

HISTORY AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN **IAKOVOS KAMBANELLIS**

**DESPINA
KOSMOPOULOU**

National Kapodistrian University of Athens & University of the Peloponnese, Greece
dkosmopoulou@gmail.com

Abstract: This essay deals with the reception of the concepts of History and the individual in the dramaturgy of Iakovos Kambanellis. As the current year marks the 100th anniversary of the author's birth (1922-2022), it is a good opportunity for one to walk in the paths of his most brilliant work. Using the tools of the genetic interpretive, sociological, and socio-semiotic approach, an attempt will be made to render the most appropriate way of reading and receiving Kambanellis' works, always in relation to the concepts of History and the individual and in comparison with the social and historical context of his time and his contemporary authors, Greek and European. The aim of this essay is to pay even the slightest tribute to this so talented and great playwright, who throughout the course of his writing career did not stop looking for new ways of artistic expression, giving as a gift to modern Greek literature, through his works, his wisdom for Man, life and History.

Keywords: Iakovos Kambanellis, History, Individual, contemporary Greek dramaturgy, reception, metatheatricity.

How to cite: Kosmopoulou, Despina (2021). 'History and the Individual in Iakovos Kambanellis', *Concept* 2(23)/2021, pp. 155-169.

Introduction

This essay deals with the reception of the concepts of History and the individual in the dramaturgy of Iakovos Kambanellis. As 2022 marks the 100th anniversary of the author's birth, it is now a good opportunity to walk in the paths of his most brilliant work. Born in a shocking year for Hellenism, the year of the Asia Minor Catastrophe, and having experienced the cruelty of World War II, the horror of the concentration camps, the civil war strife, and the violation of all freedoms during the seven years of dictatorship, his work could not be separated from the course of History and the course of Greek society (Mpsios, 2011, pp. 354-357). Kambanellis was not intimidated by the social adversities of his time that prevented him from becoming an actor and turned to writing, thus penetrating the world of theatre. His plays *The Seventh Day of Creation*, *The Courtyard of Miracles* and *The Age of Night* are his first steps as a playwright.¹

When dealing with Iakovos Kambanellis, one should first of all keep in mind that the author does not follow the seemingly unbroken course of Greek theatre, which goes through from the post-civilian phase of Lorca to the American theatre and finally to the theatre of the Absurd, but he introduces the reader and the spectator, especially with his solo plays, in the field of theatrical modernism (Grammatas, 2000, p. 199). This is the author who managed to pass from the space-time of historical events to the new, uncertain, and spatially and temporally

1 Some of the most important works of the author are: *Daddy war* («Ο Μπαμπάς ο πόλεμος»), *Odysseus, return home* («Οδυσσεύς, γύρισε σπίτι»), *Nobody and the Cyclops* («Ο κανείς και οι Κύκλωπες»), *A Comedy* («Μία Κωμωδία»), *Mautbauwen* («Μαουτχάουζεν»), *Stella* («Στέλλα»), the trilogy *Letter to Orestes* («Γράμμα στον Ορέστη»), *The Supper* («Ο Δείπνος») and *Thebes Side Street* («Πάροδος Θηβών»), *A fairy tale with no name* («Παραμύθι χωρίς όνομα»), *The broad bean and the chickpea* («Το κουκί και το ρεβύθι»), *Our grand circus* («Το μεγάλο μας τσίρκο»), *Our enemy, the people* («Ο εχθρός λαός»), and many more.

indeterminate present, while through the theatre he succeeded in reviving the past and activating the collective memory (Pefanis, 2008, pp. 257-260).

Concepts such as “History” and “Individual” raise the issue of the connection of social and historical reality with the field of literature, which has concerned and still concerns the fields of interpretation and sociology (Tzouma, 1995, p. 5). Kambanellis, by using as basic means self-referentiality and polysemy, seeks through his works to give a new perspective which focuses on a social currency with historical depth, while the direct and lively characters that he creates capture the image of the multi-faceted individual of the author’s era (Grammatas 2006, 60). Using the tools of the genetic interpretive, sociological, and socio-semiotic approach, an attempt will be made to render the most appropriate way of reading and receiving Kambanellis’ works, always in relation to the concepts of History and the individual and in comparison with the social and historical context of his time and his contemporary authors, Greek and European.

Metatheatricality in Iakovos Kambanellis as a means of concepts reception

In 1963, Lionel Abel introduced for the first time, in his study *Metatheatre: A new view of dramatic form*, the term “metatheatre”, in which he summed up the theatricalization of characters with an awareness of their theatricality and the digression of “meta-plays”, as he called them, from the ancient tragedy (Lionel, 1963, pp. 45-46).² The “theatre in theatre”, a common narrative technique of Kambanellis’ writing, is a form of metatheatricality, which is defined as a second plot within the main one without breaking the coherence of the narrative ensemble (Culler, 2003, pp. 56). It is a narrative and distancing technique, whose function can be either philosophical, focusing on ontological concerns about the limits of illusion and reality, or a reflection of theatre in a mirror. Other terms synonymous with the term “theatre in theatre” are post-narrative narration and narrative embedded in fiction (Gennette, 2018, pp. 306-309).³

Kambanellis’ plays are mostly metatheatrical, with their main features being the rehearsal element, the self-referentiality, the breaking of dramatic illusion and the heterotopia (Puchner, 2010, pp. 43). The main thematic axis of his work is the recording of the existential impasse of post-war Greece, thus giving

² For Abel, only Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* and Jean Racine’s *Athalie* meet the conditions set by ancient tragedy.

³ Next to post-theatricality, it is worth mentioning the important role of the titling in Kambanellis’ work. This is an area of theory that explores the periphery of the main text. It is a key element of the context with a post-textual essence, which in the case of Kambanellis clearly highlights the scope and quality of his work (Ververopoulou, 2006, p. 102).

his writing a historical, political and social dimension, while the events of modern Greek History are used as a dramatic background (Pefanis, 1997, p. 407).

For Kambanellis, the promotion of the citizenship and the love of his place has an important role. His place is also his first source of inspiration, with the imagination and the dream bringing to the surface images from the familiar past, as happens in the plays *Invisible troupe* and *A meeting elsewhere* (Georgopoulou, 2001, p. 7). A second source of inspiration is the author's experiences in the Mauthausen camp, with his homonymous narrative being part of the Holocaust literature. The play, with the help of metatheatricity, transcends the kind of autobiographical testimony and the narrow time frames and renders the feeling of horror at a universal level as well as the irony of History (Kosmopoulou, 2016, pp. 245-251). The means that Kambanellis chooses to convey the magnitude of the pain are the allusions, the connotations and the subconscious relationships. Finally, in *The Last Act*, Kambanellis utilizes the theory of theatre and gives a theoretical extension to the dramatic text, projecting as necessary the reference through the play to the theatrical tools. Odysseus is integrated in the play by playing himself and pretending to accept as reality the performance set up by his social environment (Georgopoulou, 2001, p. 21).

Genetic interpretative approach to the concept of history in Kambanellis' dramaturgy

Genetic interpretation deals with the historical and social dimension of literary texts and their timeless interpretation based, on the one hand, on the theoretical data that allowed this writing and, on the other hand, on the ideological mechanisms that regulate the process of textual reception (Tzouma 1995, p. 18). The era of Kambanellis' writing coincides with a period of historical, political and social reorganizations, the birth of ideological and philosophical trends and the formation of new worldviews (Grammatas, 2006, pp. 223-228). World War II and the ensuing Greek civil war created the Cold War and post-Cold War context of modern Greek dramaturgy, which also surrounded Kambanellis' work and was characterized by censorship, economic and political opportunism, diversion from parliamentary institutions and a general orientation to European politics (Grammatas, 2002, pp. 42-50). His plays *Seventh day of creation*, *Courtyard of miracles*, *Invisible troupe* and *A meeting elsewhere*, which include – among others – situations inspired by his experiences at the Mauthausen concentration camp, are a sound proof that he is an experiential writer who, with reference point the personal core of conception, transforms the experiential material stored in his memory, thus setting the limits of ethnographic dramaturgy (Pefanis, 1997, pp. 408-411).

The dramatic presentation of complex emotions embedded in simple images aims at shaping a new social concern and at rendering an expanded historical dimension to theatrical events (Pefanis, 1999, pp. 79-83). The plot of the play *Hidden Sun* unfolds in a single-place setting, in the Inzersdorf concentration camp in Vienna. It is about the story of a group of prisoners, among whom there is a traitor, who reveals their attempt to escape. The coexistence of the united group, on the one hand, and its traitor, on the other hand, presents an existential view of human relations on the verge of tolerance (Pefanis, 2005, pp. 66-77). Emotions gradually change and pass from aggression and hatred, to tolerance, to understanding and finally to tenderness. But the dominant emotion above all these personal ones is that of co-belonging, of common destiny and shared responsibility for survival.

Influenced to a large extent, at least in his first steps, by Brecht, Kambanellis approaches History in two ways; on the one hand taking it – historically and philosophically – as an Idea, and on the other hand presenting it as the highest objective truth of events (Tsatsoulis, 2004, p. 14-2). Through his plays he reconstructs the social reality and transforms it into a historical one. Next to the process of Kambanellis' historicization, the technique of dialectics is added, which penetrates History and promotes it as an ideal theatrical material.⁴ Having as broader goal the shaping of historical identities, he seeks to highlight those points of its social environment that in some way affect the individual, while at the same time attempting to explain how people's behaviors are shaped under the pressure of specific historical circumstances (Georgopoulou, 2001, p. 17). With the distancing technique that he has often borrowed from Brecht, he wants to arouse the viewer's question, but without leading him to any identification with any of the characters of the play, so that through a discerning point of view to give birth inside himself to a unique and objective truth.⁵ Through the historical definition of society, which offers the capability of reception and understanding of its composition, Kambanellis plants in the viewer's consciousness the necessity for its subversive change (Blesios, 2011, pp. 369-373).

Perceiving the theatre as a marginal space of coexistence of fiction and reality, Kambanellis through his plays always seems to be focused on the search

4 Regarding Historicization, Brecht characteristically states: "With historicization man acquires something of double importance, something incomplete. He is presented as something more than a simple figure. On the one hand it is presented as it is, and there are several reasons for this over time, but that is, to the extent that time has shaped it, at the same time someone else, that is, if one is detached from this moment in time, in some another time may be shaped differently." [in: Brecht, Bertolt (1993). *Über das Historisieren*, in *Bertolt Brecht Werke*, Subrkamp, vol. 22.2, Frankfurt: Main, 689-690].

5 Brecht defines the technique of distancing as a means of transforming the ordinary into impressive [in: Brecht, Bertolt (1993). *Über das Historisieren*, a.a., 588].

for historical and social space and time (Pefanis, 1995, pp. 35-38). Kambanellis' favorite mythical figure is certainly Odysseus, the ingenious, well-traveled man, the one who so well fits to the historical reality of Kambanellis and reflects the man of the modern time; this is why he utilizes him with great ease and skill (Georgopoulou, 2001, p. 9). In his play *Nobody and the Cyclops*, Kambanellis goes beyond his influences from Pirandello, going one step further: the Cyclops are not for him imperfect beings living in the social and historical margins of their time; instead, he tries to give to their fictional face the historical status that belongs to them (Puchner, 2010, p. 67). The Cyclops of Kambanellis invade the house of Odysseus and demand their own place in their social environment, acquiring a historical identity. Imagination and History finally meet in Kambanellis' theatrical writing. Respectively, in *The Last Act* a similar and even wider encounter between mythology, theatrical fiction and History is achieved. The forms of the mythical Odyssey are transformed into persons of theatrical wandering to finally become real characters of everyday life struggle, with the result that the theatre itself is transformed from a social phenomenon into a natural phenomenon through which the man captures the past (Puchner, 2010, pp. 111- 115).

A special example of the reception of History, and in fact of political History, is the play *One Comedy*, which, by having as protagonists mythical, historical, everyday and intertextual heroes, allegorically describes an entire political system (Pefanis, 1999, pp. 73-84). The protagonist of the play is Pluto, the ruler of the Underworld, who has the role of Zeus in the world of the living. His characteristics are his naivety, his servility and his inability to perceive the new political order of things, which make him a pawn in the circle of his officials, the real instigators of the political game. After this politically contradictory image created by the writer's imagination, viewers face another person, the human side of the lord of the Underworld, a family man who enjoys the tenderness of his wife (Markantonatos, 1986, pp. 470-772). Only Persephone has the ability to bring him back when he is in deadlock and ready to collapse. Persephone is the driving force in the evolution of the dramatic plot, symbolizing the unity of the two opposite worlds, the living and the dead. Kambanellis presents her as dynamic and smart in the face of political games but also cunning, making her also devise political tricks.

The only hero who has not succumbed to state and political corruption is Cerberus, who not only has a leading role in Kambanellis' play, but also acquires human status. He is the person who is completely dedicated to his work and eventually is left alone with his secret desires. His characteristics are contrary to those of his mythical archetype; he is no longer the wild monster, guardian, and regulator of the Underworld, this is why his speech has no influence. On the other hand, Hermes appears as the most disliked character of the play, thus showing

many similarities with his mythical archetype. His nickname as Winning Hermes (Κερδῶος Ερμής) shows a two-faced character, cunning, self-interested. His role is twofold, as his responsibility is to undermine the existing political regime and spy on Zeus. He demonstrates servile behavior towards prominent persons in power, thus securing favor and positions. It reflects that person who has no moral barriers and succumbs to any corrupt action for the sake of personal gain. His accomplices in this game of political corruption are Minos, Charon and Aiakos, who with their illegal tricks are damaging the public treasury of the Underworld. However, in contrast to Hermes, the above heroes are in complete contrast to their mythical archetype (Puchner, 2010, p. 171).

Of particular interest are the historical figures of the play, most notably that of Phaedrus, who represents the opposition to the political system of the Underworld. He is a popular activist who, with demagogic slogans, invokes the sentiment of his audience, with the ultimate goal of his political advancement. His political parsimony leads him to call the ruler of Hades a dictator, while in his political circles he promotes a welfare state, which will respect the rights of its citizens. Finally, alongside the mythical and historical heroes of this multifaceted play, there are also everyday faces who are a figment of the playwright's imagination but are a majority representing the society of the Underworld (Pefanis, 2013, p. 192). These are just everyday people, since the kingdom of the dead of Kambanellis is just a reflection, a continuation of the world of the living. The insignificance of unknown personalities is removed because they are placed next to mythical heroes and prominent historical persons, with whom they develop interpersonal relationships (Pefanis, 2013, pp. 195-198).

Another dramatic peculiarity of Kambanellis' writing in which one is worth standing is the diversity that the dramatic spaces present in his whole work and in the contrasts between them (Grammatas, 2006, pp. 57-62). Thus, the bourgeois private bedroom of the *Invisible troupe* is transformed into a popular and communal courtyard, while there are also professional spaces such as the intellectual's office in *Nobody and the Cyclops*. Apart from the interiors, there are also the outdoor landscapes, which can be a balcony in a hotel (*Dad's war*), an outdoor nightclub (*Stella with the red gloves*) but also natural landscapes such as a hill (*Thebes Side Street*) or a seaside place (*Odysseus return home*). In this way we observe a skillful transition from the private and family context to a wider social environment. In fact, according to Pefanis (Pefanis, 2000, p. 22), Kambanellis seems to show a conscious preference for open spaces, thus referring to the ancient Greek drama which has not ceased to be an insatiable source of inspiration for the majority of Greek playwrights. The concept of space in Kambanellis' perception acquires an ironic tone by projecting the contradiction of the consciously degenerate life of

the people within it (Siaflekis, 1994, pp. 87-95). The dramatic landscape is what will reproduce a variety of scenic landscapes which will interact so deeply with the heroes, ultimately determining the evolution and flow of History (Thomadaki, 1993, pp. 93-97).

The concern of Kambanellis' works mostly focuses on the relationship that exists between the concepts of the everyday and the historical, which is why his heroes appear with their unique character and their inner values. Everyday life for Kambanellis has no private significance but includes a whole series of social processes through which everyone is part of History (Blesios, 2011, p. 360). In *Nobody and the Cyclops*, the essence of human existence does not coincide with the family or social role, but with a continuous journey of promoting historical meaning. In *One Comedy*, the kingdom of the dead allegorically and miniaturally represents the contemporary to Kambanellis political and social era, with clear parallelisms of persons and situations. However, he does not limit himself only on allusions, but emphasizes the fragility of the political system, while on a social level he comments on the petty bourgeois element of the modern Greek perception and outlines the profile of the Greek who has easy money as his professional expectation. This social "laziness" created a values gap that is made up of stagnation, indifference and lack of goals and dreams.

The multidimensional concept of the individual through Kambanellis' plays

The concept of the individual in Kambanellis can be approached through the dialectical technique: as the 'being' converses with the 'appearing', the human is revealed as a being who is not only what is seen but is determined by many facades and different roles (Ververopoulou, 2006, pp. 100-105). The individual of Kambanellis is placed within the world as a Subject with many selves, with the gift of alternating the facades he has according to the era he is experiencing. After all, the literary and philosophical modernism of Kambanellis has escaped from the theocentrism of past periods and has turned to an emerging anthropocentrism, according to which the individual is the master of his own destiny and God has no power to intervene in his life (Puchner, 2010, pp. 88-92).

Kambanellis' theatre became from an early stage a place of constant interaction of people with the society in which they lived and acted, and consequently a place of political history. With *Courtyard of Miracles* Kambanellis escapes from the field of ethnography and penetrates into the inner world of the individual, in the essence of the human soul. The individual appears as an internal mechanism of an unstable society and tries, with his full of contrasts temperament, to balance despite the fluidity of his life conditions and the unstable

flow of his history (Pefanis, 2008, pp. 271-280). The coexistence of so many and different human souls and stories within the narrow boundaries of the Courtyard composes a social mosaic and highlights the deepest need of the individual for a miracle. The personal story of each hero becomes a trademark of the common life course within the closed boundaries of the “courtyard”. The obligatory coexistence in the Courtyard, in this fundamental social symbol of Greek history, leads to the formulation of a micro-social problem: the humanity that had been cultivated in the courtyard will fade abruptly in the violent modernization era of Kambanellis and will be lost in the urban noise and in the alienation of the apartment buildings (Pefanis, 2008, pp. 289-292). The notion of dramatic collectivity and participation, with the heroes to conflict but also to be consciously connected, ultimately constitutes the epistemological and sociological framework of Kambanellis’ work (Blesios, 2011, pp. 373-378).

In his plays *Invisible troupe* and *A meeting elsewhere*, the author applies a synthetic dialectic in which the Subject, after first shrinking and being confined, finally unfolds, and multiplies his single individual existence to many, in order to challenge the single one-dimensional social identity without coming out of its uniform space of existence (Grammatas, 2006, p. 61). The Subject, while breaking into many faces, finally manages to remain united. Especially in *A meeting elsewhere*, the different ages, although being independent personalities, finally compose the evolutionary course of human. In *The Last Act*, the invisible and anonymous Odysseus goes through the technique of ‘theatre in theatre’ from obscurity to self-consciousness and finally to the reception of his own historical and social identity (Blesios, 2011, p. 361).

Another dramatic technique frequently used by Kambanellis for the reception of such kinds of multidimensional and multifaceted concepts is that of *heterotopia*. In theatre, the real space is either represented on stage or reconstructed. *Heterotopia*, in contrast to utopia, is a real space, divided via stratification and internal dimensions, thus allowing the creation of fictional places with significant social and political dynamics (Hardwick, 2012, p. 77). The heterotopic spaces often encountered in the metatheatres are ambiguous, as, despite their real dimension, they tend to challenge the real place that is part of a normal social space, and thus contrast with the utopian spaces (Tzouma, 1991, pp. 30-33). Their ambiguity simply means that they tend to question, even to overthrow, the social structures from which they originate. Heterotopic space, however, plays another role: it is a meeting point of the potential past with a latent present (Holub, 2004, p. 109).

In the trilogy of the solo plays *Letter to Orestes*, *The Supper* and *Thebes Side Street*, the first two are a mutation of the Atreidian myth and the third is related

to the Labdakian myth. Especially in *The Supper*, a purely post-theatrical work in which the real and the virtual space coexist, each spectator becomes a member of a wider theatrical performance (Ververopoulou, 2006, pp. 102-104). The dramatic characters, who do not resemble tragic heroes, are possessed by a clearly formed identity and a stable behavior, whose psychological motives are clearly perceptible (Grammatas, 2000, p. 200). More specifically, Electra's husband, Folos, has his own name, therefore acquires a clear historical status thanks to the metatheatricity of Kambanellis. Clytemnestra is a "dramatis persona" and a self-speaking narrator for the author, who lives in a popular neighborhood with neither a tragic nor a theological cover. Kambanellis' Agamemnon, bound by earthly obligations and worries, seems preoccupied with the issue of the continuation of his patriarchal ruling power, while Aegisthus appears as a renaissance humanist. The only one who bears similarities with the corresponding tragic hero is Kambanellis' Orestes, occupied by obsessions and compulsions. Silent Iphigenia is the one who projects the curse of domestic violence that surrounded the house of Atreides, which she decided to break by sacrificing herself to death. She sacrifices herself for a wider social collectivity, believing that this is the reason for her existence and with this very quality she is finally written in History. Finally, she is the person who, with his silent simplicity, subverts the flow of Society and History. With her sacrifice she chooses to consciously exercise her own influence on History and to become part of the historical flow. By participating in the evolution of History, she becomes responsible for her own individual course and escapes from the historical impasse imposed on her by her family and social environment.

Kambanellis' *The Supper* is at the same time reminiscent of Aeschylus' *Choirs* and the *Last Supper*, as it takes the form of a daily family gathering with a ritual and thanksgiving character (Pefanis, 1997, p. 407). Kambanellis' heterotopia is achieved by the meeting of the dead and the living at a family table (with the dead listening to the living, yet without the two sides interacting) transforming the form of the play from a rehearsal-performance to a theatrical illusion. Given that the theatrical space is distinguished into real, imaginary and symbolic, one finds that dramatic creations are a tool to connect socio-political reality with the imaginary world, ultimately producing symbolic values that give human existence a different ontological status (Kosmopoulou, 2018, p. 11).

The space for the ordinary everyday human has the meaning of the spatial environment within which he lives a specific emotional experience at any given time (Kosmopoulou, 2018, p. 12). Within it, the moods of the Subject towards an Object are expressed, resulting in the identification of the two interacting parts. This is very often observed in the dramaturgy of Kambanellis, where a personification of the space, in which the individual as a social entity acquires

transcendental values and qualities, is achieved. In the *Courtyard of Miracles*, the Courtyard is the element that determines the type and the quality of human relationships, and this results in an equalization between Subject and Object (Kosmopoulou, 2018, pp. 25-27).

A key characteristic of the dramatic technique of Kambanellis is the co-function of the author with his dramatic creations. In fact, according to a verbalization by Puchner, Kambanellis coexists with his stage creatures equally, as if he were an invisible participant (Puchner, 2010, p. 170). Especially in the historical and mythical allegories *Odysseus, return home* and *A Comedy*, all the stage characters have an important role to fulfill, which is why they have their own unique historical identity (Puchner, 2010, p. 171). Individual delusions cannot affect the one and unique general principle of reality, thus projecting the historical and social role of the objective reality of Kambanellis' work (Puchner, 2010, p. 175).

The play *A Comedy* was written after an adventure in Kambanellis' health, which is why it depicts a new worldview around the individual. Through the timeless power of the myth, Kambanellis tries to tame time and lend the Individual and History a feeling of optimism and hope. The play is a demythologization of both the process of death and the principles that surround it. Through it, the mysticism of Kambanellis, the transcendence of the Ego and the approach of a mystic wholeness are showcased (Mplesios, 2011, pp. 362-369). The heroes of the play do not perform a mundane-existential cycle with the beginning and end being Hades, as would be expected, but they follow an endless course on earth. Kambanellis gives them this fate, perhaps to disapprove of them, and even to punish them for the selfishness that motivates their actions, as a result of which they repeat the same mistakes over time (Pefanis, 1999, p. 412). In conclusion, Hades symbolizes the subconscious and the descent into it a painful search for an individual and historical objective truth.

Finally, another issue raised in Kambanellis' *A Comedy* is the reception of death, with the author giving it an oneiric dimension. The need of the individual to understand the afterlife is cosmogenic, as the human mind refuses to accept the element of finality that death involves (Pefanis, 2005, p. 91). Kambanellis' Underworld balances between a mythological and a historical era, with the latter constantly accelerating, causing rapid historical and social developments. The play forces the spectator to face and consider the exact opposite possibility: what would happen if death did not exist; that is, it tries to free the human from the fear of death by indicating to him the necessity of death (Pefanis, 2013, pp. 201-203).



Tribute to Iakovos Kambanellis _ source:
[https://www.kambanellis.gr/language/en/
photo-gallery/](https://www.kambanellis.gr/language/en/photo-gallery/)

Conclusions/Epilogue

Studying the structure and content of Kambanellis' plays and then attempting to comment on the important concepts of space, History, individual or even death, one would find out that he cannot isolate them into separate chapters: speaking of history one would be forced to speak also of the Individual within it, and speaking of the Individual he will be compelled to include it in the uninterrupted flow of History. Observing Kambanellis' work as a whole, one can easily conclude that Kambanellis criticizes not only the very meaning of History but also its reception, while at the same time seeking to present the historical events not as natural, but as a consequence of the processes arising from a society divided in classes, in which the ideology of the ruling class influences and directs the development of each event (Pefanis, 2005, p. 100). From this conclusion arises the finding that only the dialectical relationship between theory and practice can make a decisive contribution to the completion of historical changes. Kambanellis considers that the understanding of History is achieved not only through its connection with the present, but also through the historicization of the present in the light of dialectical materialism, which offers objective knowledge (Pefanis, 2005, p. 80).

The place of History in Kambanellis' dramaturgy can be characterized as multidimensional and multifaceted, due to its various expressions and functions. Thus, he often chooses to connect closely with the individual in order to gradually proceed to a deconstruction of the individual, social and political composition of the modern social mechanism, usually through the historicization of the present. The individual, despite any contradictions of his temperament, which define his role on a personal – private and social level, should put aside his subjective destiny and consider the consequences that his contemporary division of society in classes will bring to history.

Kambanellis is the playwright who has become known as the “patron of history”. He gives his own stigma to a relatively new literary and theatrical genre, farce, giving it social dimensions at historical level; while from the point of view of the reception of the individual he gives us the profile of the bourgeois (and petty bourgeois) modern Greek. This essay deserves to close with the phrase of Herbert Blau, which perfectly captures the whole of the dramatic creation of Kambanellis: “where there is memory, there is theatre”.

Greek references:

- [Ververgopoulou 2006] Βερβεροπούλου, Ζωή (2006). «Η σημαντική των τίτλων στο έργο του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη», στο *Πρακτικά του Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου προς τιμήν του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη*, επιμέλεια Νίκος Χρυσόχοδός, Μαρία Ρενιέρη, 97-107. Πάτρα: Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών.
- [Gennette 2018] Gennette, Gerard (2018). *Παλίμψηστα. Η λογοτεχνία δευτέρου βαθμού*, (μτφρ.

- Πατοσιγιάννης Β.). Αθήνα: ΜΙΕΤ.
- [Georgopoulou 2001] Γεωργοπούλου, Βαρβάρα (2001). «Μία συνάντηση στην ποιητική χώρα του Ιάνωβου Καμπανέλλη». Εκδήλωση που διοργάνωσε το ΔΗ.ΠΕ.ΘΕ. Ιωαννίνων προς τιμή του Ιάνωβου Καμπανέλλη με τίτλο «Μεταμορφώσεις των τραγικών προσώπων στη δραματουργία του Καμπανέλλη, 15 Μαΐου 2001. Ιωάννινα: ΔΗ.ΠΕ.ΘΕ.
- [Grammatas 2000] Γραμματάς, Θεόδωρος (2000). «Ερρίκος Ίψεν-Ιάκωβος Καμπανέλλης: Βρικόλακες-Στη χώρα Ίψεν», στο *Ταυτότητα και Ετερότητα στη Λογοτεχνία, 18ος-20ος αι., 2*, 197-203. Αθήνα: Παπαζήση.
- [Grammatas 2002] Γραμματάς, Θεόδωρος (2002). *Το νεοελληνικό θέατρο στον 20^ο αιώνα. Συμβολή στην ιστορία του νεοελληνικού θεάτρου*. Αθήνα: Παπαζήση.
- [Grammatas 2006] Γραμματάς, Θεόδωρος (2006). «Νεοτερικότητα και μεταμοντερνισμός στη δραματουργία του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη», *Πρακτικά Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου προς τιμήν του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη*, επιμ. Νίκος Χρυσόχορς, Μαρία Ρενιέρη 57-62. Πάτρα: Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών.
- [Culler 2003] Culler, Jonathan (2003). *Λογοτεχνική θεωρία. Μια συνοπτική εισαγωγή*. Ηράκλειο: Πανεπιστημιακές εκδόσεις Κρήτης.
- [Hardwick 2012] Hardwick, Lorna (2012). *Πρόσληψη. Ερευνητικές προσεγγίσεις*. Αθήνα: Παπαζήση.
- [Holub 2004] Holub, Robert (2004). *Θεωρία της πρόσληψης. Μια κριτική εισαγωγή* (μτφρ. Τσακοπούλου Κ.). Αθήνα: Μεταίχμιο.
- [Thomadaki 1993] Θωμάδακη, Μαρίκα (1993). *Σημειωτική του ολικού θεατρικού λόγου*. Αθήνα: Δόμος.
- [Kosmopoulou 2016] Κοσμοπούλου, Γ. Δέσποινα (2016). «Τραγικό και παράλογο στο σύγχρονο γαλλικό θέατρο: οι επιδράσεις του Λουίτζι Πιραντέλλο στον Ζαν Ζενέ», διδακτορική διατριβή. Αθήνα: Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο (ΕΚΠΑ).
- [Kosmopoulou 2018] Κοσμοπούλου, Γ. Δέσποινα (2018). *Ο εγκλεισμός και η διαλεκτική του χώρου στο θέατρο*. Αθήνα: Δρόμων.
- [Mplesios 2011] Μπλέσιος, Αθανάσιος (2011). «Η προσπάθεια επιβίωσης της παραδοσιακής κοινότητα και η προοπτική ανανέωσής της στην *Αυλή των Θαυμάτων* του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη» στο *Μελέτες νεοελληνικής δραματολογίας. Από τον Χορτάση έως τον Καμπανέλλη*, επιμέλεια του ιδίου, 351-379, Αθήνα: Παπαζήση.
- [Pefanis 1995] Πεφάνης, Γεώργιος (1995). «Τοπίο μέσα σε Τοπίο: Πρωτεύοντες του δραματικού χώρου στο έργο του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη», *Δρώμενα* 14: 31-40.
- [Pefanis 1997] Πεφάνης, Γεώργιος (1997). «Μικρό οδοιπορικό στη χώρα Καμπανέλλη», *Νέα Εστία* 6: 406-414.
- [Pefanis 1999] Πεφάνης, Γεώργιος (1999). «Νέες όψεις αρχαίων κόσμων: Μορφές και ιδέες της αρχαίας ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας στη δραματουργία του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη», *Μανδραγόρας* 20-21: 73-84.
- [Pefanis 2005] Πεφάνης, Γεώργιος (2005). «Η ιστορική διάσταση στην πολιτική τριλογία του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη: *Το μεγάλο μας τσίρκο, Το κουκί και το ρεβύθι, Ο εχθρός λαός*», *Θέματα Λογοτεχνίας* 30: 58-101.
- [Pefanis 2008] Πεφάνης, Γεώργιος (2008). «Στις απαρχές της Καμπανελλικής δημιουργίας: Άνθρωποι και ημέρες (1946-1947)», *Παράβασις* 8: 257-305.
- [Pefanis 2013] Πεφάνης, Γιώργος (2013). «Ο χώρος και ο χρόνος του φαντάσματος. Μια φαινομενολογική προσέγγιση της ενότητας στη σύγχρονη ελληνική δραματουργία», *Παράβασις* 11: 189-204.
- [Puchner 2010] Puchner, Walter (2010). *Τοπία ψυχής και μύθοι πολιτείας: Το θεατρικό σύμπαν του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη*. Αθήνα: Παπαζήση.
- [Siaflekis 1994] Σιαφλέκης, Ι. Ζαχαρίας (1994). *Η εύθραυστη αλήθεια. Εισαγωγή στη θεωρία του λογοτεχνικού μύθου*. Αθήνα: Gutenberg.

- [Tzouma 1991] Τζούμα, Άννα (1991). *Η διπλή ανάγνωση του κειμένου. Για μία κοινωνιοσημειωτική της αφήγησης*. Αθήνα: Επικαιρότητα.
- [Tsatsoulis 2004] Τσατσούλης, Δημήτριος (2004). *Ιφενικά διακελμένα στη δραματολογία του Ιάκωβου Καμπανέλλη*. Αθήνα: Μεταίχμιο.

Foreign references:

- [Abel, 1963] Abel, Lionel (1963). *Metatheatre: A new view of dramatic form*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- [Brecht, 1993] Brecht, Bertolt (1993). *Über das Historisieren, in Bertolt Brecht Werke*, Suhrkamp, vol. 22.2. Frankfurt: Main.
- [Markantonatos, 1986] Markantonatos, Andreas (1986). «Moral integrity and political cynicism in Euripides' Hercules». In: *Euripides' Fabulae*, ed. Diggle J., Tomus II, 462-488. Oxford: English translations.

Dr Despina Kosmopoulou was born in Athens and has graduated from the Faculty of Letters at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. She is a post-doctoral researcher in the Department of Theatre Studies of the National Kapodistrian University of Athens and the Department of Philology of the University of the Peloponnese. She is also an adjunct lecturer in the Department of Theatrical Studies of the Arts and Crafts School of the University of the Peloponnese. Despina Kosmopoulou examines theatre further through the philosophy proposed by Semiology. She is a member and researcher of the Centre for Ancient Rhetoric and Drama of the University of Peloponnese, member of the Hellenic Semiotics Society and member of the creative team of the Analogio Festival under the auspices of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports. She has written three books that are published by the *Dromon Publications*: *Pirandello and Genet, a 'Meeting' in the Tragic and the Absurd* (2017), *SpaceDialectics and Enclosure to the Theater* (2018), *Theatrical Writing and Theory of Semiotics* (2020).