.

I must also claim responsibility for all translations in this volume which are not otherwise attributed.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> xi
Introduction: Italy in the sixteenth century	I
1 Precedents	9
Some definitions	9
Uses of comedy	10
Patterns of performance	21
The classical models	24
2 The first 'regular' comedies	31
Revivals of Roman comedy	31
First steps in the vernacular: Ferrara	34
Ariosto's dramaturgy	40
Rome and Florence	47
The comic text: Bibbiena and Machiavelli	56
3 The second quarter-century, outside Venice	64
Demarcations	64
Aretino in Rome and Mantua	66
Ariosto's verse comedies	77
The Congress of Bologna: Tuscany	87
Siena and its Academy	89
Florentine comedies	108
4 The second quarter-century, Venice and Padua	121
Spectacle and politics in Venice	121
Ruzante	125
Multilingual comedy	144
Aretino in Venice	154
Dolce and Parabosco	161
5 Improvised comedy	169
Definitions and evidence	169

Improvisation and modular structure	175
Larger units of improvisation	185
Scenarios	195
The comedy of <i>commedia dell'arte</i>	199
6 Obstacles to comedy	204
The rise of theory	204
Theory of laughter	208
Theory of decorum	216
Suppression and censorship	220
<i>La pellegrina</i>	225
7 Scripts and scenarios	227
<i>La pellegrina</i> as 'serious' comedy	227
The Florentine festivities of 1589	233
Plays and authors after 1550	237
Conclusions	244
<i>Notes</i>	249
<i>Chronological bibliography of comedies, 1500–1560</i>	271
<i>General bibliography</i>	280

Introduction: Italy in the sixteenth century

There was of course no political state called Italy in 1500. From the time of Petrarch, in the fourteenth century, a small educated class had made claims for an 'Italian' cultural identity with a Roman heritage superior to that of the 'barbarians' beyond the Alps. But such common ground as did exist between communities in Italy was balanced by an equal amount of diversity: from one city to another Italians spoke different vernaculars, obeyed different governments, and were far more used to viewing each other with mistrust and hostility than to pursuing aspirations to any kind of unity. The southern half of the peninsula in particular, a monarchy with a landowning aristocracy and an increasingly backward economy, had very little in common with the urban trade-based civilization of the north and centre. Even those who spoke eloquently of Italian values made no proposals for an Italian state – there had never been such a thing, and in the middle ages it was impossible to imagine one.

In popular cultural history the term 'Renaissance' is often linked with concepts of liberation from repressive 'medieval' structures (mental, cultural, religious, political). That there were profound changes in this period is beyond question; however, a close look at what was happening to Italian states and society between 1450 and 1600 offers little support for an image of shackles being cast off. Collective committee government characteristic of the city commune was giving way to control by monarchs and princes. Economically too the power was being concentrated at the centre, so the cultural patronage of competitive groups within society was yielding to that of the ruler, court or state. The pace and details of such changes varied in different centres, but the history of Italian Renaissance comedy has to be seen always in a context of decreasing enterprise and increasing constraint. On the largest scale, one can

hardly characterize as 'liberating' the two most obvious trends in sixteenth-century Italy: conquest by foreign powers, and the increasing autocracy of a reformed Church.

It was in the 1490s that two successive French kings brought invading armies into Italy, testing their opportunistic claims to the Kingdom of Naples and the Duchy of Milan. (The earliest comedies which will be discussed in these pages appear in the next decade, 1500–10.) From then on, for fifty years or more, the peninsula was a rich prize for predators, and a symbolic battlefield on which larger European powers disputed their primacy. These powers soon resolved into two: the Kingdom of France (notably under François I, reigned 1515–47), and the formidable accumulation of dominions which had fallen dynastically into the Habsburg hands of Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor (1519–56), King of Spain (from 1506), ruler of Burgundy and of Austria. By legal precedents dating from Charlemagne, the Empire included all of Italy, except Venice, north of the Papal State; and in the south the Aragonese or Spanish had ruled Sicily since 1416 and Naples indirectly since 1435. It was in fact the Empire and Spain which finally triumphed, and at the end of the century most of Italy was part of the international Catholic hegemony created by the Habsburgs. Part of that hegemony involved a greater religious control over art and culture, imposed by Church decree and by an altered climate of opinion.

The Italian Wars, and the shifts of political alliances and prejudices which accompanied them, sometimes provide a background to comic plots and texts. A very brief outline will indicate, if nothing else, certain key dates which may be cultural as well as political watersheds.

In 1469 (accession to effective power in Florence of Lorenzo de' Medici, 'il Magnifico'), there were five Italian states seen as major powers within the peninsula. The Duchy of Milan and the Kingdom of Naples were monarchic and centralized. The Papal State was a kind of federation in which certain centres, notably Urbino, had their own character, and where the city of Rome itself was only slowly becoming a centre of economic and artistic activity. Florence was a republic in theory, but its committee procedures were manipulated by the Medici family, who were princes in all but name. Venice continued stable under its peculiar but successful structures – a republic, but with an elected constitutional monarch in its Doge; a state administered exclusively by its aristocracy, but retaining full



Map 1 *Italy in 1492 (death of Lorenzo il Magnifico).*

Only Venice, Genoa, Florence, Siena and Lucca were republics. All the other states were kingdoms, lordships, or under some other form of 'monarchical' rule. Only Sicily and Sardinia were under direct foreign rule; though the kings of Naples were a cadet branch of the Aragonese royal family, and Spanish (or, more strictly, Catalan) culture predominated.



Map 2 *Italy in 1559 (Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis).*

Only Venice, Genoa and Lucca were nominally republics, and Genoa owed its existence to French protection, and later to Spanish/Imperial protection. Shaded areas belonged to the Austro-Spanish Habsburg Empire set up by Charles V.

Dotted areas were to some extent Habsburg protectorates.

popular support. Of these major centres, Venice, Florence and Rome were to play significant parts in the development of the new comedy, though the role of Florence was less pioneering than the city had been earlier in art, architecture and neoplatonic philosophy. Equally important, and more innovative, in theatrical history were some of the smaller centres: the twin Duchy of Ferrara and Modena ruled by the Este family, Mantua ruled by the Gonzaga, and the obstinately resistant Tuscan republic of Siena. Precisely because these states were small and threatened, they sought to enhance their image and prestige by cultural statements, and in Ferrara and Siena in particular such statements employed the medium of theatre.

The first French invasion of 1494 had led directly to the expulsion of the Medici from Florence. For nearly twenty years, until 1512, that city turned its back on its unofficial princes and tried to fight its corner as a genuine republic, while Italian states in general were juggling with the competing forces of France, Spain, Austria and the Swiss. Milan lost its ducal family and its independence in 1500, and from then on changed hands with bewildering frequency. The exiled Medici established a power network outside their native city, and with two Medici Popes in Rome (Leo X 1513–21, Clement VII 1523–34), Florence was obliged to accept their dominance and become a junior partner in an axis between the two cities. It was under Clement VII, however, that in 1527 Spanish and Imperial troops sacked Rome with great brutality, gave Italians a crisis of confidence from which they never really recovered, and persuaded the Papacy that its future role was one of partnership, not rivalry, with Imperial and Catholic Spain and Austria. Florence's republican illusions were crushed (after a three-year rebellion) by the creation of a Medici duke under Habsburg protection, and from 1530 the city, like most other centres, had a princely court offering artistic patronage and control. At a second stage, in 1557, Florence swallowed Siena (as it had been trying to do for centuries) with Imperial help, creating a new Grand Duchy of Tuscany. In 1597 the direct Este line died out, and Ferrara (but not Modena) reverted to the Papal State where Popes had always thought it belonged. Venice alone retained its autonomy, identity and constitution into the seventeenth century and beyond.

The chief significance of these changes for theatre history is that the organization of performed spectacle varied according to whether

there was a central court or a more loosely structured republic, and whether a city was autonomous or subject to another. By 1600 the major Italian centres were once more Naples, Florence, Milan, Rome and Venice; but only the last two of these could claim to have maintained the political identity of 1469, and the ideological character of Rome had changed beyond recognition. Naples (from 1503) and Milan (from 1535) were ruled directly by Spain. Florence was no longer a city republic but the ducal capital of Tuscany, dependent first on the Habsburgs and later on France. Smaller centres of culture were provided by Mantua (especially active in music), Modena, and the brand new Duchy of Parma. Ferrara and Siena had been absorbed.

Throughout all this, there was one social and cultural constant which had distinguished northern and central Italy from the rest of Europe since at least the thirteenth century. All notions of culture, progress and civilization in Italy were city-based, and were felt always to have been so. 'The City' was not a new social and ideological problem for Italians, as it was in England in the time of Jonson, but an environment taken absolutely for granted. Republican or princely, bourgeois or aristocratic, these were thoroughly urban societies – one of the many reasons why they took over so easily the theatrical plots and models of the ancient cities of Athens and Rome.

LANGUAGE AND DIALECTS

The break-up of the Roman Empire had left behind innumerable varieties of colloquial Latin speech: in an age of poor communications every region, indeed every village, spoke a slightly different Latin-based vernacular. The emergence of national languages – French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian – was a political or a cultural process, or both, by which the dialect of one region in particular was given over-riding status (Castilian, in Spain; the speech of the region round Paris, in France). In the sixteenth century this process had at least begun in the emerging national states beyond the Alps; but in Italy, with no national state, the position was more complex.

Two hundred years previously, three major writers had produced widely diffused masterpieces all in the Florentine dialect: the *Divina Commedia* of Dante (1265–1321), the lyric poems of Petrarch (1304–74), and the prose works, in particular the *Decameron*, of

Boccaccio (1313–75). Florentine was a dialect which was central not just geographically but also linguistically, with the advantage of having lost or distorted fewer sounds from the Latin roots, so the educated and literate found it more accessible whatever their own mother tongue. After Petrarch and Boccaccio, there was a period during which Latin was preferred for most serious written communication. The sixteenth century, with which the present book deals, is characterized by a drive to make *fourteenth-century* Florentine, as found in the three ‘canonical’ writers, the basis of a literary language which would be accepted throughout the peninsula for written cultural communication. There was rather less attempt (because it was harder, and more controversial) to identify this same Florentine ‘Italian’ as a medium of *spoken* communication for the educated and courtly upper classes, who met and mingled across state boundaries.

The policy of turning back to fourteenth-century Florentine as a literary model was begun by the Venetian Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) and continued later in the century mainly by Florentines (who could claim a spurious cultural leadership from the fact that it was their own dialect, albeit in an older version, which was being favoured). It was probably the only practical linguistic solution in a politically divided peninsula, but it remained nevertheless artificial. The mother tongue of the vast majority of Italians was different from Florentine – as different, say, as Spanish was, and indeed Spanish was probably no more difficult to understand. Literary ‘Italian’ (often referred to as ‘Tuscan’ at this time) was something which had to be deliberately learned.

This presented relatively few problems for texts intended to be read: those who could read at all were a minority, and were usually prepared to make the necessary efforts to understand. For theatre the difficulties were potentially more serious, if one accepted at all (as some writers probably did not) that stage language should bear some relation to living speech. All popular theatre, including that with serious religious content, had previously been written in a local vernacular for local consumption. The ‘regular’ comedy based on Latin models, which is the subject of this book, was initially offered to a very restricted audience and could afford to use (and in fact to promote) literary ‘Tuscan’ for the educated spectator. But comedy thrives on the down-to-earth, on realism, on robust caricature of authentic behaviour and language. Audiences, especially less sophisticated ones, like to be appealed to by constant reference to

who and what they are, which includes acknowledging the way they speak. Sooner or later, in one way or another, the existence of a multiple range of spoken vernaculars was going to have to be recognized on the comic stage. The rather tortuous way in which this necessity was faced in Italy forms one of the strands or episodes of the story told in this book.

CHAPTER I

Precedents

SOME DEFINITIONS

This book deals with performed 'regular' comedy in Italy, principally between 1500 and about 1555. In defining the boundaries of our topic, we shall mostly be accepting sixteenth-century definitions of what constituted 'comedy', definitions which depended in their turn on what it was thought *comedia* had meant in classical Latin. In the medieval period the term had been used in ways which did not necessarily imply either theatrical performance or the intention of provoking laughter. In the Renaissance, however, the Latin word *comedia* was applied to a genre of theatrical writing. It was defined in ways which usually did not list laughter as an essential component, but in practice most Renaissance comedies were also meant to be funny. In discussing them, therefore, we shall be unable to avoid using the words 'comic' and 'comedy' with the primary meaning which they possess in modern English conversation: they will apply to an artefact or performance intended to make people laugh. Words such as 'satire' or 'farce', when used at all, will be seen as sub-species of the category 'comedy', or *comedia* in Latin, not as contrasting categories. (The Italian word *commedia*, on its own, will be avoided in these pages: it is confusingly used by many English-speaking scholars as a synonym for *commedia dell'arte*, an important but specialized phenomenon which will be discussed in Chapter 5.)

In describing comedy as 'regular', a term actually used at the time, we mean that it conformed or at least alluded to formats derived from the Roman comedies of Plautus and Terence. In the period we are discussing, many other sources and styles were also