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The myth of Antigone has been established as a preeminent one in political and philosophical debate. One incarnation of the myth is of particular interest here. Jean Anouilh’s Antigone opened in Paris, 1944. A political and then philosophical debate immediately arose in response to the show. Anouilh’s Antigone remains a well-known play, yet few people know about its controversial history or the significance of its translation into English immediately after the war.

It is this history and adaptation of Anouilh’s contested Antigone that defines my inquiry. I intend to reopen interpretive discourse about this play by exploring its origins, its journey, and the archival limitations and motivations controlling its legacy and reception to this day. By creating a space in which multiple readings of this play can exist, I consider adaptation studies and archival theory and practice in the form of theatre history, with a view to dismantle some of the misconceptions this play has experienced for over sixty years.

This is an investigation into the survival of Anouilh’s Antigone since its premiere in 1944. I begin with a brief overview of the original performance of Jean Anouilh’s Antigone and the significant political controversy it caused. The second chapter centers on the changing reception of Anouilh’s Antigone beginning with the liberation of Paris to its premiere on the Broadway stage the following year. Additionally, I examine the changes made to Anouilh’s script by Lewis Galantière and the ramifications of such alterations. In the third chapter, and final part of my examination of Jean Anouilh’s play, I approach Antigone through the lenses of
archival theory, performance studies, and adaptation theory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I. PARIS IN PARADOX</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER II. ANTIGONE IN ADAPTATION</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER III. ANTIGONE AND THE ARCHIVE</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Let us not start from the beginning. Rather let us start with Antigone. For millennia now, the Western world has adapted and rallied round her myth – as icon, rebel, daughter and tragedy – she swells the breasts of her devotees with paradox. Perhaps it is her cosmic burden of longing that attracts searching souls in times of distress, or her death march of certainty that invites the philosophes to analyze her damning excess of brotherly love. Theatre history offers a long succession of punctuated, enigmatic experiences, and images of Antigone, from her earliest incarnation in Sophocles’s three Theban plays, to her myriad forms in the twentieth century.

G.W.F Hegel, Virginia Woolf, Matthew Arnold, Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Jacques Derrida, Simone Weil, and Jacques Lacan have all read the Antigone myth, debating humanity’s philosophical and psychological tumult as shown by the fiery daughter of the infamous Oedipus. Indeed, myths are some of the most frequently adapted of stories, lending themselves to endless re-imaginings and incarnations. Sophocles is credited for originating the Antigone story. The profound myth of Oedipus gave Sophocles material for three plays. The Oedipus cycle, including Oedipus Rex, Oedipus at Colonus, and finally Antigone, begins after a great battle has been fought over the city of Thebes.

Before Antigone’s father Oedipus exiles himself, he hands the keys of the kingdom over to Creon until his sons Polynices and Eteocles are of age to jointly rule. Not surprisingly, the brothers refuse to share the throne, and after a battle over Thebes, both brothers are killed. At the beginning of Antigone, Creon deems it necessary to make an example of one of the dead brothers, arbitrarily Polynices. Eteocles, on the other hand, though just as rebellious, is honored in death. In this way, Creon can have a hero and a villain for his country to mourn. With this edict against the burial of the shamed Polynices, Creon effectively controls how and what the
Thebans receive and remember about history.

In order to defame Polynices and honor Eteocles, Creon refuses Polynices a proper burial, thus depriving him of an afterlife, and gives Eteocles a hero’s funeral rites. Antigone rebels against this act of devastating erasure by Creon. Knowing that the punishment is death, she buries Polynices. She claims that Creon, no matter how powerful, has no jurisdiction over life eternal. Despite her engagement to Creon’s son Haemon, and the many reasonable arguments Creon produces, Antigone chooses to die rather than acquiesce to Creon’s reign.

In the very narrowest sense, the story of Antigone finds its locus in civil disobedience. Revolt is often considered to be the impetus of the myth. Indeed, it could be said that Antigone endures because her story taps a basic component of human nature, conflict. If war or revolt is an embryonic component of being, as Heraclitus, at the beginning of Western thought stated, “War is the father of all things,” then Antigone could be seen as an “everyman” figure (9).

Certainly, Antigone’s presence in Western intellectual history can be located in her association with controversy, debate, and rebellion against the powers that be. As Robert M. Cover aptly summarizes in *Justice Accused: Antislavery and the Judicial Process*: “Antigone’s star has shone brightly through the millennia. The archetype for civil disobedience has claimed a constellation of first magnitude emulators” (1).

American philosopher and social critic Henry David Thoreau, who originated the term *civil disobedience* in an essay of the same name in 1846, cited Antigone as a stirring example of civil disobedience (232). Indeed, Antigone is often linked to acts of civil disobedience and regarded in terms of her infamous and highly political father Oedipus. As the noble daughter of the self-banished, self-blinded King Oedipus, Antigone, willful like her father, is often portrayed as “the prototype of alterity in her resistance to the law” (Weinreb 21).
Attesting to the power of her myth and character, the fascination humanity has with Antigone has inspired hundreds of recreations and interpretations since Sophocles first staged her in fifth-century Greece (Steiner 121). As George Steiner makes clear in his exhaustive book *Antigones* (1984), Antigone has been the object of obsession from the end of the eighteenth century to the present day.

Certainly a significant aspect of Antigone’s preeminence in Western thought, politics is just one of many ideologies in which she has figured. Indeed, for every generation that has been drawn to Antigone, “the next seems to reject her enigmatic presence as drama’s revolutionary martyr-heroine” (Walsh 6). In a constantly changing political world, it is no wonder that the past two centuries have generated significant scholarship regarding the enigmatic and fraught character of Antigone.

Looking at variations of Sophocles’ *Antigone*, it seems that until the latter years of the nineteenth century, *Antigone* had been read and experienced exclusively in Greek. However, a resurgence of attention to Sophocles’s masterpiece in the 1800s resulted in significant translations of and commentaries on *Antigone* by G.W.F. Hegel (1829), Theodore Woolsey (1836) and R.C. Jebb (1888).

After 1840, *Antigone* began to appear in scholarship, college courses, general interest and women’s periodicals, novels, short stories, and poetry all over the Western world (Winterer 70). The Hegel, Woolsey, and Jebb translations not only brought *Antigone* to a much wider audience base, but also established it as worthy of continued philosophical consideration. However, with the advent of World War I, and the subsequent “roaring” twenties, high modernists like James Joyce, T.S. Eliot, and H.D. were bored by her literary presence as a martyr with overwhelming female foibles, and sought to outshine her importance with their own mythic literary obsessions
Evidence of Europe’s shifting logics and ideals at this time can be found in markedly irreverent adaptations and uses of Sophocles’s *Antigone*, such as E.M. Forster’s “The Road from Colonus” (1912) or Jean Cocteau’s *Antigone* (1922). A few years later in 1936, at the center of a war-ravaged and soon to be war-ready Europe, France’s Marguerite Yourcenar and Simone Weil both wrote about Antigone, connecting her to revolt in a way that brought Antigone her most recent and memorable association as a civilian résistante.

During World War II, as fascism gained control throughout Europe, Antigone again became a topic for critical and popular attention, so much so in fact that she assumed “the position of muse” for many wartime writers, scholars, musicians, playwrights, and activists (Walsh 7). It is perhaps no surprise that at the center of the largest political upheaval the Western world had yet to see, *Antigone* was center stage, embodying the base components of all humanity – rebellion, war, and conflict.

Antigone’s position as muse continued into the postwar years, but by the 1960s and continuing to the present day, Antigone’s resistant presence, as seen both in political and philosophical terms, seems to have settled into a discourse of paradox. It seems that Antigone recommends herself for times of war. Paradox and revolt are the touchstones for both. But in the post-modern world, perhaps her fatal certainty smacks of determinism and a world gone forever after World War II.

As Françoise Meltzer observes, there has been so much written about Antigone throughout history that the most recent texts might be seen as continued attempts at consolidating the spectrum of Antigone versions, obsessions, and theories (170). Judith Butler, in *Antigone’s Claim*, for example, reconsiders a great deal of the thinking on Antigone (mainly by G. W. F.

In terms of this study, I have chosen to focus on Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone*, an adaptation that has long provoked discussion and controversy. It was first performed on February 6, 1944 at the Atelier Theatre in Paris, a few months before the liberation of Nazi occupied France by the Allied Forces. A city already divided under foreign occupation, a polemic immediately arose in response to this particular adaptation. Critics and public agreed it was a brilliant, modern retelling of the classic myth, but some hailed *Antigone* as a powerful play about the Resistance in France, where others saw the play as pro-Vichy and Anouilh as a sympathizer, or worse, collaborator.

Parisian theatre critics and audiences frenzied over this astonishingly ambivalent Antigone who, during performance, inspired both collaborators and resistsants to applaud for the very same lines. Within weeks of the premiere, two of the largest papers in Paris were deadlocked in a vicious political debate, and by April, about thirty reviewers (in Paris alone) had joined the fray. *Antigone* was reviewed in the Collaborationist press as well as in the Resistance papers, leading Anouilh’s contemporary, Jean Paul Sartre to note, “Anouilh stirred up a storm of discussion with *Antigone*, being charged on the one hand with being a Nazi, on the other with being an anarchist” (40).

Such a flurry of reaction from Anouilh’s peers, press, and countrymen certainly speaks to the effect, if not the importance, of this *Antigone*. Indeed, Anouilh’s *Antigone* remained supremely successful in its run in Paris, even after the war. Yet, when Anouilh’s *Antigone* came to America in 1946, it was received unequivocally as a Resistance play, and ran for only a
fraction of the performances it had received in Paris. Performed as a play about the Resistance for over sixty years, this study explores how and why Anouilh’s *Antigone* has been misunderstood by both the public and theatre history. As recently as 2001, Mary Anne Frese Witt, Kerri Walsh, and other theatre scholars express this dilemma of interpretation surrounding Anouilh’s *Antigone* as still relevant.

As Katie Fleming notes in the abstract to her examination of “aesthetic fascism” in WWII European theatre:

> Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone* has long provoked discussion and controversy. First performed in the final year of the Occupation, Anouilh’s *Antigone* goes to the very heart of the debate about the appropriation of classics in the ideological battles of the Second World War... the *Antigone* story has stood as a figurehead for the meaning of Greek culture in the development of European thought and society. Anouilh’s *Antigone* follows in the footsteps of this tradition. (169)

Yet, the available material in English on Anouilh’s *Antigone* maintains its legacy as a Resistance play. Through a variety of research from such academic journals as *The French Review, Modern Drama, Yale French Studies, Diacritics, The Modern Language Review, Journal of European Studies, SubStance, New Literary History, French Historical Studies, The Classical Journal, Philosophy and Literature, Revue d’Histoire Littéraire de la France, Classical Philology, Critical Inquiry, Contemporary European History, Comparative Literature, Transactions of the American Philolological Association, College English, Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature*, and *Revue d’Histoire du Théâtre*, as well as the digital collections of lending academic institutions such as University of Birmingham, Kent State University, Butler University, Princeton University, University of Michigan, and Cornell University, and relevant
digital depositories such as *Post War Europe: Refugees, Exile and Resettlement, 1945-1950*, and *The Critical Art Ensemble*, I confirmed that when *Antigone* first premiered in February 1944, the Parisian public was markedly divided in their interpretation.

A handful of existing reviews of Anouilh’s *Antigone* can be located, though few to none have been translated into English, many are notations of documents no longer in existence at all, and none of them are available hard copy in the United States. Therefore, for the purposes of this study I have comparatively translated Anouilh’s *Antigone* against Lewis Galantière’s enduring English translation with a focus on the greatest alterations. Because of the limits of this study, my inquiry engages only with the most relevant portions of the altered script and does not include a complete re-translation of Anouilh’s play.

George Steiner, for example, in his *Antigones* (1986), unequivocally views Anouilh’s Creon as triumphant, intimating a pro-fascist bent; Leo Weinstein, on the other hand, remarks in his 1989 book, “Antigone’s call to Resistance is a message that seems unmistakably clear” (2). Though, even at this level there is a marked absence of available material in English, and most surprisingly, there exists no significant English translation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* since its first journey across the Atlantic in 1946.

In his memoirs, which, significant to my argument, are out of print and have never been translated into English, Anouilh claims political ignorance *absolut* when he wrote and produced *Antigone*. He states: “My conscience is clear. I knew nothing of the resistance movement during the war” (Anouilh 166). Disengaging *Antigone* from political debate, as Anouilh himself does, I propose that it is perhaps more useful to view this play in terms of its broader context of late modernist aesthetics than the political binaries of resistance and collaboration.

Yet, my research had one more major discovery for me that was to turn my inquiry into a
thesis. I wondered why at the time it was originally performed there had been such a polemic response to Anouilh’s Antigone, yet when it was received in the United States and Britain shortly after the war, the debate ended and all hailed it as a Resistance play for the Allies.

In the months between Antigone’s February première in Paris and the liberation by the Allied Forces in August, the swirling controversy over interpretation continued in the polemic press. Yet, almost immediately after the liberation, Anouilh’s Antigone was publicly acknowledged as a Resistance play. The Germans had been ousted, Vichy was a shambles, and Allied troops now occupied the city of Paris. A great number of American and British soldiers were stationed in Paris beginning in 1944, bringing a different kind of audience to the Atelier.

Among these English-speaking spectators was the American actress Katharine Cornell, who was in Europe concluding her U.S.O. tour, fell in love with the production, and brought it to America in 1946, marking Anouilh’s début on the English stage (Gillmore 117; Walsh 98). Soon after the Broadway production, Laurence Olivier presided over the British première of the play at the Old Vic in London. These early English-language adaptations by Cornell and Olivier reveal significant changes to Anouilh’s Antigone.

Key to the Cornell production’s influence on Anouilh’s reputation outside France was the selection of Lewis Galantière as translator. Of the many postwar alterations to the play in the American and British productions, both shared one major change that caused great distress for Anouilh. In his many letters throughout the process of adaptation and production, Galantière acknowledged the liberties he took with Anouilh’s text, writing: “I should be less than frank if I did not say that the play in which Miss Cornell and Sir Cedric Hardwicke will open tonight is not in every respect the play which M. Anouilh gave to Occupied France” (Walsh 6). Little was done to appease Anouilh, and the American production was less than moderately successful.
It is this reappropriation of Anouilh’s contested *Antigone* that defines my current inquiry. Firstly, it sheds light on why and how *Antigone* came to be dominantly regarded as a Resistance play. Secondly, it magnifies the highly subjective, ambiguous nature of Anouilh’s work itself. Finally, it problematizes adaptation and theatre history, and suggests that theatre history via the archive is political and unreliable.

My discussion is not a comprehensive study of wartime theatre, nor is it auteur analysis of Jean Anouilh’s works; rather I intend to reopen interpretive discourse about this play by exposing its origins, its journey, and the archival theories and practices controlling its legacy and reception to this day. With a view to dismantle some of the misconceptions this play has experienced since its premiere in America over six decades ago, I consider relevant archival theories and practices, as well as adaptation studies to create a space in which multiple readings of this play can exist.

This investigation into the survival of Anouilh’s *Antigone* since its premiere in 1944, is located at the intersection between adaptation and archival theory and practice, it begins with a brief overview of the original performance of Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone* and the significant political controversy it caused. Though many specific works regarding Anouilh appear in the form of reviews/criticisms during his productions in the late 1930s up until the mid-1950s, as well as some biographical work done after Anouilh’s death in 1987, I will consider a diverse range of scholarship in the first chapter.

Comparatively little critical or academic attention has been given to the French playwright Jean Anouilh. However, a copious amount of research exists about the ways in which European political theatre functioned during WWII. Focusing on Anouilh’s adaptation of *Antigone* within the volatile political and social environments of occupied France allows me to
draw from a diverse index of scholarly material.

One of the most recent studies regarding Anouilh’s *Antigone* is Kenneth Krauss’ *The Drama of Fallen France: Reading la Comédie sans Tickets* (2004), in which he examines various dramatic works written and/or produced during the Nazi occupation of France. Though Krauss only devotes one chapter in his book to Anouilh’s *Antigone*, “The Politics of Intention: Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone* via *Oreste,*” his examination of what he calls “Theatre Ambiguity/Audience Reception” in Anouilh’s premier production at the Théâtre de l’Atelier in Paris provides insights into the intricacies of pre-production, production, and audience reception. Krauss’ larger study, however, reads wartime drama through the lens of sexuality. Therefore, his focus is on the gender politics of Anouilh’s adaptation, and the prototypical figure of Antigone as Vichy propaganda for the subordination of women.

In terms of historical context, Robert O. Paxton’s *Vichy France: Old Guard New Order* 1940-1944, written in 1982, tackles the much written about and obfuscatory Vichy period. What recommends Paxton’s book to this study is his use of the then-newly-procured and unutilized captured German documents. Paxton’s purpose is “to restore Vichy’s initiatives to view” (47). He explores the specifics of France’s double-life throughout the occupation to demonstrate that collaboration within Hitler’s new order was an active French concept pushed by Vichy from 1940 through 1943 and beyond. I draw from Paxton’s vast examination of this period to better understand France under Vichy, from censorship policies to cultural ideologies. Paxton provides well-documented information about both the French lay resistance as well as discussing the formation and activities of various artistic movements in France, making this book a primary source for the historical contextualization of my study of Anouilh’s *Antigone*.

In addition to Paxton, *Le Syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours* (1991), by Henry
Rousso, focuses France during the war, specifically discussing the “afterlife” of the Vichy regime in French public life and memory (92). Rousso begins *Le Syndrome de Vichy* (hereafter referred to as *The Vichy Syndrome*) by attributing the continuing obsession with the Vichy period to the facts that the Second World War was an ideological conflict, and that the contestations, which produced the conflict are still active today (71). Rousso notes that the defeat of 1940 was so traumatic to the French national psyche that its devastation continues to affect the French people and how they view their fragmented past and future.

Establishing, as I do in my first chapter, the historical moment from which Anouilh’s *Antigone* emerged, the premiere, and the ensuing political controversy it garnered, I then draw on this crucial historical context throughout my inquiry. Most importantly in chapter two, I discuss the radically different reception of *Antigone* that arose a few months later, during the liberation of Paris by Allied forces, and its life- and legacy-altering translation by Lewis Galantière in America.

Turning from France in general during the war, I focus more specifically on Paris and Jean Anouilh by looking at the theatre scholarship offered by such authors as David Bradby’s *Modern French Drama*, Murray Sachs’ “Notes on the Theatricality of Jean Anouilh’s Antigone”, and Leo O. Forkey’s “The Theatres of Paris during the Occupation” for *The French Review*. These scholars address in detail the particulars of Anouilh’s production and its reception. In addition, I consult extant first-hand accounts of individuals who witnessed Anouilh’s *Antigone* in Paris. For example, Janet Flanner (Genêt), who wrote the famed *Paris Journal* featured in *The New Yorker* from 1925 until her retirement in 1975, attended Anouilh’s production in Paris after the liberation. American actress Katherine Cornell, in her biography *Leading Lady* by Tad Mosel, discusses at length her love of Anouilh’s production in Paris and her determination and
success in bringing it to American audiences.

Edward Boothroyd’s dissertation “The Parisian Stage During the Occupation, 1940-1944: A Theatre of Resistance?” for the University of Birmingham in 2009 contains copious details and reviews of the French stage throughout the war. Also, Manfred Flügge’s 1982 two volume work, *Verweigerung oder Neue Ordnung: Jean Anouilh’s ‘Antigone’ im politischen und ideologischen Kontext der Besatzungszeit, 1940-1944*, stands as an exhaustive work in the realm of Anouilh scholarship. Though the document is in German, Flügge includes many passages in French lifted directly from untranslated works that are yet unavailable in the United States.

The majority of the research that exists about Anouilh’s *Antigone* is in the form of scholarly essays, articles, and biographical works. It seems that a spike of academic interest in Jean Anouilh’s life and career occurred in the 1970s and ‘80s, near the time of the playwright’s death. To my knowledge, there are no recent book-length studies of Anouilh’s work. I will, however, draw from biographical essays and books written by Edward Owen Marsh (1953), Alba Della Fazia (1969), Lewis W. Falb (1977), and Christopher Smith (1985).

I will also consider H.G. McIntyre’s short book *The Theatre of Jean Anouilh* (1981). While McIntyre devotes his book to all of Anouilh’s plays, he points to a shift in Anouilh’s dramatic emphasis after the year 1940 (the first year of the occupation), claiming the choice of dying becomes one of the dominant themes of Anouilh’s mythical and historical theater (McIntyre 13).

*The World of Anouilh*, the first, and to my knowledge, only comprehensive treatment of Anouilh’s work in English, written in 1961 by Leonard Cabell Pronko, will feature prominently in my study. Pronko divides his material into two main parts; the first deals with dramatic themes, and the second with dramatic values. Pronko asserts Anouilh’s dominant themes include
man’s predicament, the illusion of love, and social classes. Pronko’s examination of Anouilh’s dramatic values cites various modes of realism, characters, including their psychology and symbols, and the use of myth.

Keri Walsh’s dissertation for Princeton University in 2009, “Antigone in Modernism: Classicism, Feminism, and Theatres of Protest” discusses Antigone as an enigmatic character, charting her importance and influence, particularly in the twentieth century. Though our arguments differ, Walsh’s treatment of Antigone in her many forms has been very valuable to this study. Mary Anne Frese Witt in The Search for Modern Tragedy: Aesthetic Fascism in Italy and France (2001) gives some attention to Anouilh’s Antigone. Though Witt asserts that Anouilh’s ambiguity is indicative of what she perceives as sympathizer/fascist politics, her discussion of the importance of his script and the controversy it caused is of great benefit to this inquiry.

Within the context provided by the historical works listed above, I examine why this particular adaptation of Antigone has remained, since its premier in 1944, locked in a vocabulary of binary political terms and is one of the most contested Antigones in terms of reception, interpretation, and legacy. Therefore, in the final part of my examination of Jean Anouilh’s play, I approach Antigone through the lenses of archival theory and practice, as outlined by Jacques Derrida and supported by archival theorists such as Kenneth E. Foote, Jack Goody, and Maurice Halbwachs.

In his original lecture, entitled Mal D’archive (“Archive Fever”) Derrida analyses and deconstructs the concept of the archive vis á vis Freud’s psycho-analytical model, and is chiefly concerned with method and codification. As a seminal work in the field of archival practice and theory, I will be extracting key points from Derrida’s deconstructive analysis to construct a
critical vocabulary for my treatment of Jean Anouilh’s Antigone. Aiding in my understanding of Derrida’s Archive Fever are Michel de Certeau’s The Writing of History and Michel Foucault’s The Archeology of Knowledge.

Intersecting archival theory and practice with theatre performance, as this study does, Diana Taylor’s The Archive and the Repertoire will be of great significance. The multidisciplinary nature of performance studies invites analytical perspectives from many fields. Indeed, to engage the nebulous borders of performance studies within the historical syncretism of the wartime West is a formidable task. Taylor’s central thesis develops the concept of a repertoire as a “corporeal, multi-generational heritage of actions” that exists independently of the archive, which is, exclusively, recorded material (22). It is important to note that Taylor does not present her archival/repertoiric theories as binaries, rather she notes that the repertoire, like the archive, is mediated and therefore each can be seen as equally powerful and political entities.

Most importantly, Taylor’s theories lend to this historical investigation a means by which to center Anouilh’s Antigone within but in contrast to its political environment. Interested as I am in Taylor’s work, I will not be addressing her extensive writing on the digital, nor will I be considering the many chapters she devotes in her book to Mexican, Mexican-American and Chicano repertoires. Rather, I look specifically at the historical and practical implications that her theories on the archive suggest. By looking at the differences between the Galantière and Anouilh’s Antigone, in tandem with the unreliable nature of the archive, it is possible to separate Anouilh’s Antigone from the Galantière adaptation, allowing for potential discourse that is more appropriate to the myth’s ambivalent nature and power.

In my conclusions, I will briefly touch on adaptation studies via scholars James Hillman, Lawrence Coupe, Linda Hutcheon, Phyllis Frus and Christy Williams. Hutcheon’s A Theory of
Adaptation expands the boundaries of adaptation studies by articulating a new model for adaptation studies based on what she terms “modes of engagement.” Hutcheon’s adaptation theories concerning theatre performance are far-reaching and certainly beyond the scope of this study. However, her scholarship on the nature of myth and adaptation serve to support my conclusions about the reappropriation of Anouilh’s Antigone in America. Frus and Williams provide my study with a critical vocabulary through which I address and analyze Jean Anouilh’s Antigone and its Galantière adaptation. Lawrence Coupe’s great work Myth: The New Critical Idiom parses out the pitfalls in successfully adapting myth and lends to this study a way to view Anouilh’s Antigone as myth and as ambiguous.

Finally, and significant to my later argument, for the purposes of this study and in the lack of any significant English translation, I have comparatively translated Anouilh’s original 1944 French play script and will compare it against the Lewis Galantière translation for analysis. I must note that in March 2004, Christopher Nixon of LA Theatre Works, an audio theatre project, revised the Galantière script for a readers-theatre experience. I have fully investigated the Nixon adaptation, and I do not consider it a significant translation in terms of my argument for two reasons.

Firstly, it exists in audio format only. The LA production was recorded, but no script of Nixon’s adaptation exists in the public domain. Secondly, after examining the recording of Nixon’s production, his production follows the same political intentions that Galantière’s script suggests. Therefore, Nixon’s translation is not significant to my study because it does not omit or challenge the significant changes Galantière made in the original 1946 translation.

My investigation into Jean Anouilh’s Antigone begins with a look at the historical moment from which it emerged, the production and premier, and the political and philosophical
controversy it ignited. The second chapter centers on the changing reception of Anouilh’s *Antigone* beginning with the liberation of Paris to its premiere on the Broadway stage the following year. Additionally, I expose the exact changes made to Anouilh’s script by Lewis Galantière and the ramifications of such alterations. The third and final chapter provides a critical vocabulary drawn from the fields of archival theory and practice and adaptation studies.
CHAPTER ONE: PARIS IN PARADOX

The German Occupation of France during the Second World War is referred to by the French as les années noires (the dark years). Yet, this same period has also been characterized as un âge d’or (a golden age) of French theatre. It is thus a time that embodies paradox and ambivalence. Within this environment, Jean Anouilh created a theatrical event mirroring the widespread and powerful uncertainty felt by Occupied Paris and the world at war; Antigone became an event that provoked powerful feelings from the divided identities of the citizens of Paris. Albert Camus’ unequivocal assertion on the paradoxical state of man, made shortly after the war, epitomizes the French spirit under Antigone, “I rebel, and therefore we are” (Camus 22).

This chapter lays the foundation for a fresh understanding of Jean Anouilh’s Antigone as it first emerged and was received by the Parisian public in 1944. I will discuss its premiere and initial run before the liberation in August 1944. I demonstrate in this chapter how profoundly divided the Parisian public and critics were in their interpretation of Anouilh’s Antigone, thus establishing the inherent ambivalence of the original script. In the next chapter, I will show how the liberation of Paris and in particular the translation of Anouilh’s script into English for American audiences, changed the way Antigone is seen to this day.

After the rapid advance of the German armies, the fall of Paris, the exodus of its inhabitants, and the armistice in the spring of 1940, France was divided in two zones, with Paris, the center of the French theatre, as the new epicenter of the occupied zone. The Germans could have closed the theatres and converted them into barracks, as Charles Méré observed in his column, Aujourd’hui on June 18, 1941, but in fact, they were allowed to reopen after the initial takeover in 1940. At the close of that same year, some thirty-three theatres in Paris were presenting plays (Forkey 299). The Germans not only allowed the theatres to reopen, but
encouraged them as an integral part of their program to make Paris a recreation center and France a pastoral playground.

While various theatres were allowed to stay open, Nazi-Vichy censorship of what was permitted to play was stringent. Vichy controlled the subsidized theatres and the German occupational forces exercised censorship over all. For example, Théâtre Sarah-Bernhardt was immediately renamed the Théâtre de la Cité, because Vichy blamed the decadence of the theatre on Jewish commercialization (Forkey 300).

According to Henry Rousso, the French people often held Vichy to be more responsible than the Germans for the fanaticism employed in censorship. For example, Vichy exerted control over the material and practical concerns of putting on a production, often rejecting certain props or staging techniques as too subversive or suggestive, as well as combing the scripts for sensitive subjects and language. Vichy supporters and officials turned out in droves for “approved” plays in an effort to continue censorship during performance. Furthermore, Boothroyd explains in his analysis of French Resistance Theatre, that issues such as black-outs, air-raid alerts, coal and electricity shortages as well as curfews and curtailed transportation, often presented problems for audiences and theatres alike. He notes that the French felt that every new production with its settings and costumes represented a victory over shortages and scarcities, and a triumph over Vichy.

Despite such grave difficulties and restrictions, the Parisian public flocked to the theatre, many, as indicated by the plentiful reviews and operettas, for an escape. The Châtelet opened on January 1, 1941 with *Rose-Marie*. The Comédie Française sought to gain its footing with the plays of neo-classicists like Corneille, Racine, Molière and de Musset. Revivals of *La Dame aux
Camélias and Les Mousquetaires au Couvent were some of the most popular shows during the occupation, providing the public with moral constancy of nostalgia (Forkey 302).

An examination of the billboards for the year 1941-1942 in Paris reveals an interesting trend, for the new plays did not treat the contemporary scene, but rather sought their inspiration and surroundings in archetypal legends and Greek mythology. For example, over the course of less than a year the following plays premiered in Paris: Jean Anouilh’s Eurydice; L’Échec à Don Juan by Claude-André Puget, a variation of the Don Juan theme; Mon Royaume est sur la Terre by Jean François Noël, dealing with Philippe-le-Bel and the Knights Templar; Jeanne Avec Nous, yet another take on the Joan of Arc legend by Claude Vermorel; an adaptation of La Celestina of Fernando de Rojas by Paul Achard; Lucien Fabre's Dieu est Innocent, a variant of the Oedipal cycle; and Peyret-Chapuis’ Les Dieux de la Nuit, another drama dealing with the misfortunes of Phèdre (Forkey 303). Needless to say, myths, legends and the glories of history dominated the theatres of Paris during this time. I think it is reasonable to see that the fated order of historical narratives and ancient myths and the beauty of epic poetry provided a modicum of comfort for the spectators of an increasingly unstable country.

The year 1942-1943 again witnessed the triumph of the poetic theatre, with examples such as the début of Henry de Montherlant’s La Reine Morte, Synge's Deidre des Douleurs, Renée Fauchois' Rêves d'Amour, Germaine LeFrancq's Les Inséparables and Stève Passeur's La Visiteuse (Forkey 303). During the 1942-1943 season, Le Marché Noir by Stève Passeur dealt with the black market, and the next year’s season premiered Les Eaux Basses by André Roubaud, a political satire, and L'École des Faisans by Paul Nivoix, another drama about the black market. The theme of things underground can be attributed to the rise of the resistance movement in Paris at this time.
To concisely define the resistance movement in France as a whole is difficult. But it is necessary for this study in differentiating Anouilh’s work from the resistance movement. Firstly, in his untranslated memoirs, Anouilh separates himself from the resistance by claiming political ignorance *absolut*. As noted earlier, he explains that he “knew nothing of the resistance movement during the war” (166).

Furthermore, though the theatre was an important part of the French resistance movement, often providing a public venue ideal for circulating leaflets and flyers, as Gordon Wright notes in *Reflections on the French Resistance (1940-1944)*, the heart of the resistance was its underground printing force,

> From its tiny spontaneous beginnings, the underground grew into a vast and complex network that by 1944 could publish several hundred clandestine newspapers with a total circulation of two million, could put a quarter of a million guerrilla-type soldiers into the field, and could provide the personnel for administering liberated France. (43)

By 1943, Marie Bell, Pierre Dux, Julien Bertheau, Pierre Blanchar, André Luguet, Raymond Rouleau, Armand Salacrou and Jean-Paul Sartre had formed one of the most important underground resistance groups in the country – Le Front National du Théâtre. This resistance cell actively collaborated with underground publications, distributions of leaflets, and so on.

As can be seen in the following highlights of the resistance movement, Sartre’s Le Front National exemplified the critical printing work done by the underground press. According to Jørgen Haestrup in his massive work *European Resistance Movements, 1939-1945: A Complete History*, resistance groups were forming immediately after the occupation. However, they did not unite until May 1943 under the National Council of the Resistance (CNR.) The underground
press had its major production centers in Lyon, Paris, and Toulouse. It is estimated that the circulation of the clandestine press reached an upwards of 1.5 million copies per month.

In Paris on the evening of July 14, 1943, the extraordinary Front National managed to coordinate their resistance work in all the theatres of Paris, when during all performances, a shower of resistance literature and tracts fell on the spectators (Forkey 305). Most importantly, however, in differentiating Anouilh’s work on the Paris stage from that of the resistance movement, is that the clandestine press concerned itself primarily with garnering information about and support against the Nazi and Vichy regimes (Haestrup 434-489). Claiming that he was an artisan, not a thinker, Anouilh abstained from such political ambitions, stating in an interview for the Paris-Match in 1972: “I simply do not think in terms of politics. That is the extent of my refusal” (qtd. in Parker 1).

Anouilh, who repeatedly stated, “My life, as long as Heaven wills it, will remain my own personal business, and I will reserve my right to withhold the details of it” did in his later years shed light on his own creative obsession (translation mine, Ginestier 117). Being careful to note later that his ideas about purity come from a theatrical understanding, not from fascism, Anouilh notes: “For thirty years I have been writing about lost purity, as others have about adultery” (Brasillach xi; qtd. in Thody 9).

Literature historian Frank Jones effectively describes Anouilh’s Paris thus, “In Paris in 1945 it was possible for a time to see the story of Antigone enacted in three different versions: that of Sophocles; that of Robert Garnier (1579) adapted for the modern stage by Thierry Maulnier; and that of Jean Anouilh which had a steady run since its premiere in February 1944” (91). Jones continues his description by adding, “This situation was unusual, and possibly unique in that it exemplifies simultaneously the three ways in which the European stage has tried to
come to grips with Greek tragedy since the Renaissance: restoration and adaptation and re-
creation” (91).

Re-creation and re-telling are certainly key features of myth, but they are also themes found in the immediate context of collaboration, occupation, and propaganda of the World War II period. It is evident that the highly translatable nature of Greek myth, and the equally immutable character of Antigone in particular, held a paradoxical appeal for the French, so much so that theatre critic André Fraigneau noted, “Our theatre today has moved into a howling, screaming, ‘Antigone crisis’” (Witt 219). Perhaps it is the “a-contextual” nature of myth that lends itself so well to adaptation. Myth has an eternality that allows it to be free of contexts and true for all people, wherever, whenever, they may be. But more importantly, the adaptation of a myth suggests a paradox, or a duality within itself. Anouilh, as adapter and bricoleur, is fitting two worlds together – the Sophoclean and the Modern.

From the inter-war years on, authors such as Cocteau, Giraudoux and Camus turned to Greek myths in an attempt to articulate the modern individual’s crisis of identity, isolation, alienation, and doubt – pre-existential musings certainly. World War II scholars such as Robert Paxton and Henry Rousso characterize this period in France as one of rupture and continuity – a paradox to say the least. As Ethan Katz states, “The years 1940-1944 saw a series of military, political, and cultural reckonings with the French past, present and future that changed for ever [sic] how the French saw their revolution, their country and themselves” (154).

It is within this environment that Anouilh’s Antigone emerges – and even its premiere is clouded in controversy. The exact date of Antigone’s premiere is difficult to determine due to inconsistencies in the announcements appearing in Parisian cultural newspapers, so for the purposes of this study, I shall limit my focus to the first public premiere on Tuesday, February
15, 1944. Evidence of Antigone’s inconsistent press campaign can be seen in the memoirs of Antigone’s director André Barsacq’s son, Jean-Louis Barsacq. Apparently, Jean-Louis was shocked by the number of people present at the premiere performances of Antigone, because the press release has been so conflicting he had expected very few patrons to be present (Barsacq 302). This surprising public enthusiasm was to mark the long run of Antigone at the Atelier Theatre.

Performances of Antigone were interrupted by frequent bomb alerts, and most performances went without electricity and heat due to air raids, but the people of Paris still attended nightly in droves. The press and audiences of 1944 hailed Anouilh’s heroine as the embodiment of the true French spirit – an ambiguous claim, considering the political division in Paris. The Parisian newspaper L’Appel exclaimed on February 10, 1944, “Yes, the Greek Antigone we have always known was good, but this younger, rejuvenated, adaptation is a French Antigone for 1944!” (emphasis mine; trans. mine; qtd. in Flügge 263). Anouilh’s director, Louis Barsacq, in an interview for the newspaper Au Pilori further supports this sense of a new kind of Antigone, on January 6,

This is my favorite play by Anouilh. It has the purity of a crystal. It isn’t really an adaptation of Sophocles’s tale at all. It is all Anouilh, without any blending. Think for example that Créon, who, in Sophocles, condemns Antigone to death, distinctly attempts to save her from her fate. This is just one example of Anouilh’s departure from the original. (trans. mine; qtd in Flügge 264)

Throughout the interview, Barsacq stays apolitical in tone, alluding to the “atemporal style” sought by playwright and director and of leaving interpretation to the audience – both markedly modern characteristics (Flügge 264; Boothroyd 256). I think it is safe to say that textual fidelity
to Sophocles’s script was not the goal of the Anouilh-Barsacq team.

As Murray Sachs notes in his 1964 essay for *The French Review*, “Notes on the Theatricality of Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone*”:

The intent in *Antigone*, of course, was to be neither French nor Greek. And this purpose is accomplished by imaginatively calculated theatrical means. The opening stage directions specify that the curtain goes up on *un decor neutre*, and that the characters, who are already on stage, *bavardent, tricotent, jouent aux cartes*. Ever since the first production, and probably on Anouilh’s initiative, all the actors have been dressed in modern evening clothes. The plain intent of the stage directions and costumes is to plant in the minds of the audience the idea that the time of the action is very much the present, though not in any specifically identifiable time or place. This effect is further reinforced throughout the play by a whole series of deliberate anachronisms (for example, the nurse offers Antigone “*un bon café et des tartines*,” Polynices is described as fond of racing “*avec ses voitures*,” and of spending money “*dans les bars*,” the guard takes Antigone prisoner with ”*des menottes*,” etc.), and by the free use of contemporary slang among all the characters. Thus Anouilh neither avoids mention of the past, nor prevents identification with the present, but by subtly blending the two achieves a convincing sense of timelessness and universality. This universality has been much praised, and it is perfectly suited to the play’s theme. (6)

Further demonstrating the popularity of *Antigone* with the French public, large extracts of the play were published weekly in quarto format with high quality photos by *L’Illustration* from
February 26, 1944 on (Krauss 109). Anouilh had certainly managed to get the public’s attention with his modern adaption of this familiar myth – attention that ignited the Parisian press.

As biographer Alba della Fazia notes, “When Antigone was first presented in Paris at the Théâtre de l’Atelier in February 1944, a polemic arose concerning the interpretation of the play and the significance of the two main characters” (22). Indeed, Jean Paul Sartre, who was living in Paris and working with the resistance at the time of the “Antigone crisis”, noted the controversy Anouilh’s Antigone caused, writing, as noted earlier: “… with Antigone, [Anouilh is] being charged on the one hand with being a Nazi, on the other with being an anarchist” (40).

The more attention the play received, the more the Parisian public poured in to see it. Parisian theatre critic, Roland Purnal, in the February 19, 1944 issue of Comœdia, declared that all advocates of the play were snobs, while René Trintzius pronounced for the German-controlled La Gerbe on April 27, 1944 that opponents of the play were in fact the snobs (Boothroyd 271). In his treatment of Parisian Resistance Theatre throughout the war, Edward Boothroyd notes that within the first two months of the Antigone public premiere, about thirty reviews appeared in Paris alone, “with only a couple clearly rejecting the play and fourteen praising it unreservedly” (Boothroyd 272).

Anouilh’s Antigone must have resonated with the Parisian zeitgeist, for across the city, political publications, collaborationist papers, and even small journals included reviews of the play, with many papers featuring more than one substantial review. Even the notoriously fascist, yet highly influential editor, journalist, and critic, Alain Laubreaux, joined the cacophony surrounding the Antigone controversy, noting the universality of Anouilh’s play in his article Je suis partout, on February 25, 1944: “The whole world is talking about this” (qtd. in Dioudonnat 49).
Yet perhaps the most remarkable aspect of Paris’ reception of Anouilh’s *Antigone* was that even during performance, spectators were drawn into powerful opposing emotions. Highlighting *Antigone’s* ambiguous text, audience members and critics Beatrix Dussane, Henri Amouroux, and Herve Le Boterf attested, from their first hand observations, to the tendency of Resistance sympathizers in the audience to hail Anouilh’s *Antigone*, while collaborationists applauded along with them, sometimes rallying, cross-purposed around the same single line (Dussane 111; Le Boterf 251; Amouroux 250).

Such a flurry of reaction from Anouilh’s peers, press, and countrymen certainly speaks to the effect, if not the ambivalence, of *Antigone*. Certainly, the views prevalent in 1944 were informed by a contextual, allegorical understanding of Créon as Vichy leader Pétain, and Antigone as an active French resister; certainly this interpretation of *Antigone* was largely determined by these early responses to the play, which, as demonstrated, were never in agreement. As David Bradby notes in *Modern French Drama 1940-1980*:

> At the time of the play’s first production the structure was sufficient and the emptiness [of Antigone’s sacrifice] went unnoticed for the most part, since each member of the audience read into the play his own concrete difficulties – whether to resist, whether to collaborate. *Antigone* was well reviewed in the Collaborationist press and was at first assumed to be on the Vichy side. But the progressive isolation of Antigone carries along with it a strong emotional charge when the play is being performed, leading an audience to sympathise with her much more strongly than might be evident from a reading of the play. Gradually the public came to identify more with Antigone and her uncompromising ‘No!’ Créon came to be seen, not as the sensible compromiser but as the opportunistic
collaborator. (35-36)

Perhaps the play would have remained ever ambiguous – a notion that a decade or so later, the French existentialists would have rallied around. But the liberation of Paris during Antigone’s initial run changed the way Anouilh’s play is seen to this day. Establishing as I have a review of the controversial context from which Anouilh’s Antigone emerges, I can now analyze the next step in Antigone’s journey.
CHAPTER TWO: ANTIGONE IN TRANSLATION

It is clear from the available material in English on Anouilh’s Antigone that the archive maintains its legacy as a resistance play. Inside the realm of digital entries and theatre history textbooks, one would find little to contest that interpretation. Yet, as I established in chapter one, when Antigone first premiered in February 1944, the Parisian public was markedly divided in their interpretation of it. The Parisian press exploded with debate over its interpretation.

In this chapter, I chart Anouilh’s Antigone through the liberation of Paris, and, most significantly, across the Atlantic to America. It is on this journey that Anouilh’s Antigone takes a decisive turn in terms of adaptation, translation, and legacy. I will discuss the significance of Katherine Cornell and Lewis Galantière to Anouilh’s Antigone and analyze the significant changes made to Anouilh’s script.

In the absence of any significant translation of Anouilh’s Antigone since the Galantière adaptation in 1946, I have included in this study my own translation of the most significantly altered portions of Anouilh’s script to compare with Galantière’s. A fresh look at the major differences between these two scripts enables me to expose the significant changes that erased the ambiguity, and consequently, the controversy and greatness of Anouilh’s original Antigone.

In addition to my translation work on the script, much of the archival material used in this study has never been translated into English and are often copies of originals no longer in existence. In my next and final chapter, this lack of available material becomes even more significant.

In the months between Antigone’s February premiere and the liberation by the Allied Forces in August, the swirling controversy over interpretation continued in the polemic press. The Antigone obsession had reached even reached the foreign press – a journalist in Geneva compared the bataille d’Antigone to the bataille d’Hernani (Flügge 324). Though successful in
its run throughout the liberation, the “Antigone preoccupation” of Paris, as noted by critic André Fraigneau, continued, but in a different spirit (Witt 219). The Germans had been ousted, Vichy was exposed and fell into shambles, and Allied troops now occupied the city of Paris. English speakers began pouring into performances alongside their French allies, and with them came the triumphant spirit of victory.

Janet Flanner (Genêt), of The New Yorker’s “Paris Journal” was living and working in Paris in 1945 and saw Anouilh’s production in Paris after the liberation. In her March 7, 1945 journal entry from Paris for The New Yorker, Genêt describes her experience thus,

Two extremely curious plays that ran under the baffled Nazis have persisted into the liberation. The weightier of the pair is the Atelier Theatre’s Antigone, once by Sophocles, now put into modern dress and modern psychology by Jean Anouilh, a well-known dramatist. It is extraordinary that the Germans, with their power complex, should have permitted the presentation of this power classic, which for two thousand years has been proving that individual rebellion is a good idea. The fillip of anachronism which modern dress and mode always give to the classics is especially thought provoking in Antigone (21).

But even in Paris’ liberated climate, where political conflicts had lost some of their harsh rhetoric, Anouilh’s script continued to produce debate. For where Genêt saw depth and wit, other critics began to re-appraise the play, citing faults such as “extreme subjectivity” or “mawkish sentimentality” (Bradby 36). Hubert Gignoux, a prominent theatre producer dismissed Anouilh’s Antigone as “a psychological drama that merely meets the requirements of tragedy” (trans. mine, Gignoux 115).

However, one famous American visitor to Anouilh’s Antigone would enter and alter the
debate, at least in the public sphere, forever. As noted, a great number of American and British troops were stationed in Paris beginning in 1944 after the liberation, bringing a new audience to *Antigone* at l’Atelier, and later, at Théâtre Antoine. One of the most significant members of this English-speaking audience was the American actress Katharine Cornell (*Best Plays of 1945-1946*, 176). Cornell was in Europe concluding her U.S.O. tour, ending with a record forty performances as Elizabeth Barrett Browning in *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* (Gillmore 117). Cornell attended *Antigone* “in an unheated theatre in Paris,” though the date is unclear; as she remarked later, on February 15, 1948, to the *New York Times*, “the memory of it would not leave me and I knew I must do it.”

We may never know why she felt this way, but Cornell was not alone in her enthusiasm for the play. Even before her clandestine visit, a reviewer in the September 29, 1944 issue of *L’Homme Libre*, just six months after a tumult of damning collaborator reviews, now saw Antigone as the French “sister of all those who dared to say ‘no’ until death” (qtd. in Witt 228); and the following day, *Le Front National* suggested “an ‘anti-fascist accent’ could be heard in Antigone’s resistance to ‘the tyrant Creon’” (qtd. in Witt 228).

Cornell’s discovery of this play under the unique circumstances of the Liberation, and the powerful feeling of prevailing right and optimism that swelled in the streets of Paris as Charles de Gaulle and the Résistants returned to Paris, is certainly a factor in considering her attachment to Anouilh’s *Antigone*. However, it is evident that the modern ideology in this play resonated with Cornell, Genêt, Camus, Sartre, Cocteau and others, perhaps even more so than the possible political interpretations that were still palpable.

After initially viewing the original production in Paris, she had decided she wanted to produce Anouilh’s *Antigone* in America with the production company she shared with her
husband, Cornell & McClintic Productions, Inc. (Mantle 176). Immediately after returning to the States, Cornell discovered others were interested in Anouilh’s script for American audiences. After a battle with Metro-Goldwyn Pictures, and later Gilbert Miller from the Office of War Information, for the dramatic rights to produce Anouilh’s *Antigone* in the United States, Cornell agreed to co-produce with Miller, and secured the play. Lewis Galantière was appointed translator, and by February 18, 1946 *Antigone* reached Broadway, marking Anouilh’s debut on the English stage (Mantle 176; Walsh 98).

The Broadway production of *Antigone* was directed by Cornell’s husband Guthrie McClintic, and the cast included the famed Cedric Hardwicke as Creon, Cornell herself playing Antigone, the relatively obscure Horace Braham as the Chorus, and a young Marlon Brando as the understudy for the Messenger. Key to the production’s influence on Anouilh’s reputation outside France, however, was the selection of Lewis Galantière as translator (Cornell 39).

So definitive was Galantière’s translation, that in the sixty years since its debut on the American stage, no significant English translations have been made. As previously stated, this study is in part an attempt to fill that gap by looking at the most significant changes Galantière made to Anouilh’s script. In the rest of this chapter, I will briefly discuss the American response to Cornell’s production of *Antigone*, and then I will use my translation of the specific changes made to Anouilh’s script against Galantière’s to finally expose the postwar alterations that changed the reception and legacy of Anouilh’s *Antigone* forever.

There were great expectations for the Broadway premier of Cornell’s *Antigone*. Opening night press reviews were favorable, though largely because of Cornell’s personal involvement in the play (Mantle 176). Perhaps the most astonishing aspect of the American response to Cornell’s *Antigone* is the middling lack of praise or pan. If there was one thing certain about
Anouilh’s *Antigone*, it was that it incited debate – whether political or, later after the liberation, philosophical. As I established in chapter one, a roar of public and critical controversy surrounded this play and its interpretation in Paris. Yet, when it opened for American audiences on Broadway in 1946, it was met with passivity.

Howard Barnes of the New York *Tribune* remarked simply and smugly that he supposed, “Sophocles became an honorary member of the French resistance movement” (qtd. in Mantle 177). Even more underwhelmed, Louis Kronenberger of the newspaper *P.M.*, noted, “Anouilh’s *Antigone* [is] unlike Sophocles’… As an inspirational figure for an occupied Paris she undoubtedly had her value; as a human being she is quite unreal” (qtd. in Mantle 177). A far cry from the passionate debate incited in Paris, indeed it almost sounds like a different play.

The reviews were so indifferent, that in an interview with Harriet Johnson of the *New York Post*, Cornell felt it necessary to justify her own attachment to the play.

> I like to talk about the character of Antigone because I love and admire her. We can’t live by Antigones alone, but if we have no Antigone within us, we are spiritually barren. She was remote and willful, but she was uncompromisingly true to the things she believed; the conflict between Creon and Antigone is the conflict between the spirit and the flesh. (qtd. in Mantle 177)

Despite Cornell’s best efforts, *Antigone* only ran at the Cort Theatre for a total of 64 performances, from February 18 to May 4, 1946 – a far cry from Anouilh’s *Antigone* in Paris, which had 475 consecutive performances by autumn, 1947 (Boothroyd 275; Thody 329).

One can look at many possibilities for this twist in *Antigone*’s journey – latent American anti-French post-war sentiment, poor production or acting, removal from the immediate context of political fervor and rebellion, etc. However, the reviews do not seem concerned with
aesthetics or production design; indeed all hail the production design by Raymond Sovey and the fancy-dress evening gowns and tuxedos by Valentina as very well done (Mosel 485). If one considers the changes made to Anouilh’s Antigone for English-speaking audiences, surely the greatest alteration was the translation of the script itself.

In his many letters throughout the process of adaptation and production, Galantière acknowledged the liberties he took with Anouilh’s text, writing: “I should be less than frank if I did not say that the play in which Miss Cornell and Sir Cedric Hardwicke will open tonight is not in every respect the play which M. Anouilh gave to Occupied France” (qtd. in Walsh 6). With that admission in mind, comparison of the Galantière translation and Anouilh’s original French script firstly, and most generally, reveals changes to tone and vocabulary.

Instances of slang or colloquial banter are replaced with cleaner, more “appropriate” verbiage. The modern, as opposed to classical, dialogue in Anouilh’s script mentioned things like “going to the can” (34), “hopping in the sack” (40), “sex” (30), and “bitch” (27, 35). Anouilh’s inclusion of this language gives the French script a modern, more urban, base tone.

These and other words were cleared away with moralistic fervor for the postwar English-speaking audiences, taking the tone of the play from an “everyman” feel to the classical poetics of Galantière’s version. Anouilh’s use of spare, almost lonely words adds to the placeless, timeless quality that audience members noted during production. Galantière’s adaptation is wordier, laden with metaphoric flourishes. The script seems almost self-conscious of its Sophoclean heritage, hesitant to join the modern, postwar West. There is no doubt that Galantière’s translation is beautiful, imbuing Anouilh’s words with a poetic force too heavy for the original. Cleaning up “dirty” words, though, is only one of the changes Galantière made in translating this play for American audiences.
Most significantly, Galantière adds a section of lines for the Narrator during his opening speech. In the French, the Narrator ends this opening monologue wherein he reveals the plot, character, and purpose of the play, by stating, *Quiconque osera lui render les devoirs funèbres sera impitoyablement puni de mort* (Anouilh 13), and Galantière’s translation is close enough: “Above all, any person who attempts to give [Polynices] decent burial will himself be put to death” (Galantière 17). After this sentence, Anouilh’s script begins with stage directions and progresses toward the first character interaction on stage between Antigone and the Nurse.

However, in the Galantière English translation of *Antigone*, the Narrator continues on:

> It is against this blasphemy that Antigone rebels. What is for Creon merely the climax of a political purge, is for her a hideous offense against God and Man. Since time began, men have recoiled with horror from the desecration of the dead. It is this spirit, which prompts us today to suspend battle in order to bury our dead, to bury even the enemy dead. (17)

Interestingly, these codifying comments rationalize Creon’s motivations and actions, and with the use of the term “political purge” suggest the recent Holocaust. Galantière also reinscribes the presence of deity in the text by not only citing “blasphemy,” a concept chiefly reserved for religious transgression, but also, of course, by direct reference.

Anouilh’s text is purposely and markedly devoid of the concept of “God” (always capitalized in Galantière's version); in Anouilh’s play, the word *dieu* itself only shows up as an exclamation, all examples of which Galantière removed. Later instances of Galantière’s additions to the text reveal his continued use of the word and notion of “God” in Anouilh’s script. Moreover, this opening coda pronounced by the Narrator also attempts to invoke a wartime spirit of unity via rebellion, and goes further than that by introducing the concept of
Certainly Anouilh makes it clear, as did Sophocles, that Antigone’s brothers, Eteocles and Polynices, were both villains set on sacking and ruling Thebes in their own right, so that in the immediate context of the story, one could rationalize that the addition of the term “enemy dead” refers to the unlucky Polynices. However, considering that Anouilh does not use the term or concept of *l’ennemi mort* in any part of his script, one must consider a different context, and a different motivation.

For the 1946 Broadway audience, the mention of “enemy dead” could have suggested residual animosity toward Germanic peoples; but perhaps more importantly, it may have suggested the troubled Franco-American alliance throughout the war. Perhaps the use of this term is an attempt at reconciliation, suggesting America and France were, and always had been, on the same side.

Whatever the intentions behind Galantière’s alterations, Anouilh invokes a different kind of camaraderie in this speech – one of survival. For in the Narrator’s opening monologue, Anouilh uses what is known in French as *la nécessité littéraire* (Bradby 35). This refers to the sense of obligation to play out a particular story simply because that is the way it was written - a literary fate, so to speak. As French Theatre scholar, David Bradby notes in *Modern French Theatre 1940-1990*, “For Anouilh, role-playing is synonymous with inevitability” (35).

While both versions of the script contain the Narrator’s description and fate of each character present on stage, rather than rallying the audience to burial of the “enemy dead,” Anouilh’s Narrator states, “Antigone is her name…and she will play her part to perfection. But we, we who have been brought here to watch her fate, *we – who do not have to die tonight* – can calmly enjoy our evening” (trans. mine; emphasis mine; Anouilh 10). I would argue that Anouilh
is, with morbid humor and tongue-in-cheek, uniting the survivalist instinct in his audience, acknowledging not only the extraordinary odds that civilians daily overcame during WWII, but also the sobering notion that any person may have escaped death today, but that Antigone’s fate is waiting for everyone.

Learning about Galantière’s changes to the script, Anouilh, normally neutral in his interactions with the press, was furious. Once the Parisian press got hold of Galantière’s translation, they began a derisive campaign against Anouilh. In response to changes by Cornell’s production, Anouilh wrote to Galantière with uncharacteristic force about the Narrator’s extra lines at the beginning and end of *Antigone*:

I have the English text before my eyes, and my feeling is that it is perfectly ridiculous. I ask that you instantly cut those [lines]...the French newspapers are mocking me. I haven’t responded and will not do so, but I beg you not to let them believe that I am the author of [these] little speeches. (qtd. in Walsh 143)

But there were more changes to come. During this one act tragedy, Creon and Antigone tangle on more than one occasion, most notably when she has been caught attempting to bury Polynices. Galantière cuts a long interaction between Antigone and the Guard, a scene pointed out by Genêt to be one of the most surprising and poignant in Anouilh’s script (Flanner 22), to spend more time with Creon.

Throughout this fiery encounter between Creon and Antigone, the king spells out for her who exactly she was risking her life for – bad boy Polynices. Creon exclaims that it is “absurd” that she is willing to die over burying a brother who wouldn’t have lifted a finger for her in life (Galantière 47; Anouilh 73), to which Anouilh has Antigone state in reply, *Oui, c’est absurde* (78). “Yes, it is absurd,” Antigone arrogantly states throughout her exchange with Creon,
building to the idea that life itself is absurd (94). Galantière removes this early existential philosophy by Anouilh, allowing for only one, non-troubling mention of the word “absurd” in the script (45).

Furthermore, throughout the play, Galantière erases examples of modern philosophy. For example, while describing to Antigone the “precious gift” of life she possesses and is so willing to throw away, Creon adds in the Galantière version that “people will want to make use of you” (Galantière 57), implying that Antigone, as an archetype, is a rallying point for rebellion. However, in Anouilh’s version, Creon ends with, “the people will see your fire” (99).

I would argue that Anouilh’s version supports the extension of this metaphor to imply Antigone’s existential struggle. For earlier in the discussion, Creon is telling Antigone that life is perhaps only the happiness you can exact from it, when they have a profound moment of existential reflection (98). Creon states, “Nothing is true except that which we don’t say” (98). What a loaded statement for those just recently under enemy occupation! It seems that Anouilh’s “weighty” philosophies and brevity were replaced with poetic emotion but devoid of their original potency (Flanner 22).

Galantière’s motivation for changing the script in the ways he did can be seen in the way he defends his translation to an outraged Anouilh; Galantière explains: “I must say to you that it would be absolutely impossible to play your text in America without our press crying Fascism, taking Creon for a Führer and the author for a fascist” (6). Anouilh protested Galantière’s rationale, emphasizing the importance of his original script’s ambiguity. He states: “I believe that it is completely useless to add morals to the piece...and that it is necessary to let the spectators make their own choice between Antigone and Creon all alone, if chance has blessed them with that ability” (qtd. in Walsh 140).
Not surprisingly, there is little information about the involvement of the Office of War Information’s Gilbert Miller on Galantière’s translation, apart from the apparently obligatory mention in The Best Plays of 1945-1946, but Cornell does not mention Miller as an inhibiting presence during production. However, his mere presence surrounding this play suggests the U.S. government was keen to ensure a united Resistance message for the American public. Perhaps the controversial reputation of Anouilh’s Antigone, and the possibility of another passionate debate exploding, caused American government censors to “oversee” Galantière’s changes to the script.

The changes were thorough. In the final pages of the play, the Narrator and Creon discuss Antigone’s fate. Galantière adds lines that make Creon a more sympathetic tyrant. For example, in response to why he held to the letter of the law concerning Antigone’s rebellion, Creon states, “The task is there to be done. They say it’s dirty work. But if I didn’t do it – who would?” (70). And later, in the final monologue of the play, the Narrator again rationalizes Creon’s behavior, stating:

Creon was the most rational, the most persuasive of tyrants. But like all tyrants, he refused to distinguish between the things that are Caesar’s and the things that are God’s. Now and again – in the three thousand years since the first Antigone – other Antigones have arisen like a clarion call to remind men of this distinction. Their cause is always the same – a passionate belief that moral law exists, and a passionate regard for the sanctity of human dignity. (71)

In Anouilh’s original, the Narrator might be seen as an embodiment of the coming existential crisis of the late modern world – concerning himself as an artist with the modern human fears of isolation, the problems of determinism, and gaining existential knowledge.
However, in both the American and British versions, Galantière’s Narrator ends with a saccharine speech about moral law in which Galantière once again incorporates the notion of “God” into Antigone’s world, expounding on moral law and human dignity. Anouilh thought so too; making clear his displeasure, he wrote to Galantière that the Narrator’s new lines “come under the field of imposture; of preaching; or of a gag. It’s a speech by the darn Marx Brothers” (trans. mine, qtd. in Walsh 144). One can understand why Anouilh was so worried about his name being attached to the Cornell production. Galantière had removed from Anouilh’s script its simplicity, its subtly – in effect, its ambiguity.

No matter how insistent Anouilh was about his displeasure, little was done to appease Anouilh’s specific objections, and, perhaps not surprisingly, the Antigone Broadway production was less than moderately successful. Three years later, Laurence Olivier and wife Vivien Leigh had moderately more success with their star-studded British premiere of the play at the Old Vic. One can only speculate the reasons for this, but firstly, one must point out the play’s star power as a significant public draw. Secondly, it seems likely that in England, where rubble from the Blitz was still being cleared and rationing continued well into the mid-1950s, the British public would have been more attuned to the atrocities of war than their isolated American allies.

After the relative flop of Cornell’s production of Antigone, Galantière’s script was relegated mainly to high school or undergraduate curriculum and sporadic community theatre, professional, and civic productions. Postwar interpreters outside of France determined that, “the ambivalent politics of Anouilh’s Antigone required a makeover in the image of Allied Victory, [the] heroic myth of resistance rapidly [eclipsed] the memory of French collaboration” (Walsh 101).

It is this re-appropriation of Anouilh’s contested Antigone that defines my current
inquiry. Firstly, it sheds light on why and how *Antigone* came to be dominantly regarded as a Resistance play. Secondly, it magnifies the highly subjective, ambiguous nature of Anouilh’s work itself – reinforcing it as a late modern classic rather than merely a political piece. Finally, it problematizes adaptation and the archive, and suggests that the archive is political and unreliable.

In the next and final chapter, I unpack the extraordinary survival of Anouilh’s *Antigone*, as handed down from theatre history. Building on the information about the play as experienced in different political circumstances and in a different nation, in the next chapter I introduce how the archive maintains and legitimizes material, such as these two scripts, and I discuss notions of adaptation from such scholars as James Hillman, Linda Hutcheon, and Lawrence Coupe.

Certainly, the live-ness of theatre makes Anouilh’s *Antigone*, and other theatrical performances, unique in time and space. But as I have shown in this chapter, the Galantière translation was the most significant transformation Anouilh’s *Antigone* endured crossing the Atlantic. By considering how we know what we know about Anouilh’s *Antigone* and Galantière’s adaptation, we can look at how the archive and adaptation have affected Anouilh’s *Antigone*, and we can successfully distinguish and re-categorize these plays.
CHAPTER THREE: ANTIGONE AND THE ARCHIVE

Thus far in my study, I have set up two frames of reference. First, I looked at the French premiere and reception of Jean Anouilh’s *Antigone* in occupied Paris, 1944. I have established through the contemporary Parisian press reviews, critical notations, and records of first-hand experiences that Anouilh’s adaptation of the Antigone myth caused a great political debate. As theatre historian David Bradby aptly summarizes, “the audience read into the play [their] own concrete difficulties – whether to resist, whether to collaborate. *Antigone* was well reviewed in the Collaborationist press and was at first assumed to be on the Vichy side” (35). In addition to grounding the initial controversy in historical significance, the intensity of Paris’ reaction, and the ensuing critical debates, I also suggested that French responses reflected the highly ambiguous nature of Anouilh’s script.

Secondly, I looked at the changing reception to Anouilh’s *Antigone* after the Liberation. In Parisian theatres, the free French sat alongside their American and British allies, no longer crowding in to see *Antigone* with the Vichy fantoches and Nazis. With this new spirit of freedom to go with a new audience, the debate about *Antigone* turned from political to philosophical, when audience members began speculating on the “weighty” content of Anouilh’s play.

Finally, and most critically, I established the significance of the Katherine Cornell production of *Antigone* in 1946, which featured Lewis Galantière’s translation of Anouilh’s original script. I analyzed the specific changes made to Anouilh’s script by Galantière, supporting my inferences by the American audiences’ reception. Comparing the audience reception of *Antigone* in Paris and Broadway alone, one would think that it was a different play entirely. As Keri Walsh notes in “Allied Antigone: Jean Anouilh in America and England”: “In the late 1940s, with a heroic myth of resistance rapidly eclipsing the memory of French
collaboration, the ambivalent politics of Anouilh’s *Antigone* required a makeover in the image of Allied Victory” (101).

The ramifications and significance of Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s controversial *Antigone* are the focus of this chapter. I have shown Anouilh’s *Antigone* was rife with ambiguity, allowing for political and philosophical debate; yet Galantière’s translation of this same play came to be dominantly regarded as just a Resistance play by the English-speaking West. In this chapter, I suggest the archive improperly buried Anouilh’s *Antigone* under Galantière’s translation, depriving future generations of the power, and ambiguity, of this piece. It is perhaps ironic that central to the story of *Antigone* is the title character’s fight for her brother’s proper burial, yet no one, until now, has fought for the proper interment of Anouilh’s *Antigone* in the archive as distinctly separate from the Galantière translation.

The archival materials I have used to represent the trajectory of Anouilh’s *Antigone* thus far are products of the long-established Western practices of collecting and ordering that reflect common understandings of legitimate authorship and intellectual property. This notion of the archive as a foundation for Western memory is important to my inquiry for several reasons. First, let me define what is meant in this study by the term “archive.” Diana Taylor offers one way to consider the concept of the archive.

In *The Archive and the Repertoire*, Taylor describes repertoire as a “corporeal, multi-generational heritage of actions” that exists independently of the archive, which is exclusively recorded material (Taylor 22). Taylor divides the “archive” into three areas: place, thing, and practice. Taylor’s terms of place (from/to) and practice (commitment to posterity) are self-evident, but she defines “thing” as a “nameable, storable, preserveable object, imbued with the power and authority of place and selection” (Taylor 22).
It is important to note that Taylor does not present her archive and repertoire as binaries, but instead shows that the repertoire, like the archive, is *mediated* and therefore each can be seen as equally powerful and political entities. In discussing the political nature of the archive, Taylor observes that the forms and forums of archival materials are ambiguously situated between the private and public spheres (33). For example, many of the textual sources I use in this study, from newspaper articles to book-length studies, have come to me in various languages. Others, especially texts written prior to 1980, are from private archives and cannot be lent or even electronically scanned for circulation or reproduction.

For example: Manfred Flügge’s systematic documentation of early audience responses to Parisian Theatre during WWII remains the only comprehensive treatment of this subject, and it has yet to be translated from German and French into any other language; Mary Anne Frese Witt uses the extant reviews to group Anouilh’s play alongside Henry de Montherlant’s *La Reine Morte* as an example of “aesthetic fascism” in the French theatre of this period; and Kenneth Krauss studies the censorship that compromised all works on the Occupation stage including Anouilh’s *Antigone*, side-stepping the interpretation controversy.

According to Taylor, the archive consists of items or written words that exist through time and that deal with particular events, practices, histories, or experiences, like that of Anouilh’s *Antigone* (13). Taylor places a certain emphasis on the archive’s staying power by highlighting Western society’s privileging of the written word over embodied practices. Taylor also stresses that because of the West’s emphasis on textual or recorded material because it endures over great periods of time, the archive is viewed typically as *proof* that a particular “thing” existed.
She suggests that archival memory is assumed to exist as “documents, maps, literary texts, letters, archaeological remains, bones, videos, films, CDs, all those items supposedly resistant to change” (19). But she stresses that the interpretation of the archive can and does change. She explains: “what changes over time is the value, relevance, or meaning of the archive, how the items it contains get interpreted, even embodied. Bones might remain the same, even though their story may change, depending on the paleontologist or forensic anthropologist who examines them” (19).

Taylor contrasts archival memory with the repertoire. According to Taylor, the repertoire “enacts embodied memory: performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing—in short, all those acts usually thought of as ephemeral, nonreproducible knowledge” (20). She suggests: “the repertoire requires presence: people participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by ‘being there,’ being a part of the transmission. As opposed to the supposedly stable objects in the archive, the actions that are the repertoire do not remain the same” (20).

Though this study is an attempt to fill gaps in American theatre scholarship about Anouilh’s Antigone, and to place a distinction between Anouilh’s Antigone and Galantière’s adaptation, the archival materials I have been able to access for this study have mostly been in French. Therefore I have had to translate these “permanent” materials myself, changing them yet again. In effect, only those privileged with the highest level of education and access to extensive and multilingual databases via controlling elite institutions could uncover how Anouilh’s Antigone has been changed in translation.

My attempts here differ from the past by simply acknowledging the distinction between Anouilh’s Antigone and Galantière’s, and hopefully thereby returning some of the power and ambiguity of Anouilh’s original adaptation of this Greek myth. Again, by looking at archival and
adaptation practices, it is possible to disengage Antigone from the binary of political debate and to allow for potential discourse more appropriate to her ambivalent nature.

To add to the broad strokes of Taylor’s conception of the “archive,” one can consider archival theorists and practitioners, such as Kenneth E. Foote, Jack Goody, and Maurice Halbwachs, who have developed theories discussing the social and cultural roles of archives as well as the sustainability of collective memory. In addition, I consider Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida’s archival theories as they relate to the case of Jean Anouilh’s Antigone. Indeed, Jacques Derrida’s assertion that the archive may not be a “concept dealing with the past that might already be at our disposal” but rather, “a question of the future” (36), is central to my argument in this chapter. For Antigone is not an exception in the archive; indeed, her story is common within its walls. By understanding the function and limits of the archive by which we access Anouilh’s Antigone, we can separate it from Galantière’s adaptation, allowing Anouilh’s Antigone distinction from the political questions of its past, and welcome it into questions of the future.

The evolution of permanent writing systems provides examples of their comparative communication range; the Antigone myth itself comes to us from such early recordings. As Jack Goody notes in his book, The Interface Between the Written and the Oral, “Although many factors were involved in the rise of early civilizations, the beginning of complex social organization seemed to require a means of notating the spoken word” (56). Oral and ritual traditions have a similar function in transmitting knowledge, but because the spoken word finds its futurity in the memories of the corpus globus, it is distinct from “the archive” – a notion Taylor explores in her distinction between the archive and the repertoire, as previously noted.

In addressing the concept of the archive, writers have often drawn attention to the broader
notion of archive as collective memory. As Kenneth E. Foote notes in “To Remember and Forget: Archives, Memory, and Culture,” “From this perspective, archives transcend the immediate tasks of documentation, educations, enrichment, and research to help sustain cultural traditions and values” (29). Indeed, writings in anthropology, linguistics, and semiotics contend that the material nature of the archive – objects, documents, artifacts – ensures that the archive plays a distinct role in lasting human communication and teleology. It is just such durability that defines the archive as an epistemic resource that transmits information across temporal and spatial limits. Indeed, if it were not for such durability, Anouilh’s adaption of Antigone would not have survived to contradict the later Galantière version.

In agreement with Maurice Halbwachs of The Collective Memory, Kenneth Foote notes in his work, “To Remember and Forget: Archives, Memory, and Culture”:

First, as discussed in sociology and psychology, collective memory refers to the beliefs and ideas held in common by many individuals that together produce a sense of social solidarity and community. In the second sense…the term implies that many individuals and organizations act collectively to maintain records of the past, even if these records are shaped by the demands of contemporary life. (Foote 30-31).

The value of Foote’s observation is firstly that it warns against the idea that “collective memory” can, or does, reside in a single type of epistemic institution. Secondly, Foote reminds us that the “cultural” demands of the archive determine what is selected as “important” information for posterity, rendering it incapable of retaining objectivity within itself.

This instinct of the archive can be seen in the way that Anouilh’s Antigone has survived in multiple epistemic institutions; but more importantly, Foote’s statement reminds us that the
individuals and organizations that acted collectively to “maintain” Anouilh’s *Antigone* did so within the “demands” of wartime rhetoric. Thus, the Galantière adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* can be seen as not only altering this play’s past, how it was received then, but also its future, how we access and understand it now.

In that connection, Michel de Certeau argues that it is this very collective terminus that gives the archive its “colonial” tendencies; he explains: “The power that writing’s expansionism leaves intact is colonial in principle. It is extended without being changed. It is tautological, immunized against both any alterity that might transform it and whatever dares to resist it” (216). This is nothing new. Bureaucracies, corporations, governments, and individuals have long sought to control information. In this sense, both the archive and the knowledge it possesses are means of politics and power.

One could argue that the established accounts of Anouilh’s *Antigone* as a Resistance play reflect that process and practice. Certainly no archival conspiracy exists for this little play; rather, Anouilh’s *Antigone* is, again, an example of a common plight. Both written versions of the play still exist in the archive, to compare as I have done. Yet, because the archive sustains the material it legitimizes, the distinction between Anouilh’s *Antigone* and Galantière’s translation has gone unnoticed, until now.

This is perhaps the most striking feature of the archive in connection with Anouilh’s *Antigone* – its simultaneous selection and legitimization of material. Jacques Derrida, in his lecture “Archive Fever” (June 5, 1994), presented in London at the Freud Museum during an international conference entitled “Memory: The Question of Archives,” directly addresses this idea, but first he discusses the word “archive” in terms of the significance of its Greek roots. He explained:
Arkhē… names at once the commencement and the commandment. This name apparently coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, there where things commence – physical, historical, or ontological principle – but also the principle according to the law, there where men and gods command, there where authority, social order are exercised, in this place from which order is given a nomological principle. (9)

Here, Derrida sets up the notion, or word, “archive” in two very distinct terms: commencement (the original, history, selection) – suggesting the archive’s inherent legitimacy, and commandment (the law, order, nomological) – emphasizing the authority of the archive.

Like Taylor, Derrida divides the archive into “orders of order.” Unlike Derrida, Taylor first makes a distinction between the repertoiric knowledge, i.e. corporeal, multi-generational heritage of actions, and the archive’s knowledge, which is, exclusively, recorded material (Taylor 22). Once that distinction is made, Taylor divides the “archive” into three areas: place (from/to), practice (commitment to posterity), and thing (nameable, storable, preserveable object, imbued with the power and authority of place, and selection) (22).

Anouilh’s Antigone can be seen to inhabit all of these fields. Most literally, in terms of place, Anouilh’s Antigone went from France to America and Britain, and it can still be accessed through archives on both sides of the Atlantic; it was certainly the object of practical scrutiny, as it was altered so significantly in translation; and the Galantière adaptation of Anouilh’s Antigone is certainly a nameable, storable, preserveable script imbued not only with the power and authority of the archive but also the authority of Anouilh’s “original” script.

Within Taylor’s triune framework of place, practice, and thing, we can see Derrida condense these three functions into two motivations: the sequential and jussive (9). In his view:
“The concept of the archive shelters in itself... But it also shelters itself from this memory which it shelters: which comes down to saying also that it forgets it” (9). He goes on to observe:

> The meaning of ‘archive’… comes to it from the Greek *arkheion*:
> initially a house… the residence of… those who commanded. The citizens who thus held and signified political power were considered to possess the right to make or to represent the law...[They] are first of all the documents’ guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited...They are also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives. It is thus, in this domiciliation, in this house arrest, that archives take place. The dwelling… marks this institutional passage from the private to the public, which does not always mean from the secret to the nonsecret. (10)

Certainly in terms of this study, Derrida’s observations solidify the notion that archived meaning is also, and most importantly, dictated by the structure that archives (17).

In light of Derrida’s comments, it is possible to understand how both the Anouilh *Antigone* and the Galantière adaptation can be hidden from each other within the archive and, perhaps more importantly, from us. Derrida’s comments above suggest that it is not only the physical security of an object, in this case a script, within the archive that is most important, but also the “right” and “power” of the archive to interpret and legitimize that object. So, within the walls of the archive, it is less important that these two versions of the “same” *Antigone* still exist, and more valuable that they have been selected, and therefore legitimized.

Furthermore, we can see from Derrida’s notes on the “private” and “public,” “secret” and “non-secret,” that Anouilh’s *Antigone* has remained in the “private” but not “secret” realm of the archive, being situated within the archive but not accessible to many in the “public” arena.
Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone*, on the other hand, can be seen as “public” because it is readily available to the public via the archive, and yet it can also be seen as “secret” because so little is known about the marked difference from the “original” Anouilh adaptation.

Derrida continues this notion of “commandment” of the archive by moving his discussion of the archive toward the “consignation” function of the archive. He writes:

> The archontic power, which also gathers the functions of unification, of identification, of classification, must be paired with… the power of consignation. By consignation, we do not only mean… the act of assigning residence or of entrusting so as to put into reserve in a place… but here the act of consigning through gathering together signs. Consignation aims to coordinate a single corpus… in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration. In an archive, there should not be any… heterogeneity or secret, which could separate… The archontic principle of the archive is also a principle of consignation, that is, of gathering together. (10)

If, according to Derrida, consignation not only means depositing, to preserve, but also to coordinate a system of unity, Anouilh’s *Antigone* is currently precariously positioned between these two levels of consignation. On the one hand, both Anouilh and Galantière’s adaptations have been deposited and maintained successfully. On the other hand, because of this preservation, we can now see there is “heterogeneity,” a separation or partition between these two documents in terms of translation.

Derrida suggests that the archive resists this kind of distinction on principal, which sheds light on how Anouilh’s *Antigone* came to be situated in the “private” sector, while Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone*, the more “recent” of the two, is located in the “public” sphere.
This negotiation between public and private spheres cultivates notions of power, politics, and memory. If information is power, and the archive selects, excludes, orders, and legitimizes that knowledge, there is perhaps nothing more powerful, or more political, than the archive.

After WWII and the many social, political, and cultural crises across Europe, social historian and theorist Michel Foucault developed a theory that repositioned the archive as a space of enunciation. In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, he writes: “The archive is first the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events…it is *the system of its enunciability*” (129). Though not directly, Taylor adds to Foucault’s claims by noting that prior to the 1960s, institutions of power – government funded libraries, museums, etc. – merely offered “methods for describing the archive and protocols for ensuring its order remained undisturbed” (Eichorn 1). For in the West, as Taylor notes, “The dominance of language and writing has come to stand for meaning” (25).

Perhaps Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* was subordinated to such dominant ideologies – in this case, the English-speaking West’s aversion to ambiguous politics or philosophies. Perhaps, according to the rules of the archive, the act of merely preserving and consigning Anouilh and Galantière’s *Antigones* constituted meaning and value. Certainly, I am grateful that these steps were taken, making my reclassification of Anouilh’s *Antigone* as distinct from Galantière’s adaptation possible.

Yet, as Foucault notes, all periods of history possess these unique underlying “conditions of truth” that constituted what could be discursively expressed (131). Foucault argues that these conditions or systems of discourse have changed over time (Holub 57). Therefore, it may be assumed, the conditions that demanded preserving Anouilh and Galantière’s respective *Antigones* as separate but the same within the archive, no longer exist for us today – again,
making possible this examination.

With these shifting notions of power in mind, memory becomes paramount, both in terms of the archive and the story of Antigone. Emerging from within a politically divided city, the story of Antigone rises against those who would erase the dead, dishonored or not. At the time of its premiere in Paris, Anouilh’s audiences were having their memories and identities revised by the occupying Nazi and Vichy. Once the liberation swept through Paris, memories previously forbidden could be once again embraced.

When the play arrived in the United States, Galantière and the American audiences had a different “memory” of the World War II than that of Europe. As noted, Galantière admits “it would be absolutely impossible to play [Anouilh’s] text in America without our press crying Fascism…” (6). This statement indicates that the North American memory of wartime events would have read Anouilh’s script as subversive, evidently motivating Galantière’s extensive alterations. Even if Galantière’s motivation could have been justified, ultimately, the same political concerns do not apply today.

But as Taylor notes, “Memory, like the heart, beats beyond our capacity to control it, a life line between past and future” (82). Here, there is another aspect of memory that relates to Galantière and Anouilh’s respective Antigones – that of archival memory. Derrida echoes the important function of memory, noting, “There is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory” (11); he also positions and problematizes memory within the archive, by suggesting, “the archive takes place at the…breakdown of…memory” (11-14). Perhaps, because the archive controls how we access, understand, and interact with these two scripts, we receive the Galantière translation because the archive can simultaneously “forget” Anouilh’s adaptation.
It seems that in the broadest sense, Anouilh’s *Antigone* and the archive share associations with paradox, politics, memory, death and law. To engage more fully with the paradoxes within the archive relating to Anouilh’s *Antigone*, Derrida also discusses the notion of “exergue,” which he notes is responsible for what is omitted or added in the archive – in other words, the exergue consists in capitalizing on ellipsis (12).

Derrida describes the exergue as the “first figure of an archive;” as such, it is a basic and irreversible function of the archive itself (12). He further interprets the function of the exergue as “archival violence,” saying: “What is at issue here, starting with the exergue, is the violence of the archive itself, as archive, as archival violence” (12). As Derrida posits, the archive is concerned with self-conformation.

The notion that the archive poisons its own waters, so to speak, exemplifies the story of Anouilh’s *Antigone*. For, in order to ensure its futurity, political pressure was applied to Galantière’s translation/adaption. The power of the script, its ambiguity, is unclassifiable, unpredictable, and above all, uncontrollable – characteristics at war with the archive. This is not to say, however, that Anouilh’s *Antigone* is unique within the walls of the archive.

Indeed, I have used Taylor to show that the archive orders information firstly by privileging written tradition over oral tradition. Thus, both the Galantière translation and Anouilh’s original adaptation of *Antigone* have been, first and foremost, textually preserved. I consulted Foote to establish the archive as collective memory, which is not objective and is bound by cultural demands that shift from epoch to epoch.

This principle is valuable with regard to Anouilh’s *Antigone*, for it suggests that the cultural and political demands faced by Anouilh and Galantière may have determined both the original controversy over Anouilh’s *Antigone* in Paris, and the ensuing radical alterations made
to the scripts by Galantière in America. Furthermore, if these cultural demands shift over time, within the present epoch, I am at liberty to consider and distinguish these two scripts.

Within this understanding, Derrida describes the functions and practices of the archive as simultaneously self-producing and self-legitimizing. As previously stated, archived meaning is codetermined by the structure that archives. Thus, according to the archive, it is less important that these two versions of the “same” Antigone still remain and contradict each other, and more valuable that they have been selected, and therefore legitimized for posterity.

Building on these ideas, I examined Derrida’s division of the archive from commandment to consignation. As previously mentioned, the commandment principle of the archive gives it the authority to produce and legitimize its material. The consignation function relates to the preservation and unity of materials within the archive. As discussed, here we see how the consignment of the archive has secured, deposited, and maintained both Anouilh and Galantière’s adaptations successfully. Yet, because of this preservation, we can now see there is a “heterogeneity” or incongruity between these two documents in terms of translation. To unify these differences, the archive has allocated Anouilh’s Antigone to the private (though not hidden or secret) sector, while Galantière’s remains in public access.

Finally, the idea of memory – both popular and archival – comes into play. Derrida suggests that political control cannot exist without archival control of memory. I have discussed Derrida’s concept of archival memory, relating it to how Anouilh’s script moved from one realm of archival and popular memory in France to a different world of memory in America. Even Galantière cites the American wartime memory and fervor as the reason he could not remain faithful in his translation of Anouilh’s Antigone for his audiences in 1946. This brings up the subject of adaptation in both theory and practice.
Understanding how and why Anouilh’s *Antigone* became buried under Galantière’s distinctly different translation of the same play is important for not only theatre history but also in understanding how the governing epistemic institutions order and relegate our collective information. Now that we understand how the archive functions, the remaining factor to consider as I unravel the journey of Anouilh’s *Antigone* is the theory and practice of adaptation.

Up until point we have looked at how the archive works, and how it absorbs, orders, preserves, and circulates information, especially cultural phenomenon such as this theatrical play. However, the central point of this study is to make clear the distinction between Anouilh’s *Antigone* and Galantière’s adaptation. Thus, a brief look into the nature of adaptation, specifically adaptation and myth, will be helpful here. For now that I have established how and why Anouilh’s *Antigone* came to be positioned thus within the archive, it is important to note that a retranslation of this play is essential.

The term “adaptation” comes from the Latin word *adaptare*, meaning, “to fit, to join.” Therefore, one who adapts is one who fits pieces together. In the case of Anouilh’s *Antigone*, the question remains, why did Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* fail so in America, and is it possible to resurrect this play for the twenty-first century?

*Antigone*, as an adaptation, as a myth, is meant to be joined or fitted to/with a new context via retelling. As practiced by Anouilh himself, in a rare moment of candor about his creative process regarding *Antigone*, he said, “Sophocles’ *Antigone*, which I read and reread and knew by heart forever, was a sudden shock for me during the war... and I rewrote it in my way, with the resonance of the tragedy we were living” (my emphasis, Tiefenbrun 42).

With such a powerful statement from a reclusively private man, one can only guess at Anouilh’s true motivations here, but it seems reasonable to suggest that Anouilh saw parallels
between Antigone’s mythic struggle and Paris’ plight; whether he viewed that struggle as political or philosophical, we may never know.

In addition, the “classical myth” status of Sophocles’ play was probably instrumental in getting Anouilh’s *Antigone* a performance license. During a period of great censorship, within marked political camps and increased governmental pressure, Anouilh managed to create an *Antigone* that spoke to everyone, an incredible feat. As evidenced by the political debates in the Parisian press, and later the philosophical observations of audience members, Anouilh adapted Sophocles’ *Antigone* to a new time and place, so ambiguous that enemies cheered for the same lines.

Adaptations, as Linda Hutcheon asserts, paradoxically encompass popularity and scorn, so that they exist as a double entity. The practice of adaptation has been ongoing for millennia: one might note the canonical works of Shakespeare, Molière, Racine, the fluid adjustments of religious texts, and the regular amendment of political constitutions, to name a few.

Simply put, myth bridges the eternal and temporal, collapsing time and place; it is a unifying mode of engagement for audiences. Thus, myth, and by extension here, Anouilh’s *Antigone*, are “a-contextual” in this regard, without the temporal limitations of fixed time and place, inherently given to debate over meaning, purpose, and legacy. In this way we can see the importance of ambiguity within an adaptation of a myth. Originally from the Latin *ambiguus* meaning “having double meaning, shifting, changeable”; adj. derived from *ambigere* “to dispute about,” lit. “to wander”; from *ambi* – “both/double” + *agere* “drive, lead, act.”

In view of this, Anouilh’s adaptation can be seen to embrace *Antigone* firstly as myth, and with the ambiguity necessary to make it timeless. The adaptive, a-contextual nature of myth and the necessity of ambiguity are perhaps the two greatest factors in determining why
Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* failed in America, and has since been left to stagnate as a Resistance play.

As shown in chapter two, the letters between the two authors show Galantière directly and literally interpreting Anouilh’s script as a commentary on Occupied France (6). Thus, firstly, Galantière’s adaptation grounds itself in the historical and political specifics of World War II, rejecting the a-contextual nature of myth. Anouilh’s *Antigone*, on the other hand, retains its sans context feeling through a blank set, contemporary costumes, and no specifics mentioned about time or place within the play. Secondly, by Galantière’s own admission, he was unwilling to commit to the ambiguity in Anouilh’s original script for fear the audience would view it as a “fascist” play (6). In this regard, Galantière’s adaptation resists the two factors that could have given power to his adaptation of Anouilh’s *Antigone* – myth as a story without temporal or spatial context, and ambiguity as the language of myth.

Yet, was it even possible for either of these authors to be “faithful” to an adaption of a retelling of a myth? Discussion of fidelity in adaptation studies springs from the inherently comparative nature of adaptation itself. However, *Antigone* as myth, and as adaptation, essentially resists notions of fidelity. As adaptation studies scholars Phyllis Frus and Christy Williams argue, it is possible to side-step fidelity arguments when dealing with mythic stories: “Because we rarely have one original tale, rather a host of stories with similar plots or details, there is no one story to be faithful to, and the issue of fidelity is avoided completely” (6).

It seems that Anouilh’s approach to Sophocles’ *Antigone* reflects this knowledge. As shown earlier, Anouilh approached the myth of *Antigone* in his own way, for the tragedy he and his friends and family were living through. Though Anouilh evidently made mental parallels in his mind between the mythic struggle of *Antigone* and the struggles of Occupied Paris, he retains
much ambiguity in his script, allowing the audience to interpret meaning for themselves – something Galantière was unwilling to do.

In his letters to Galantière throughout the adaptation process, Anouilh responds to Galantière’s apparent fear of how his audience would react to the ambiguity his script with a veiled jab at the intellectual abilities of the American masses, stating, “it is completely useless to add morals to the piece... it is necessary to let the spectators make their own choice between Antigone and Creon all alone, if chance has blessed them with that ability” (qtd. in Walsh 140). Anouilh later likens Galantière’s adaptive style to “preaching” (qtd. in Walsh 144). Apparently, Anouilh felt that by literalizing his script, Galantière had removed its power, its essence, and its futurity.

Here, we turn to the final and greatest problem with the Galantière adaptation of Anouilh’s Antigone. In his work Myth: The New Critical Idiom, Lawrence Coupe’s definition of “mythopoeisis” as a continuous cycle of creation and re-creation, shows that mythology calls into question the very notion of originality. Myth never “completes” itself, and in this way, it does not look back to a starting point that it can emulate. Though myth is always in process, Coupe provides a viewpoint that opposes mythopoeisis, one which is analogous to the plight of Anouilh’s Antigone in America.

Demythologization is the process by which a myth is “perfected” or “completed” so that any further re-imagining is halted. In effect, the story stops and is “finished.” In terms of adaption, and specifically Anouilh’s Antigone, demythologization permits no further retellings, by draining any further nuance or possibility from the story. Indeed, as Walter Benjamin simply states, “storytelling is always the art of repeating stories”(Benjamin 2). And, Hutcheon points out, “as an adaptation, [the play or account] involves both memory and change, persistence and
variation” (173).

A collage is an apt metaphor for the work of an adapter, especially an adapter of mythology, like Anouilh or Galantière. A collage focuses the disjointed construction of the work, synthesizing basic elements from various versions or sources. The result coheres into a new work that, like myth, combines the new and old. This is what Anouilh accomplished in 1944 with his Antigone.

As a collaborative art form, theatre is perfect for offering new interpretations of “old” texts, and reviving outdated classics, which makes the failure of Galantière’s adaptation even more noteworthy. In light of Coupe’s notion of demytholization, we can perhaps see why it is so necessarily this play be distinguished from Anouilh’s brilliant work, and re-published under a new translation.

It is evident from his correspondence to Anouilh and the extant script itself that Galantière failed to embrace and retain the ambiguity essential to the power of Anouilh’s Antigone. However, in terms of demytholization, one can see that erasing the ambiguity in Anouilh’s script grounded Antigone in the specific struggles of Resistance and collaboration, giving it definite time, place, and context – effectively perfecting, completing, or ending Anouilh’s Antigone. Galantière imbued Anouilh’s Antigone with such specificity that interpretive discourse or debate about its meaning and message halted.

As a myth is envisioned and retold from new thresholds, the richness and relevance of a story is deepened and revived. Myth scholar James Hillman points to one of the great responsibilities and benefits to adapters: respect. Using the metaphor of a walk through a garden, Hillman describes the ways in which we see the same landscape differently as we walk:
These shifts of seeing again are precisely what the word ‘respect’ means. To look again is to ‘re-spect.’ Each time we look at the same thing again, we gain respect for it and add respect to it, curiously discovering the innate relation of ‘looks’—or regarding and being regarded, words in English that refer to dignity (75).

Hillman’s notion of respect stands out because much of the terminology surrounding adaptation is that of moral degradation, with words like “theft”, “betrayal”, and “corruption” commonly appearing. In differentiating Galantière’s adaptation from Anouilh’s Antigone, I have been careful to point to the removal of ambiguity, so essential to retelling myth, as one of the chief causes Galantière failed to create a successful adaptation. Tied to the absence of ambiguity in the Galantière script, I highlighted how the demytholization of Anouilh’s Antigone grounded it unequivocally in the world of WWII, halting future considerations of this adaptation of Antigone.

Finally, I concluded my discussion of how Anouilh’s Antigone has survived through the archive with Hillman’s particular framing of respectful adaptation. As I consider my own comparative translation of the disparate parts of Galantière and Anouilh’s adaptations of Antigone, Hillman’s notion of respect as “looking again,” to see afresh, is useful in determining how to approach Galantière’s adaptation of Anouilh’s Antigone. Firstly, it puts aside any notions of debasing or reducing the existing Galantière translation and enthusiastically supports retelling from the vantage point of Anouilh’s original ambiguous vision. It is my hope that this study separates, and “looks again,” or “re-spects,” in the fullest sense, both Anouilh and Galantière’s Antigones.
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