ODRODZENIE I REFORMACJA W POLSCE ▪ SI 2016 ▪ PL ISSN 0029-8514

Michał Bajer
Department of Romance Philology
University of Szczecin

"The Words of My Mouth Shall They Be, Yet the Will of the Greeks". A Representation of the "Diplomatic Mission" in Act III of *Troas* by Łukasz Górnicki

Translations are an important element of the diverse body of work of Łukasz Górnicki (1527–1603) – the royal secretary to King Sigismund Augustus and the Alderman of Tykocin and Wasilków. The prestige granted to translators' work in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century derived primarily from the innovative and at times even experimental nature of the most significant translation undertakings of the period. When working on texts forming part of the European cultural canon, translators would test out the ability of the Polish language to express the previously unexpressed content in brand new forms. In this respect, the most popular of Górnicki's works – the adaptation of *Il Cortigiano* (1528) by Baldassare Castiglione, published under the title *Dworzanin polski* (1566) – stands in the same rank as *Eneida* (*Aeneid*; Polish version – 1590) by Andrzej Kochanowski (1542–1596) and *Gofred* (*Jerusalem Delivered*; 1618) by Piotr Kochanowski (1566–1620). Despite being less frequently discussed,[1]

[1] After its initial publication, the text did not have any further editions in the Old Polish period. Nonetheless, a surprising testimony to the reception of Górnicki's piece can be found in the works of Stanisław Morsztyn (d. 1725) from the late seventeenth century; his translation of *Andromaque* by Jean Racine (ca. 1690) features not only the usual references to Jan Kochanowski but also clear paraphrases of the text discussed in this paper. More information on the subject can

http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/OiRwP.2016.SI.07

the Polish adaptation of *Troades* by Lucius Aenneus Seneca, published under the title *Troas* (1589), was meant to be just as ambitious as the aforementioned masterpieces of Polish translation in the period of late Renaissance and early Baroque. This is evidenced by the preface written by Górnicki, who emphasises the unique character of the *opus* dedicated to Piotr Wiesołowski: "Ja tedy, Polakiem będąc, życzyłbym tego narodowi swemu, żeby między tymi ludźmi, co je *Barbaros* zową, poczytan nie był naród polski, i dlatego, gdzie mogę, podaję tego ludziom, żeby polskim językiem rzeczy te pisali, które są abo w greckim, abo w łacińskim języku. [– –] przeto onę tragedyją Seneki [– –] posyłam W[aszej] M[iłości] po polsku, iżbyś W[asza] M[iłość], przyrodzony rozsądek dobry mając i w naukach niepodle ćwiczony będąc, przypatrzył się, mogąli tym kształtem w polszczyznę wchodzić rzeczy językiem greckim abo łacińskim pisane, czyli inakszego sposobu w tej mierze zdałoby się W[aszej] M[iłości] naszladować".[2] Such an appeal to the reader can be explained by the fact that Górnicki's *Troas* was the earliest full translation of an ancient tragedy in Poland.[3]

The plot of Seneca's piece – inspired by *Troades* and *Hecuba* by Euripides, as well as by Virgil's *Aeneid*[4] – takes place after the fall of Troy. As the title suggests, the play does not feature a central individual protagonist; the source of pity and fear is the fate of the surviving female members of the royal family ruling the fallen city-state (Queen Hecuba, Andromache, the widow of the heir apparent, and young Princess Polyxena) and the wife of Menelaus, Helen of Troy. The static structure of the tragedy, giving great importance to the performances of the chorus and songs of lamentation, greatly influenced the attempts to revive the ancient genre in the Renaissance period, both in Italy (where it was translated by Lodovico Dolce)[5] and in France

---

be found in my article: M. Bajer, "Problem spójności tekstu w staropolskim przekładzie tragedii. Stanisław Morsztyn i Andromacha z Racine'a," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 106, no. 1 (2015), p. 108.

[2] Quotes from *Troas* after: Ł. Górnicki, *Pisma*, vol. 1, ed. R. Pollak (Warszawa, 1961).

[3] Cf.: J. Abramowska, *Ład i fortuna. O tragedii renesansowej w Polsce* (Wrocław, 1974), p. 90; T. Bieńkowski, *Antyk w literaturze i kulturze staropolskiej 1450–1750. Główne problemy i kierunki recepcji* (Wrocław, 1976), p. 114.

[4] Cf. W.M. Calder III, "Originality in Seneca's *Troades*," *Classical Philology* 65, no. 2 (1970), pp. 75–82; F. Corsaro, "Andromaca, Astianatte e Ulisse nelle *Trades* di Seneca. Fra innovazione e conservazione," *Orpheus* 12 (1991), pp. 63–84. For more on Seneca's intertextuality cf. Ch.V. Trinacty, *Senecan Tragedy and the Reception of Augustian Poetry* (Oxford, 2014).

[5] Cf. L. Dolce, *Le Troiane, tragedia recitata in Venetia l'anno MDLXVI* (Venetia, 1593).

(translated by Robert Garnier).[6] Górnicki's adaptation was created in the late period of the writer's professional activity. Rafał Löwenfeld has made a connection between the translator's interest in the piece of Seneca as writer and the high esteem which humanists held for the output of Seneca as philosopher (at the same time emphasising that the two were often confused at the time).[7] The hypothesis of the close relationship between *Troas* and Górnicki's fascination with Stoicism re-emerges in the works of Roman Pollak,[8] Janina Abramowska[9], and Jakub Zdzisław Lichański.[10] This view is also supported by the fact that the translator published Seneca's treatise *De beneficiis* (*Rzecz o dobrodziejstwach*, 1591) shortly after the publication of *Troas.* Throughout more than a century which passed since the release of the first monograph on the Renaissance intellectual,[11] Górnicki's artistic confrontation with Seneca has been subject to various evaluations. The main criticism of the work is that it is much longer than the original.[12] Other flaws mentioned by the critics are anachronisms,[13] excessive moralising[14], and ignorance of the very essence of Seneca's artistry.[15] When asked why the work has found so little popularity, Barbara Noworolska indicated its deeply rooted pessimism.[16]

---

[6] Cf. R. Garnier, *La Troade, tragédie* (Paris, 1579).

[7] Cf. R. Löwenfeld, *Łukasz Górnicki, jego życie i dzieła. Przyczynek do dziejów humanizmu w Polsce* (Warszawa, 1884), p. 131.

[8] Cf. R. Pollak, "Górnicki Łukasz (1527–1603)," in: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, vol. 8 (Wrocław et al., 1960), p. 428.

[9] Cf. Abramowska, *Ład i fortuna*, p. 103.

[10] Cf. J.Z. Lichański, "Sarmacki Castiglione," *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 26, no. 9 (1982), p. 114; idem, *Łukasz Górnicki. Sarmacki Castiglione* (Warszawa, 1998), p. 88.

[11] Löwenfeld, *Łukasz Górnicki*.

[12] Cf.: ibidem, pp. 138–139; Bieńkowski, *Antyk*, p. 114. The expansion of the text in the context of Górnicki's literary strategies is thoroughly discussed by M. Wiśniowolski: "The appearance of explanations of certain words and terms which may not be recognised by the Polish reader can be excused. The poet, after all, did not want to introduce footnotes to his work. However, the pleonasms which do not constitute purposeful amplification aimed at enriching the stylistic aspect of the text are used excessively by Górnicki and constitute a defect of the translation"; idem, "*Troades* Seneki w adaptacji," in: *Łukasz Górnicki i jego czasy*, ed. B. Noworolska, W. Stec (Białystok, 1993), p. 297.

[13] Cf. Löwenfeld, *Łukasz Górnicki*, p. 135.

[14] Cf. Wiśniowolski, "*Troades* Seneki," pp. 299–300.

[15] Cf. ibidem, p. 301.

[16] Cf. B. Noworolska, "*Troas* Łukasza Górnickiego czyli tren dla Rzeczypospolitej," in: *Łukasz Górnicki i jego czasy*, p. 108.

At the same time, *Troas* is praised for its expressiveness,[17] agile use of Mannerist stylistic means[18], and masterful rhetorisation, characteristic for the period.[19] As Mieczysław Wiśniowolski puts it in his discussion of the linguistic properties of the translation, "the author often demonstrates his stylistic agility through his selection of words and phrases".[20] Having these reviews in mind, in this paper I would like to shift the emphasis from the evaluation of the work to its description and attempt to interpret the text in its historical and literary context. At the same time, I will focus my attention on one specific part of the translation – Act III – and limit my analysis to the issue of how the text reflects certain elements of the Renaissance concept of diplomacy. I will aim to show that these issues are significant enough to be the object of a separate analysis.

Act III of *Troas* focuses on the dramatic confrontation of Ulysses and Andromache, culminating with the heir of Troy, Astyanax, being captured and executed by the Greeks. According to Jerzy Ziomek, it constitutes the most characteristic *passus* of the tragedy,[21] even though most critics point out the extreme pathos prevalent in this part of the text.[22] Using these remarks as a starting point, I would like to put forward a different, more extensive interpretation of the scene in question. While it is true that the speeches and events in the text have an extremely emotional character, they are nonetheless consistent with the broader structure of the work, based on stage interpretation of various aspects of the rhetorical and dramatic word. One the one

[17] Cf.: Z. Żygulski, *Tragedie Seneki a dramat nowożytny do końca XVIII wieku* (Lwów, 1939), p. 164. J. Lewański mentions a "dramatic tension," cf. idem, *Dramat i teatr średniowiecza i renesansu w Polsce* (Warszawa, 1981), p. 200.

[18] Cf. Noworolska, "*Troas* Łukasza Górnickiego," p. 109.

[19] Cf. Wiśniowolski, "*Troades* Seneki," p. 300.

[20] Ibidem, p. 301.

[21] "Act III is the most characteristic and most 'Senecan' [– –]. It is one of the most shocking scenes: the futile pleas of Andromache, the paralysing fear of Astyanax, the inhumanly heroic attitude of the mother and the brave behaviour of a child facing death," J. Ziomek, *Renesans* (Warszawa, 1976), pp. 412–413. Lewański comments on it as follows: "The stage is filled to the brim with a multitude of characters and experiences tugging at our heartstrings. The play seems to oscillate towards tragic melodrama and Gothic drama characteristic of the nineteenth century, straying far from the styles of monumental Greek tragedies, *Odprawa posłów greckich*, and even further from *Jeftes*"; idem, *Dramat i teatr*, p. 329.

[22] Cf.: Abramowska, *Ład i fortuna*, pp. 92–111; Lewański, *Dramat i teatr*, pp. 328–329; Lichański, *Łukasz Górnicki*, pp. 87–95.

hand, each scene of a classical tragedy (as well as each part of speech) constitutes the (continuously repeated) synthesis of the possibilities granted to the author by the literary system of the era. Such strategy is applied in accordance with the principle of *varietas*, used in the art of public speaking and poetry. On the other hand, the multi-dimensional character of the long dialogue in Act III of *Troas* should rather be seen as a consequently implemented composition principle.

The aforementioned multi-dimensional or multi-faceted nature of Act III consists in the purposeful placement of the key dramatic conflict at the junction of several basic functions performed by the characters in the play. I do not allude exclusively to the (evident but not trite) observation that the characters are both politicians and human beings: Ulysses is both a man wishing to return home (like the old Greek soldier he talks about, the "miles senex" mentioned in v. 551) and an astute ruler, Andromache – a queen and a terrified woman, etc. When analysing the fragment in question I will focus primarily on the duality of the character of Ulysses – a king serving as an envoy to other Greek monarchs and a representative of their collective will.[23] It is this particular context that brings to the fore the conflict between the human and the public dimension of the character.

The main focus of analysis and discussion will be the modifications and additions introduced to the Latin original by the Renaissance translator. The methodology used in the paper, therefore, will place it among the works written from the perspective introduced in the influential output of Radosław Rusnak.[24] In this light, translation constitutes a multi-faceted interpretation of the source material. When comparing Górnicki's work with Seneca's original text, I will carefully analyse the former author's treatment of tragic heroes and the rhetorical *ethos* of the antagonists.[25] The aim of this study is to

---

[23] This unusual character construction is indicated by Timothy Hampton in reference to Orestes from Racine's *Andromaque* (1667). The analogies between the works of Seneca and Racine will be elaborated on further in the paper, where I will once again refer to Hampton's book.

[24] Cf. R. Rusnak, *Seneca noster. Studium o dawnych przekładach tragedii Seneki Młodszego* (Warszawa, 2009); idem, "Seneca – Kochanowski, Kochanowski – Seneca," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 99, no. 3 (2008), pp. 35–56; cf. also idem, "Konstantynowej Sobieskiej na pożegnanie z Żółkwią, czyli o przekładzie łacińskiej Oktawii," *Przekładaniec* 1–2 (2007), pp. 198–217.

[25] For more information on the connections between rhetoric and drama in Górnicki's era cf. i.a.: M. Fumaroli, *Les héros et orateurs. La rhétorique et dramaturgie cornéliennes* (Genève, 1995); K. Płachcińska, "Oracje z *Odprawy posłów greckich*

pinpoint the basic tendencies which influenced the sixteenth-century Polish intellectual's interpretation of Seneca's tragedy. The tendencies present in the translation correspond well with the philosophical and political transformations taking place in the period. The former derive from the Christian perspective adopted by the Polish poet,[26] while the latter – from the apparent analogy to the contemporary public life. Seneca's original presentation of the speeches by the king of Ithaca emphasises their connection to the wartime negotiations as depicted in narrative literature, especially the works of Homer.[27] I will aim to prove that the linguistic portrait of the Polish Ulysses, while preserving some elements of the original, is to some extent parallel with the activities of politicians involved in various negotiations at the courts of Christian Europe. Some of these negotiations can be referred to as diplomatic service, which was gaining more and more importance in the times of Górnicki's life and literary activity.[28] As mentioned

---

w świetle mów sejmowych z czasów Jana Kochanowskiego," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 97, no. 4 (2006), pp. 203–228; A. Chojowska, "Retoryka w renesansowej tragedii humanistycznej," in: *Retoryka a tekst literacki*, vol. 2, ed. M. Hanczakowski, J. Niedźwiedź (Kraków, 2003).

[26] Górnicki's literary output coincided with what in Europe is described as Christian Stoicism, represented by, among others, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Justus Lipsius, and Frenchmen: Guillaume du Vair, Pierre de la Primaudaye, Guy du Faur de Pibrac, Pierre Charon, Michel de Montaigne. There is an extensive body of literature on the subject. Apart from classic works: Léontine Zanty, *La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1914) and Anthony Levi, *French Moralists. The Theory of the Passion* (Oxford, 1964), it is worth mentioning some newer studies: *Le stoïcisme au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle. Le retour des philosophies antiques à l'Âge classique*, ed. J. Langrée (Caen, 1994); *Juste Lipse (1547–1606). Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 1994*, ed. Ch. Mouchel, (Paris, 1996).

[27] The third act of the original tragedy was thoroughly analysed by Francesco Corsaro. As indicated by its title, his paper focuses primarily on the treatment of source material by Seneca. It also contains a number of significant comments, interesting in the context of Górnicki's text. Corsaro believes that by making Ulysses capture Astyanax, Seneca modifies the tradition, which assigned the role to Pyrrhus. At the same time he argues that such a decision was appropriate for this particular depiction of Ulysses: "la sua topica carracteriale di sofista consumato e il suo ben noto repertorio di collaudati trabochetti lo rendevano particolarmente adatto alle esigenze della lunga e tesa controversia"; idem, "Andromaca, Astianatte e Ulisse," p. 68. The Italian historian also mentions the duality of Ulysses in Seneca's work. While his role in *Troades* is morally dubious, Seneca's ethical treatises present him as the ideal of Stoic virtue, ibidem.

[28] Górnicki had a political career as the royal secretary to Sigismund II Augustus and the Alderman of Tykocin and Wasilków. Cf.: Löwenfeld, *Łukasz Górnicki*;

by Roman Żelweski in the book *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, "[in the years 1506–1572] the ruler theoretically maintains his control over diplomacy but the increasingly complex international relations make it necessary, regardless of the monarch's personal abilities, to introduce improvements to the advisory bodies he has at his disposal. It is important for both the advisors and the emissaries to be not only talented but also well-trained. Fully professional advisory bodies and envoys will appear slightly later but the aforementioned period is precisely when such tendencies start to emerge, [– –] creating a bridge leading all the way to modernity".[29]

More and more complicated diplomatic missions, carried out away from the centres of power by representatives working on their behalf, constituted an important element of the sixteenth-century reality, and, as such, could have an influence on Polish translations of texts as deeply rooted in politics as ancient tragedies. This should come as no surprise considering the typical poetics of Renaissance translations, often described as adaptive.[30] Particularly characteristic are the words which Górnicki puts into Ulysses' mouth when the character talks about his mission. The passage: "Ja, co poselstwo niosę tobie ku słuchaniu / Ciężkie [– –]" (vv. 197–198) is parallel to "Durae minister sortis"[31] (v. 524) in the original. The sixteenth-century intellectuals, including Górnicki, translated the word "minister" as "priest", "helper" or "servant",[32] even though one dictionary also features the meaning "intermediary, translator, envoy".[33] Paraphrasing the Latin

---

Pollak, "Górnicki Łukasz". The literary testimony to his political activity is *Dzieje w Koronie Polskiej*, written in the final years of the author's life.

[29] R. Żelewski, "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1506–1572," in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. 1: *Połowa X w. – 1572*, ed. M. Biskup (Warszawa, 1982), p. 725. Górnicki's *Dzieje w Koronie Polskiej* is a source quite frequently cited in the publication.

[30] Cf. i.a.: M. Ballard, *De Cicéron à Benjamin: traducteurs, traductions, réflexions* (Villeneuve-d'Ascq, 2007); L. D'Hulst, *Essais d'Histoire de la traduction. Avatars de Janus* (Paris, 2014).

[31] Seneca, *Tragedies*, vol. 1, ed. F.J. Miller (Cambridge, MA and London 1960). The excerpts cited in the paper are compared to the sixteenth-century edition, similar to a copy that could circulate in Górnicki's circles: *Senecae tragoediae, Benedicti Philologi Florentini praefatio* (Firenze, 1513).

[32] Cf. J. Nicot, *Thrésor de la langue française tant ancienne que moderne* (Paris, 1960).

[33] *Słownik łacińsko-polski*, ed. M. Plezia, vol. 3 (Warszawa, 1998), p. 498. *Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce* lists the following meaning: "court minister, previously the judge's assistant and later lower court officer delivering claims";

phrase with the term *poselstwo* ("diplomatic mission")[34], therefore, seems correct from the point of view of linguistics, although at the same time Górnicki omits the mention of fate ("minister sortis"). He instead introduces a series of changes, most important of which is shifting the emphasis from the metaphysical, even sacral aspect of the king's intervention to one that is human and political. The monarch's importance loses its transcendent nature and becomes mundane. Ulysses is no longer the "servant of destiny" revealed by Calchas but a messenger informing the outside world of the will of the priest (and other people, as the subsequent verse mentions some unspecified "elders", v. 200).

Górnicki goes on to create a broader vision through the words of Ulysses ("pacem laetus ad Danaos feram", v. 606), depicting Greeks awaiting the envoy and rejoicing at the news he brings them: "wnet u Greków będzie wdzięczny goniec, / Którzy na to czekają, żeby co słyszeli / Lubego, gdyż się doma radzi by widzieli" (vv. 324–326). The word *goniec* ("courier")[35] used in the text is not an equivalent

---

Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce, ed. M. Plezia, vol. 6 (Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków, 1985–1992), p. 338. It is unlikely that Górnicki found any parallels between Ulysses and such a low-ranking officer, but on the other hand, Seneca depicts him as "delivering" a decision to Andromache.

[34] This term refers to a group of envoys or a "matter or order entrusted to an envoy or emissary, also the message that is to be delivered"; *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, ed. M.R. Mayenowa, vol. 27 (Warszawa, 1999), p. 451. Only the latter meaning is reflected in what Ulysses says. The term also appears in other works by Górnicki. It is often used to refer to a third-party intermediary in private negotiations (cf. "stara się o to, aby chęć swą i serdeczną miłość co najbarziej miłej swej pokazał, kiedy niema przyjaciela takiego, któryby i poselstwo donosił, i o chęci takowej umiał powiedzieć", Ł. Górnicki, *Dworzanin polski*, in: idem, *Dzieła wszystkie*, vol. 1, prepared for print by R. Loewenfeld, ed. P. Chmielowski [Warszawa, 1886], p. 183), even though it also describes diplomatic activities in the current meaning of the term; cf. "z tym do cesarza Karła, a do Węgier do siostry królowej węgierskiej Isabelle księdza Filipa Padniowskiego sekretarza (który potym pieczęć mniejszą puściwszy biskupem krakowskim umarł) z poselstwem pełnym miłości i do inszych panów chrześcijańskich na pogrzeb prosząc, posłał"; idem, *Dzieje w Koronie Polskiej*, in: ibidem, vol. 3, p. 148. At times, however, it is difficult to define whether the phenomenon described by the term is private or public in nature; cf. "Ten o radę kołace, ów aby cię w poselstwie użył; więc jednać, więc raić, więc stanowić, wszystkiego tego u mądrej głowy szukają"; idem, *Dworzanin*, p. 111.

[35] Cf.: "Emissary, envoy sent out with a defined aim or mission, *nuntius*, *veredarius*"; *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, ed. M.R. Mayenowa, vol. 7 (Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków, 1973), p. 539: the word comes in a line with the word *poseł*.

of any Latin term from the original. The translator once again accentuates Ulysses' diplomatic function and his importance as an envoy sent out by a decision-making body. While the mission of the king of Ithaca does not fully correspond with the activities of a sixteenth-century ambassador[36] (the figure of which has been described by numerous theorists[37] and slightly earlier depicted in a highly idealised manner by, among others, Hans Holbein in his famous 1533 double portrait), the text of the translation provides plenty reasons to closely study the function of an "envoy" usurped by the protagonist, which constitutes a particular example of the application of the art of oration in a wide range of forms and of rhetorical practices commonly used in the times of Górnicki. Moreover – as I will aim to demonstrate in further parts of the paper – the complexity of the role of Ulysses is a reflection of the political and intellectual tensions of mature Renaissance.

Dramatic situation and political mission

A good starting point for the discussion of the diplomatic mission of Ulysses can be the book focusing on the depictions of diplomacy in Early Modern literature, written by Timothy Hampton and published in 2009.[38] Particularly interesting is the chapter on *Andromaque* by Jean Racine (1663), since – unless the American historian analyses *Troades* by Seneca – the work of the seventeenth-century dramatist can be considered a creative variation on certain themes of the Roman play. Most visible parallels can be found in Orestes' mission to the court of Pyrrhus, during which the son of Agamemnon pleads for

[36] The issue of the diplomatic terminology of the period is quite complicated. It is mentioned in *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*: "While the issue of diplomatic missions was usually systematised, the use of terminology was initially arbitrary. Apart from the Latin titles of *legatus*, *nuntius*, *internuntius*, *orator* etc., their equivalents in various languages are used; in mid-sixteenth century, the title of ambassador, already known in Venice, starts to gain popularity. A permanent envoy is an ordinary ambassador, and a provisional envoy – an extraordinary ambassador"; Żelewski, "Dyplomacja," pp. 751–752; "Historians point to various, often imprecise terms used in Polish diplomacy, where an envoy is often described as: internuncio, ambassador, legate, ablegate, orator"; M. Barłowska, *Jerzy Ossoliński, orator polskiego baroku* (Katowice, 2000), p. 26. Cf. also S.E. Nahlik, *Narodziny nowożytnej dyplomacji* (Wrocław, 1971).

[37] G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York, 1988); D. Ménager, *Diplomatie et théologie à la Renaissance* (Paris, 2001).

[38] Cf. T. Hampton, *Fictions of Embassy. Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, 2009).

the return of Astyanax. In this perspective, Racine's work cannot be seen as an example of the final stage of the evolution of the tragic genre reanimated in Renaissance Europe.[39] It rather seems to be another[40] lasting proof of the dramatist's erudite[41] fascination with the work of the playwright from Cordoba. It is worth pointing out that when entrusting Orestes with the mission parallel to the one carried out by Ulysses in Seneca's work, the French playwright consistently uses the term "diplomatic mission"[42] and refers to the son of Agamemnon as the "ambassador of the Greeks". According to Hampton, the figure of the king-ambassador symbolises a particular era in the history of the forms of political organisation (the same which – in the Polish context – Roman Żelewski calls "an organisational bridge leading to modernity"[43]). When describing the task of Ulysses as a "diplomatic mission", Górnicki anticipated the decisions of Racine. This serves to confirm the hypothesis formulated in the introduction to this paper, according to which political habits of modern readers influenced their interpretation of ancient plays. In the context of the study put forward in this paper, the text of *Andromaque* should serve as a gloss shedding light on the categories in which the situation presented in Act III of Seneca's *Troades* was decoded by a man living in the century directly following the era of Górnicki. At the same time, however, the possibilities of re-interpreting Seneca's text within the frameworks adopted by Górnicki and Racine differ significantly. By using certain elements of the Latin work as an intertextual mould generating more autonomous forms of expression, the French poet had access to incomparably broader possibilities of intervening in situations and speeches of the original text. Górnicki's work, as a translation (though an adaptive one), was much more restrained when it came to adjusting the

---

[39] Such a vision of the relationship between Classicist tragedy and Renaissance works within the genre is presented by Janina Kułtuniakowa, *Odprawa posłów greckich Jana Kochanowskiego wobec tragedii renesansowej* (Prace Wydziału Filologicznego, Ser. Filologia Polska, no. 4; Poznań, 1963).

[40] After texts by Lodovico Dolci, Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio, Guérin de La Pinelière and many others.

[41] Cf. R. Tobin, *Racine and Seneca* (Chapel Hill, 1971).

[42] French: *ambassade*.

[43] Żelewski, "Dyplomacja," p. 725. As Timothy Hampton puts it when referring to Racine's *Andromaque*: „Orestes embodies the tension between a new culture of diplomatic professionalization, on the one hand, and a strong sense that embassies are best carried out by members of the highest nobility, on the other hand"; idem, *Fictions of Embassy*, p. 170.

original text to the cognitive horizons of the target audience. This is why in the case of Górnicki one cannot speak of a full transformation of the role of Ulysses but rather of a marked tendency of the translator to accentuate analogies to diplomatic missions.

When comparing *Andromaque* to *Troas*, we can conclude that in the latter, as opposed to Racine's Orestes, Ulysses does not negotiate with the head of an autonomous state or any of its representatives: in Act III, he faces Andromache – a captive woman with no real power.[44] This is a key difference between Górnicki's text and the French tragedy written in the later period, as it makes the dramatic situation more akin to the political interventions of king-warriors from the world of *The Iliad* than to the customs of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century courts.[45] The execution of politically warranted rights from a helpless woman, along with the use of threats or direct violence – all this makes the king's actions differ significantly from the sixteenth-century concept of diplomacy.

Even if the task entrusted to Ulysses cannot be described as an ambassador's mission,[46] it still combines several functions connected to carrying out negotiations away from the centre of power. What makes Ulysses similar to an envoy is the obligation to creatively fulfil his duty. He is not, after all, a typical tragic messenger devoid of his own will[47],

---

[44] In Racine's work, Orestes is a synthesis of Ulysses and Agamemnon. This is evidenced not only by the fact that – similarly to the protagonist in Seneca's tragedy – he is presented in contrast to Pyrrhus but also by Racine's use of arguments appearing in the speeches of Agamemnon.

[45] As Timotny Hampton puts it: "those whom Racine calls 'les Grecs' and who have sent Orestes to Epirus now appear to have settled the petty quarrels of the Trojan conflict and seem to constitute a new kind of political organization. This new unified body has the potential to overcome the archaic code of rivality and infighting incarnated by Pyrrhus. It aims to work through negotiation rather than massacre. And in this regard it provides the first glimmerings of a world of international dialogue, some foreshadowing of the 'states system' that emerged in the mid-seventeenths century in Europe"; idem, *Fictions of Embassy*, p. 173.

[46] More analogies to the behaviour of a diplomat can be found in the part of Agamemnon, who attempts to attenuate the cruelty which Pyrrhus inflicts on Polyxena.

[47] There is a large body of literature on the subject of the basic figure of a dramatic 'messenger'. Cf.: J. Barret, *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley, 2002); A.M. Baertschi, "Drama and Epic Narrative. The Test of Messengerspeech in Seneca's *Agamemnon*," in: *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to Middle Ages*, ed. I. Gildenhard, M. Revermann (Berlin and New York, 2010).

merely stating the facts (like Talthybius in Euripides' *Troades* or Poseł in *Troas*, informing of the death of Astyanax and Polyxena in Act V). On the contrary, Ulysses' quest can be considered quite a complicated venture, the outcome of which depends solely on the intellectual capacity of the politician in charge, as well as his knowledge of the human nature and the understanding of the complexities of the situation. At the same time, the means to an end mentioned above make the task of the king similar to the activities of emissaries working within the covert diplomatic network, where boundaries would often be blurred between envoys and spies or the people referred to as "*condottieri* of diplomacy" by Claude Badalo-Dulong.[48]

In the context of the political activities of the turn of the seventeenth century, therefore, Ulysses from Górnicki's translation of Seneca is a multi-faceted figure, a combination of high and low functions performed by emissaries of various ranks. At the same time, the ambiguous nature of the protagonist's activity did not deter Górnicki from calling it a "diplomatic mission".

When it comes to the general framework of Ulysses' diplomatic mission, we should reiterate that, firstly, all three discussed texts (the original tragedy by Seneca, Górnicki's translation, and Racine's rendition) feature the "duality" of the king-delegate, signalled in the introduction to this paper and indicated by T. Hampton in his study of Orestes. According to the American researcher, this suggests that the period preceding the first events of *Andromaque* must have featured a conference of Greek kings in which they negotiated a common policy[49] –

[48] C. Badalo-Dulong, *Trente ans de diplomatie française en Allemagne. Louis XIV et l'électeur de Mayence (1648–1678)* (Paris, 1956), p. 10. Another researcher of pre-modern diplomacy comments on the point where the ambassador's mission converges with the grey area of international relations as follows: "Ils s'efforçaient de connaître le pays dans lequel ils vivaient, en étudiant la personnalité du souverain, le jeu des institutions nationales, les principaux ministres, les forces politiques, les intrigues de cours, les partis lorsqu'ils existaient comme en Angleterre, les forces sociales, les ressources financières, les forces militaires. Il s'agissait d'informer le souverain lointain, mais il fallait être aussi prudent car l'ambassadeur ne devait pas être soupçonné d'espionage"; L. Bély, J. Béranger, A. Corvisier, *Guerre et paix dans l'Europe du XVII siècle* (Paris, 1991), p. 58. As it can be seen, the risk of confusing the two types of international activities – the legal and the illegal – has always been present.

[49] As indicated by Timothy Hampton (idem, *Fictions of Embassy*, p. 174), which is applicable to all three texts, the mission of Orestes is inherently self-contradictory as it suggests the existence of a delegating body which is modern enough

the same conclusion can be drawn from *Troas.* Secondly, the general outlines of the political situation depicted in the discussed works are largely similar. In case of all three tragedies, the negotiations are carried out after the fall of Troy, in a period of suspension between war and peace.[50] Górnicki emphasises the aforementioned ambiguity by slightly modifying the utterances referring to the issue. The sentence: "Żebyśmy naszych dzieci rzeczom dogodzili, / A pokój wieczny z Trojąonym zostawili"[51] bears a certain ambivalence. It can refer both to the wish to conclude a yet unconcluded peace treaty and to secure ("eternally" prolong) the relations established thus far. Moreover, Ulysses negotiates with Andromache in the vicinity of the Greek camp,[52] which, on the one hand, makes his activities different from an ordinary Renaissance diplomatic mission, and, on the other hand, brings them closer to actual wartime negotiations of the period, taking place away from the ambassador's residence in the territory of a foreign country, often in field conditions.[53] Thirdly, even though – as I have already pointed out – Andromache does not have any real political power, she depicts herself as a representative of the Trojans, building a symbolical image of herself as the equivalent of the head of the (fallen) kingdom ("A ja pytam, gdzie Hektor i inni Trojanie? / Gdzie Pryjamus, podobno z martwych już nie wstanie? / Ty się o jednym pytasz, ja pytam, gdzie drudzy / Wszyscy, co poginęli, panowie i słudzy", vv. 275–278). The mention of various social classes (lords and servants) was added by Górnicki to put additional emphasis on what today we would call the political base of the queen of a fallen state (albeit reduced to its symbolic aspect).

Having discussed the general aspects of Ulysses' political mission, we can now delve into its details, the analysis of which shows that the translator introduced a series of fragments absent from the original text, emphasising the limited autonomy of the king of Ithaca. Górnicki mentions Calchas much more frequently and extensively

---

to seek peace but, at the same time, archaic enough to be willing to obtain it by spilling the blood of the offspring of the defeated party. This contradiction did not prevent Racine from using the term 'diplomatic mission,' which makes it easier to look for diplomatic analogies in the remaining texts.

[50] The situation is clearer in Racine's text since *Andromaque* is explicitly set a year after the fall of Troy.

[51] Orig.: "post arma tam longinqua, post annos decem" (v. 591).

[52] Though not in the exact place where other commanders reside. This is evidenced in the previously cited sentence in which Ulysses calls himself a messenger.

[53] Bély, Béranger, Corvisier, *Guerre et paix*, pp. 62–64.

than Seneca. In v. 280 Ulysses strongly underlines the importance of his intervention, speaking in first person plural: "nam nielza jeno koniecznie to wiedzieć" (v. 280); this constitutes an amplification of the original. Later on, his simple answer to Andromache's question concerning the reason why it is impossible to spare the life of Astyanax ("Non hoc Ulixes, sed negat Calchas tibi", v. 749) is extended into a distich once again emphasising the role of Calchas: "Nie ja bronię, ale ten, co nam wszytkim srogi, / Kalchas, który krwią ludzką nasze błaga bogi" (vv. 515–516). The seer is presented as a figure feared by the Greeks. Finally, by expanding another short phrase ("Tumulus hic campo statim / toto iacebit", vv. 667–668), Górnicki puts the following words in the mouth of Ulysses: "Ta mogiła hnet z ziemią będzie porownana, / Gdyż jest wieszczkową skaźnią na zburzenie dana" (vv. 401–402). In all the cited fragments, the king of Ithaca is depicted as a messenger sent out with a simple, concise "instruction"[54] to be followed as closely as possible.

References to the Greek decision-making body are not limited to the mentions of Calchas. In his speeches, Górnicki's Ulysses provides a detailed description of the political entity which he represents. This can be seen in the changes introduced by the translator in the protagonist's first utterance in the scene:

> Ja, co poselstwo niosę tobie ku słuchaniu
> Ciężkie, nie mnie je przypisz, lecz starszych mych zdaniu.
> Słowa moich ust będą, ale Greków chcenie,
> Wszytkich, wielkich i małych, jedno stanowienie,
> Którym zwrotu do domu plemię Hektorowe
> Broni, choć ze wszytkim są okręty gotowe (vv. 197–202).

Apart from the appearance of the word *poselstwo* ("diplomatic mission") mentioned earlier, it is important to notice the change in the figure of speech used by Ulysses to emphasise his lack of autonomy from the Greeks. The Latin original features a synecdoche ("Graiorum omnium / procerumque vox est", vv. 526–527).[55] In the same

[54] "The instruction, apart from technical issues [– –], contained a list of matters assigned to an envoy or a group of envoys, sometimes also the sequence and content of speeches, and occasionally specific instructions, such as keeping the aim and outcomes of the mission in secrecy"; H. Wisner, "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1572–1648," in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. 2: *1572–1795*, ed. Z. Wójcik (Warszawa, 1982), p. 130.

[55] The passage itself echoes the utterance of Talthybius from Ennius' *Trojan Women*, cf. Corsaro, "Andromaca, Astianatte e Ulisse", p. 82, and an excerpt from

passus, Górnicki introduces a verse based on antithesis: "Słowa moich ust będą, ale Greków chcenie". Such a modification can be considered detrimental to the artistic quality of the text, which underlines the organic unity of the representative and the represented. At the same time, however, by replacing the synecdoche with an antithesis, the translator made the meaning of the excerpt more explicit. Considering the fact that the opposition is rooted in the conceptual system of philosophical anthropology hailing back to the Middle Ages, the translation manifests almost scholastic clarity: *słowa* ("words"), *verba*, are contrasted with *chcenie* ("will"), equivalent to *voluntas* – the rational pursuit of a goal.[56] *Voluntas* is synonymous with what Aristotelian ethics define as *proairesis*, that is a voluntary choice at the core of *ethos*. Górnicki's Ulysses, therefore, puts much greater emphasis on the ethical responsibility of the Greek decision-making centre than the protagonist in Seneca's tragedy. His conviction logically derives from the dramatic situation and fits into the king's strategy of excusing his actions before Andromache. Ulysses further distances himself from his message by the use of synecdoche "moje usta" ("my lips"; as opposed to "the voice of the Greeks" in the original). The phrase shows that the protagonist does not fully identify with his own speech organ, forced to utter words he fundamentally disagrees with.

The excerpt in question contains more passages which merit our attention. First: "nie mnie je przypisz, lecz mych starszych zdaniu". According to the creators of the so-called Warsaw Dictionary, one of the definitions of the word *starszy* is "a person who is higher ranking, more dignified and influential".[57] Seeing that Ulysses is a king, however, this definition is not applicable to Górnicki's work. The same dictionary also defines the word as "elder brothers, the council of the elders, i.e. the Senate", using the following sentence by Andrzej Wargocki as an example: "Uznawam chęci i rozsądek ichmość panów braci

Euripides' *Andromache*, cf. G. Ammendola, *Le "Troadi" di Seneca. Motivi e reminiscenze* (San Marino, 1971), p. 25. This shows that Seneca is another author of tragedies to dissect the state of political delegation, as well as – as a reader of Greek authors – a translator. Górnicki's work, therefore, is one in a long series of translations and re-interpretations, combining long-lasting tradition with the knowledge of modern world and political life.

[56] Cf.: Tomasz z Akwinu, *Traktat o człowieku. Summa teologii 1, 75–89*, trans. and commentary S. Swieżawski (Kęty, 2000); idem, *A Commentary on Aristotle's De Anima*, trans. R. Pasnau (New Haven and London, 1999).

[57] Cf. *s.v.*: "Starszy," in: *Słownik języka polskiego*, ed. J. Karłowicz, A. Kryński, W. Niedźwiedzki (Warszawa, 1900–1927).

moich starszych i młodszych, ichmość panów senatorów i posłów".[58] The word used in this context also appears in a quote from Mikołaj Rej cited by Karłowicz: "Jako tedy rz[ecz]p[ospo]l[i]te mają swoje senatory, tak też kościół Boży ma swoje starsze".[59] Górnicki's version, therefore, suggests that there exists a decision-making body which not only has great control over the actions of Ulysses but also legitimises his mission in a manner equivalent to the Senate under parliamentary monarchy. This is confirmed in another passage: "Wszystkich, wielkich i małych, jedno stanowienie". Here, the translator expands the brief phrase used in the original: "Graiorum omnium". It is clear that Górnicki transforms the original text to additionally accentuate the collegiality of the decision taken by the Greeks. This corresponds with the evolution of diplomacy in the world inhabited by the translator. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century, after the adoption of the Henrician Articles in Poland (1573), "the monarch remained the head figure in the country but from that moment on, he could not, or rather was not supposed to, send out and receive diplomatic missions, declare wars and sign peace treaties 'without the involvement of the Crown Councils of both nations, nor to engage in any matters assigned to the Sejm'".[60] The customary proceedings in the politics of the period could have influenced the way Seneca's tragedy was understood, which can be observed in Górnicki's interpretation of the text.

The collegiality of the Greek decision-making process and the general framework of their diplomatic activities are reflected in the changes made by the translator in the subsequent passages of the text. Ulysses' original laconic utterance ("Et esse verum hoc qua probas Danais fide?", v. 598) is converted into a distich describing the stages of the diplomat's mission: "Temu żebych ja wierzył, a mnie Grekowie, / Pokaż, bom się ja zawdy u swych stawił w słowie" (vv. 313–314). The fragment also puts emphasis on the flow of information and – once again – the dependence of Ulysses on the decisions of the remote decision-making centre. This corresponds with the change signalled in the introduction to this paper, consisting in Górnicki's use of the word *goniec* when referring to Ulysses ("wnet u Greków będzie

[58] Ibidem.
[59] Ibidem.
[60] Wisner, "Dyplomacja," p. 115; the author quotes *Literae confirmationis Henrico Reg antea oblatorum*, after: *Volumina legum*, vol. 2, ed. J. Ohryzko (Petersburg, 1859), p. 150.

wdzięczny goniec, / Którzy na to czekają, żeby co słyszeli / Lubego, gdyż się doma radzi by widzieli", vv. 324–326). Both modifications shed light on the persuasive tactics applied by the ambassador and emphasise the fact that high-ranking diplomats are primarily orators whose task is not only to make a convincing argument to the entity they negotiate with but also to reassure those sending them of their ability to correctly analyse the situation.

The passages cited so far should be enough to confirm our initial hypothesis, according to which Górnicki translated the scene in a way that emphasises various analogies between Ulysses' mission and the activities of an envoy in the times of the translator's life. It should also be pointed out that Górnicki's interpretation of Seneca's text may have been influenced by another masterpiece of the Polish tragic genre, that is *Odprawa posłów greckich*. Kochanowski's play puts a diplomatic mission to the fore of the plot, allowing its proceedings to serve as the framework for the text's dramatic structure: the tragedy opens with the arrival of the envoys and ends with their return to Greece. After reading Kochanowski's text, his contemporaries may have become more sensitive to the diplomatic nuances appearing in ancient plays. At the same time, the convergence of the dramatic and diplomatic situation of *Troades* suggested a certain set of rhetorical devices to be used in the Polish translation of Seneca. In consequence, the persona of the public speaker was constructed from this key perspective.

In the following part of the paper I would like to distinguish between two tendencies in the dramatic representations of issues connected to diplomacy in *Troas.* The first and, paradoxically, more obvious tendency concerns the covert aspects of the characters' activities. I will discuss various manipulation techniques used by the participants of the agon in order to achieve their political goals. Such train of thought is quite natural as it derives from the deep-rooted stereotype associating diplomacy – as well as the rhetorical devices used for its purposes – with a psychological and linguistic game aimed at discovering covert motivations of other people without unveiling one's own ulterior motives.[61] The other aspect of the dramatic representation

[61] Gerard Labuda cites the definition by Rajnold Przeździecki: "in its general meaning, [diplomacy] is the art of agile, often cunning [– –] fulfilment of certain political objectives according to a premeditated plan"; R. Przeździecki, "Dyplomacja," in: *Encyklopedia nauk politycznych*, no. 6 (Warszawa, 1936), p. 962; quoted after: G. Labuda, "Wstęp. Historia dyplomacji – przedmiot i zakres

of diplomatic missions studied in the paper will be the issue of the protagonist's *ethos*, complementary to the aforementioned covert aspect. I will therefore describe and analyse the characters' public activities and utterances put in the context of broadly accepted concept of moral behaviour. Despite the overt nature of these elements, they will also need to be subjected to historical reconstruction, which I believe will unravel some lesser known aspects of Górnicki's text.

C o n s i l i u m

One of the key concepts necessary to analyse the manipulative aspect of political discourse is the rhetorical theory of *iudicium* and *consilium*. Both terms appear in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* alongside *ethos* and *pathos* as some of the phenomena connected to the orator's discursive auto-presentation. While *iudicium* is publicly displayed (and manifests itself in speech and the selection of vocabulary and arguments), *consilium* – which can be translated as "ingenuity" and which is paraphrased by Francis Goyet as "strategic intelligence"[62] – remains concealed from an unspecialised audience which, at the same time, succumbs to its powers. As such, *consilium* can only be speculated on by specialists assessing the work of a master of oratory art. Similarly to *ethos* and *convenientia*, its comprehension and proper application derives from great understanding of the circumstances of a given situation. Understood as the ability to strategically plan actions and utterances, *consilium* could be placed alongside the concept of *giudizio* or its Polish equivalent *baczenie* ("discretion"), playing major part in Castiglione's *Il Cortigiano* and Górnicki's *Dworzanin*.[63] The representation of *consilium* in a tragedy, however, needs to fall in line with a more conflict-driven, confrontational vision of human relations dictated by the very nature of the genre. In this sense the antagonism depicted in *Troas* is well explained through another paraphrase

wykładu," in: *Historia dyplomacji*, vol. 1, p. 9. It can be seen that cunning is one of the traits commonly associated with the profession of a diplomat.

[62] F. Goyet, *Le sublime du "lieu commun". L'invention rhétorique dans l'Antiquité et à la Renaissance* (Paris, 1996), p. 40.

[63] As stated by an expert on the subject, *discretion*/*giudizio* "is the ability to rationally distinguish between what is just/unjust or good/bad, and [– –] the ability to form personal opinions according to common beliefs and, at the same time, the ability to make judgements in accordance with what is universal and natural"; M. Wojtkowska-Maksymik, *"Gentiluomo cortigiano" i "dworzanin polski". Dyskusja o doskonałości człowieka w "Il Libro del Cortigiano" Baldassarra Castiglionego i w "Dworzaninie polskim" Łukasza Górnickiego* (Warszawa, 2007), p. 62.

by Francis Goyet, who describes *consilium* as "moving the conflict to one's own territory".[64] When understood as such, the concept gains an element of deception.[65]

"Machinator fraudis et scelerum artifex"

I will focus on the concept of *consilium* primarily in the context of the characteristics of Ulysses' rhetoric. The ingenuity of this character is, naturally, well rooted in the canon of Greek literature.[66] In Seneca's play, this particular character trait is indicated even before the king enters the stage. It is mentioned by Starzec (Old Man, vv. 188–190) in his speech, translated close to the letter of the Latin text. Ulysses' cunning is developed in the following scene, culminating with an extended invective uttered by Andromache which opens with the following words: "O machinator fraudis et scelerum artifex". In comparison with the original, Górnicki's version is largely expanded:

O machinator fraudis et scelerum artifex,
virtute cuius bellica nemo occidit,
dolis et astu maleficae mentis iacent
etiam Pelasgi, vatem et insontes deos
praetendis? hoc est pectoris facinus tui.
nocturne miles, fortis in pueri nocem,
iam solus audes aliquid et claro die.
(vv. 750–756)

O mistrzu wszej niecnoty, fałszu, złości, zdrady,
W którym nie masz ni męstwa, ni pobożnej rady,
Od którego żaden człek nie poległ prawice,
Lecz od dowcipu, któryś wywrócił na nice.
I Greczanin niejeden posłan w ciemne kraje
Na co bezecnej twojej chytrości dostaje.
A prawdaż to, że wieszczek ma to rozkazanie
Od bogów? Niewinni ci, twe to, zbrodnia, zdanie,
Którego wszytko męstwo położone w zdradzie.
Żołnierzu nocny, we dnie nie widać cię w zwadzie!

[64] Goyet, *Le sublime*, p. 40.

[65] The issue of deception in reference to the figure of Ulysses has been discussed by several researchers. Cf. G. Declercq, "Le manteau d'Ulysse. Poétique de la ruse aléthique," in: *La Parole masquée*, ed. M.H. Prat, P. Servet (Genève, 2005), p. 11–44.

[66] Apart from *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, it also appears in Sophocles' *Aias* and *Philoctetes*. Cf. also Corsaro, "Andromaca, Astianatte e Ulisse," p. 68.

> Już teraz we dnie chcesz być i mężnym i srogim
> Nad tym, coć się nie broni, dziecięciem ubogim. (vv. 517–528)

It is worth analysing this excerpt in the context of the most popular work by the Alderman of Tykocin, that is *Dworzanin polski*. Andromache's speech features elements absent from the original but present in Górnicki's translation of Castiglione, where they are used to describe the political and rhetorical ideal. One of them is *dowcip* (wit), an equivalent of Italian *ingenio*. As can be noticed in the excerpt cited above, Górnicki expands the description of Ulysses, emphasising the improper use of wit "wywróconego na nice" ("turned outward"), which reflects the meaning – although not word for word – of the original phrase "malefica mens" (n. 752). In an ideal court, wit should facilitate striking up and maintaining important social ties,[67] but the world after the fall of Troy uses it to implement cruel plans of the ruthless winners. Andromache, therefore, points out the double perversion of Ulysses' actions. Not only does he betray his mission (this is shown in the passage: "Niewinni ci, twe to, zbrodnia, zdanie", which casts a doubt on the words in which the protagonist invokes his Greek mandate), but he also misuses his innate thinking skills, which are neutral in themselves but can serve to achieve a virtuous goal when used correctly, as indicated in the following passage from *Dworzanin polski*: "A przeto, iż teraz rodzą się ludzie z więtszym nierówno dowcipem, niż się na on czas rodzili, więc kto się do cnot obróci, zostawi daleko na zad one, które starcy chwalą; a kto się też uda do niecnoty, będzie w niej nierówno znaczniejszy".[68] When translating Seneca's text, Górnicki saw the opportunity to create a miniature

---

[67] As stated by Kostka in *Dworzanin polski*: "wszakoż tak, iżby w niczym sobie źle nie począł, ani ustąpił namniej s prawej drogi, a dowcip i baczenie jego, tak w kunście, jako i statku, żeby znać było, i co pocznie, żeby mu wszystko przystało"; Górnicki, *Dworzanin*, pp. 28–29.

[68] Ibidem, p. 54. The passage is inspired by the following fragment: "e pero producendo adesso la natura molto miglior ingegni che non facea allora, si come quelli che si voltano al bene fanno meglio che non facean quelli suoi, cosi ancor quelli che si voltano al male fanno molto peggio"; B. Castiglione, *Il cortegiano* (Firenze, 1854), p. 77. Later on, Górnicki translates *ingegno* as *domysł* ("conjecture" – "pokazują na oko więtszy być domysł u naszych dzieci"; Ł. Górnicki, *Dworzanin*, p. 55; orig.: "confermano i nostri fanciulli aver piu ingegno, che non avevano i loro vecchi"; Castiglione, *Il cortegiano*, p. 78). In Renaissance and Baroque Europe, the term *ingegno* inspired the reflection on various applications

version of an anti-courtier. Ulysses is portrayed as a man endowed with "więtszym dowcipem" ("greater wit") but "udający się do niecnoty" ("resorting to iniquity"). He makes improper use of his talent, thus becoming – in the context of Christian philosophy – almost the embodiment of evil itself (similarly to Milton's Lucifer). At the same time, the reversed analogy to *Il Cortigiano* shows that Górnicki's idea of a politician is synonymous with the one of a courtier, which finds its confirmation in the social practices of the era.[69]

"To unleash wit against wit"

Up until this point, Ulysses' *consilium* has been discussed solely from the point of view of other characters. It would therefore seem more than appropriate to look for its traces in the words of the king of Ithaca himself. Górnicki's attempt to put more emphasis on the issue is clearly visible in his rendition of vv. 535–536 in the original:

et, si taceret augur haec Calchas, tamen dicebat Hector, cuius et stirpem horreo.	Chociaby Kalchas milczał, rzecz to pokazuje, A Grek, co mu jest na tym, z samej woni czuje. Więc pamiętne są słowa Hektora mężnego, Którego się lękamy i pogrzebionego. (vv. 215–218)

The translation elaborates on the simple opposition between the silence of Calchas and the words of Hector cited after his death. It also adds more elements of communication to the excerpt, demonstrating Górnicki's focus on the linguistic aspect of the text. The Polish version features a third ("rzecz to pokazuje") and a fourth element, the latter being a Greek politician (synecdoche "Grek") endowed with great observation skills and the ability to make correct deductions from hidden premises.[70] This short passage constitutes a laudation

---

of this particular ability of the soul. Cf. J. Wolfe, *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 48.

[69] Roman Żelewski wrote the following about Polish seal-makers in the second half of the sixteenth century: "most of them gained education in Kraków, Bologna, Rome [– –], they were very talented, had interest in science and humanities [– –], most of them followed the popular lifestyle of a courtesan, that is a courtier submissive to the will of the monarch in order to gain a strong position at the court"; idem, "Dyplomacja," pp. 746–747.

[70] Górnicki changes the grammatical person from first ("cuius [– –] horreo") to third.

of astuteness, a feature identified with the Greeks both in antiquity and the Renaissance.

The mentions of the strategic and tactical skills of the Greeks are complemented by the self-praising speeches of Ulysses. This falls in line with the literary tradition interpreting the character as the greatest of the Hellenic manipulators. It is interesting (and, by its very nature, very dramatic) that the starting point for the king's musing on his own abilities is his moment of crisis. At first, Ulysses was open to Andromache's persuasion – he accepted her version of events and did not take advantage of his usual mental capacities. He only does so in the midst of his animated soliloquy:

> Ale cóż ja to czynię? mnie będą Grekowie
> Wierzyć, a ja zaś komu wierzę? białejgłowie!
> A jeszcze matce! [– –]
> Przydzie tu rozum wywrzeć twój, Ulisses, cały,
> Chytrość na chytrość puścić i dowcip dozrzały.
> Prawdzie utonąć trudno, chocia się pogrąży
> Jak olej wszedszy w głębią, zaś się na wierzch wstąży (vv. 327–329, 333–336).

In the above monologue – which is a model example of speeches by all self-conceited schemers, from Shakespeare's Richard III and Yago to Schiller's Wurm and Franz Moor, as well as, in its comedic iteration, Bartolo from Beaumarchais' *Marriage of Figaro* – Ulysses crafts his own image as a (so to speak) theatrical personification of rhetorical *consilium*, with Górnicki simultaneously attenuating certain aspects of his speech (he for instance omits Ulysses' apostrophe directed at himself in vv. 607–608 of the original: "quid agis, Ulixe? Danaidae credent tibi, / tu cui?") and enriching it with various linguistic indications of the character's ingenuity. He presents the protagonist as a more attentive observer: the Polish Ulysses looks at Andromache, reflects on his own thoughts ("zmyśla ta czy w prawdzie stoi", v. 329),[71] and later meticulously analyses her fears ("A wieszczek co naznaczył, tego się nie boi", v. 330). His astuteness is also reflected in his gnomic reflection based on a simile: "Prawdzie utonąć trudno, chocia się pogrąży / Jak olej wszedłszy w głębią, zaś się na wierzch wstąży" (vv. 335–336).

This passage is to some extent parallel with a famous scene from another of Seneca's tragedies, that is with the elevated, haunting

[71] The sentence is an addition.

monologue of the eponymous protagonist in Act V of *Medea* (vv. 910–960). The scene shows the mythical heroine in a moment of hesitation before infanticide. For a second, her identification as the most infamous child killer of the Greek world is undermined, only to immediately be confirmed in the words: "Medea nunc sum" (v. 910). After the moment of crisis, the face of the protagonist blends with the mask she is traditionally assigned. A similar identity transformation can be observed in Ulysses' monologue in Act III of *Troas*. When he believed in what Andromache was saying, he was one of the tired Greek warriors ("miles senex", v. 551), but once he starts seeing through her lies – he regains the power of a Homeric hero.[72]

"Simulata verba"

Another character whose *consilium* is emphasised in Act III of *Troas* is Andromache. In her case, the most important scene is the tragic confrontation concerning Astyanax, who remains in hiding. I would like to interpret this fragment, which is perhaps the most exalted part of Act III, as a confrontation between two protagonists-orators – Ulysses and Andromache – who make practical use of their astuteness. Even though in most respects they are polar opposites of each other, what they have in common is the mastery of the art of speaking (and, when appropriate, keeping silent), which in Górnicki's world is an essential skill of both a monarch and a diplomat.

We should begin by emphasising the fact (which is to some extent concealed by the plot) that when facing one another, Andromache and Ulysses are very aware of that fact that they are taking apart in a rhetorical dispute. This needs to be underlined particularly in reference to Ulysses, who due to the power imbalance (he is after all older than Andromache, a man, the winner, etc.) may be prone to underestimate the tactical prowess of his opponent. In reality, despite being aware of his advantage, it is Ulysses who more frequently points out the discursive character of the confrontation, for instance when addressing the members of his entourage: "Cóż stoicie? płaczliwa ruszyła was mowa / I co narzeka głupie wściekła białagłowa" (vv. 415–416). It would be anachronistic to only notice contempt for the words of Andromache

[72] In this respect, the analysed scene constitutes an apparent breach from the Horatian principle of adjusting the traits of the tragic character to the established tradition, cf. M.G. Vida, *Poeticorum libri tres* (Padova, 1731), vv. 460–490. The return to orthodoxy preceded by a moment of hesitation makes for more complex psychological depiction of the character.

in the above passage. What these verses refer to is not the stereotype forged in the later eras, according to which tears are a weapon of the weak. Quite the contrary, if Andromache's "płaczliwa mowa" ("teary speech") managed to move the people listening, it only goes to show her mastery of one of the most important aspects of oratorical art, that is the rules of invoking affections,[73] and serves to honour the queen's political efforts. Andromache's mirror image in the words of her adversary clearly reflects the figure of the orator.

Another important aspect of the rhetorical confrontation in Act III is Andromache's use of ambiguous expressions, a feature pointed out in numerous analyses of the scene. These expressions are the essence of what Ulysses calls the "simulata verba" (v. 568) assigned to the character. They only appear when Andromache, pressured by Ulysses, speaks of the place where Astyanax is hiding as a tomb. In the eyes of the reader, it is obvious that the playwright used such rhetorical terms to show Andromache's intention to deceive her oppressor while protecting her dignity as a monarch.[74]

The first instance of Andromache using an ambiguous expression is when she tells Ulysses: "W grobie mój syn" (v. 309), which in the original appears as the unambiguous phrase "Hectoris proles obit" (v. 597). As explained by the British editor of the original text, the queen's utterance is a lie as she is not under oath.[75] Seneca's depiction of Andromache emphasises her dishonesty, with the same fragment also featuring her theatrical apostrophe to pain. By replacing the original sentence with an ambiguous expression and omitting the apostrophe,[76] Górnicki makes sure not to strip the queen of her dignity.

Another ambiguous expression used by Andromache can be found in the original: "ut luce cassus inter extinctos iacet / datusque tumulo debita exanimis tulit" (vv. 603–604). As the British editor puts it, this time Andromache speaks under oath and uses words which are the literal truth but which seem to be self-contradictory.[77] Górnicki's

---

[73] Cf. G. Mathieu-Castellani, *La rhétorique des passions* (Paris, 2000).

[74] The son mourned by the protagonist, who was "among the dead", had been hidden alive in the tomb of Hector.

[75] "Andromache first tells Ulysses to report that her son is dead; but she is not yet under oath", as the British editor observes, Seneca, *Tragedies*, vol. 1, p. 175.

[76] In the original text the lie is objectivised, with its mask materialising on the stage and listening to the queen's apostrophes.

[77] In the opinion of the British editor: "in the second statement, being under oath, she speaks words which give the literal truth, but seem to say the opposite";

translation reads as follows: "Tak ci jest, iż w ziemi syn, duch szedł w ciemne strony, / Martwy podług zwyczaju przy swych pogrzebiony" (vv. 321–322). According to Roman Pollak, the excerpt is unambiguous, which, as posited by the researcher, would correspond with the analogical structure of the original.[78] While the statement regarding the lack of ambiguity in the original can easily be corrected on the basis of the comments made by the British editor of the text, Pollak's opinion on the work by Górnicki should also be contested. If there is no doubt about the ambiguous character of the phrase "w ziemi syn", the expression "duch szedł w ciemne strony" should also be treated as an unequivocal declaration of a person's death. Andromache does not comment on the relationship between her child's soul and body, assuming that the listener will take the separation of the two for granted. In fact, however, the soul of Astyanax moved to a dark place (not the Underworld but to a tomb) but it did so together with his body (and not after leaving it, as it could be assumed when interpreting the phrase only on the surface level). The last sentence in the passage has a similarly complex structure: "Martwy podług zwyczaju przy swych pogrzebiony" (v. 322). The utterance does not seem to be a literal description of the state of affairs (as it is in the original text) or a lie (as it is seen by Pollak). I would suggest to see it as a general statement, a reference to the commonly accepted ceremonial, and – in this context – paraphrase it as follows: "the one who, as the custom dictates, is buried next to his relatives, must be considered dead".[79] The sentence would therefore serve as the major premise – the maxim – of an enthymeme, which – when developed into a full syllogism – would take the following form: Astyanax is in a grave, we usually bury our dead in graves, therefore Astyanax should be considered dead. When interpreting the fragment through this lens, we can conclude that Górnicki strays from the Latin text but nonetheless manages to preserve the original ambiguity in the context of the queen's *consilium*. Enthymemic reasoning – a bold

---

Seneca, *Tragedies*, vol. 1, p. 175. In the English philological translation of the text, Andromache's utterance reads as follows: "my son, deprived of light, lies among the dead and, given to the tomb, has received the due of those who live no more"; ibidem.

[78] As R. Pollak puts it: "The ambiguous expression in v. 309 ["w grobie mój syn" – M.B.] here is devoid of ambiguity, as it is in the original"; Górnicki, *Pisma*, p. 497.

[79] Another form of burial was contrary to custom.

and original choice, compared to the Latin text – allows Górnicki's Andromache to avoid telling a lie while alluding to it in front of her interlocutor. The utterance constitutes a form of reversed maieutics: the listener is given a fragmentary clue which allows him to discover the lie by himself.

In the context of Andromache's "double speech", consistently applied and emphasised by the translator, we should also analyse the use of the same rhetorical method by Ulysses. He speaks of Astyanax, who "ojca w podziemnych jaskiniach nawiedził" (v. 362). Later, when ordering to bring down the tomb of Hector, he exclaims: "Rozrzucę wszytkę ziemię, wyrwę to, co w grobie, / Mały się gwałt stać może umarłej osobie!" (vv. 397–398 correspondent to vv. 664–665 in the original[80]). The second verse was added by Górnicki. It should be pointed out that – just like in the case of the utterance of Andromache discussed above – the fragment, having two different interpretations, once again constitutes (in accordance with the etymological meaning of the word *maxima*) the major premise of an enthymeme and is used by Ulysses to morally attenuate the ethical horror of his behaviour.

It is important to remember that such discursive strategy on the part of Ulysses serves a very different purpose than in the case of Andromache. It is devoid of a realistic psychological motivation: Ulysses is still unaware of the hiding place of Astyanax so he does not have a reason to express himself in this particular way. His ambiguous speech is not used as a mode of *consilium* or irony (which would happen if he had already discovered the secret of his opponent and mocked her unsuccessful tactical efforts). What could therefore be the purpose of this strategy, consistently used by the translator? One of the possible answers would be showing the character's subconscious knowledge. Seen from this perspective, Ulysses' discourse reflects observations which are yet to be consciously made by the reason and still remain "subliminal". However, such an interpretation, while coherent in the light of the current psychological doxa, cannot be accepted in a historical context.[81] This is why the starting point of another, non-anachronistic solution proposed in this paper will not be the psychological

[80] "Pergam, et e summo aggere / Traham sepulcra".

[81] For more information on pre-modern ideas of reasoning similar to "subliminal thinking" cf. M.R. Carré, *La folle du logis dans les prisons de l'âme. Les essais sur les théories psychologiques au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1998).

integrity of the character but rather the influence which the words uttered on stage have on the audience. It seems that the ambiguity of expressions used in the play has no purpose beyond triggering a reaction in the viewers, who start to fear for the life of a defenceless child. The words of Ulysses intensify the feeling of threat, making the audience believe that he will soon discover the truth – that he is on the verge of finding his victim. This creates suspense based on the viewers' sympathy towards the persecuted character. The effect was not present in the original but introduced to the Polish version by Górnicki.[82]

"Ulysses, look at the mother"

Even though, as I have pointed out before, Andromache is depicted as an orator well versed in the arcane rules of manipulative rhetoric, she eventually ends up on the losing side of the confrontation with Ulysses. Nonetheless, she does not fail on the level of discourse. Her downfall is brought about by what lies beyond language, that is by physiological symptoms. Ulysses manages to discover the hiding place of Astyanax by analysing certain patterns in his mother's behaviour:

> Ulisses, patrz na matkę, jako się frasuje,
> Twarz mieni, płacze, wzdycha, tam, sam postępuje!
> Na każde twoje słowo wnet nakłada ucha,
> Już tu barziej bojaźń znać niż smętnego ducha. (vv. 337–340)

Influenced by the second book of Aristotle's treatise, the researchers of rhetoric in the Renaissance and the subsequent periods focused much attention on the methods of restraining the symptoms of strong emotion. This was because the voice of passion lies beyond the control of the reason. The case of Andromache is a good illustration of this phenomenon – in *Troas,* she falls victim to what contemporary treatises would call the "signs of passion".[83] Moreover, the philosophical nature of the confrontation allows for it to be described as an example of "moving the conflict to one's own territory", the

[82] According to J. Lewański, Górnicki indeed accentuates those elements of the original which will later become foundations for melodrama evoking fear for the life of a sympathetic hero in a hopeless situation.

[83] This trend of European thought will find its culmination and – due to its suggestive title and international success – its symbol in the seventeenth-century work by Martin Cureau de la Chambre entitled *Les charactères des passions* (modern edition: Cambridge, 1990).

concept introduced by Francis Goyet in his description of *consilium*. Ulysses mimics Andromache's style of speaking and surrounds her with extralinguistic signs, leaving no room for escape. He correctly interprets the message which emerges independently from the words of the queen, nullifying their meaning; he allows for the body to do the talking in order to discover the secret of the mind. This method immediately renders all of Andromache's efforts futile. This is the final proof of Ulysses' rhetorical victory – his *consilium* neutralises the *consilium* of his astute and strong-minded opponent. Her failure seems inevitable, as indicated by the words of Ulysses ("Nierozum to chcieć taić, co się wydać musi", v. 298) and Andromache herself ("Skrycie nie pomogło / Moje, okrutne nieszczęście przemogło", vv. 454–455).

E t h o s

As mentioned above, the manipulative aspect of the rhetoric used in Act III of *Troas* dominates all other applications of the art of oration. Even through the strategic and tactical efforts of the protagonists remain at the fore, the structure of Seneca's tragedy leaves enough room for the development of other themes, one of which is the issue of *ethos.*

In his *Rhetoric,* Aristotle distinguishes between three modes of persuasion: "The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker (*ethos*); the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind (*pathos*); the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself (*logos*)".[84] He describes the first mode as follows: "Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible".[85] It concerns doubtful or disputed issues. This mode of persuasion does not depend on the auditory's knowledge about the speaker's life but on the orator's words themselves; the assumed reliability of the orator influences the way his audience responds to his speech. Eugene Garver describes the operation of *ethos* in rhetoric as follows: "Let us imagine that I am trying to persuade you to vote for candidate X, basing my speech on the arguments you put forward in favour of voting for candidate Y. [– –] I can refer to these arguments on an ethical basis by respecting your involvement and your rules, and by joining you in considering their consequences. What is at stake here is not consistency, as it would be in a logical argument,

[84] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1356a, 2, 5, 13, 23, 26.
[85] Ibidem.

but credibility. In this case, addressing a particular auditorium is not a concession to its weakness or an opportunity to manipulate them, as it is in an emotional argument. It is what Aristotle calls *homonoia*, the idea of uniting with you in order to discover the consequences of your beliefs. This is what constitutes an ethical argument – and this is why it is civic by its very nature".[86]

In this context, the phenomenon in question could be described as the orator and the listeners being rooted in an all-encompassing community of values. How is *ethos* understood this way reflected in the Polish Renaissance translation of Seneca's tragedy? The protagonist whose personal character becomes subjected to opinions expressed *expressis verbis* in Act III of *Troas* is Ulysses. The complexity of his ethical performance is evidenced by the fact that the king is described by other characters in an unequivocally negative light. Ulysses is shown as a speaker lacking Aristotelian *ethos*. "Bezecny człek z Itaki on, boskie skaranie, / Ku nam obraca kroki, a myśli złośliwie, / Ni z Bogiem ten, ni z ludźmi pochodzi prawdziwie" (vv. 188–190) – these lines, spoken by Starzec right before the king's arrival to the stage, reduce the figure of Ulysses to his degenerate cunning nature. A similar sentiment is expressed by Andromache, not only in the invective cited before ("O machinator fraudis et scelerum artifex", v. 751) but also in other parts of the dialogue. The scene features a number of instances of Andromache accusing Ulysses of lacking virtue and bravery.

Despite this criticism of the king, it is still possible to indicate some ethical elements in his utterances. The general framework for Ulysses' *ethos* is provided – slightly paradoxically – by his inherent duality. It is based on the stark contrast between the protagonist's emotions and the political function he performs. This is most visible in the vv. 495–495 and 537–548: "Niezmierny smętek matki serce me przeraża, / Lecz naszych matek barziej łzy człowiek uważa" and "Dałby to Bóg, bych się mógł nad tobą zlitować, / Ale w mej mocy nie jest ciebie poratować". These passages constitute the climax in the development of the theme of diplomatic mission, present throughout the entire scene and crucial for this paper. No other part of the play puts so much emphasis on the conflict between Ulysses' mission and his sense of *misericordia*. At the same time, while Górnicki's

[86] E. Garver, "La découverte d'èthos chez Aristote," in: *Èthos et pathos: le statut du sujet rhétorique. Actes du colloque international de Saint-Denis, 19–21 juin 1997*, ed. F. Cornilliat, R. Lockwood (Paris, 2000), p. 20.

interpretation of Seneca favours multi-dimensional characters, the inner conflict of the protagonist is not tragic in the sense of the word developed in the later periods (particularly during Romanticism and post-Romanticism) as it does not result in a perpetual escalation of tensions but is constructively resolved in a series of speeches and decisions made by Ulysses.

Misericordia and the awareness of necessity

The ethical element assigned to Ulysses' actions in the scene seems to be his attempt to attenuate Andromache's suffering after the capture of Astyanax. Having overcome the greatest obstacle to his mission and fulfilled the task he had been assigned (which he himself considers cruel), the king brings the political course of action to a temporary halt. He is about to bring his plan to a close but delays its completion: "Dajęć to, co w mej mocy, czas, nasyć się łzami" (v. 539). These lines expose the face of a man behind the mask of a politician. They also show Ulysses' diplomatic knowledge of human psychological mechanisms in a new light. It no longer solely serves the purposes of *consilium* and its manipulative tactics, instead allowing Ulysses to show concern for a deeply miserable woman. The Stoic decision of the king of Ithaca to give Andromache the only thing he has control over – time – is followed by his detailed exposition of his vision of what can be described as the maieutics of suffering, which he delineates with the use of the ancient theory of humorism: "Snadź upływa serdeczny ból z oczu wodami" (v. 540), and later: "Gwałtem, matko, zadzierż płacz, musi iść sąd boży, / Bo ciężki żal sam sobie kresu nie założy" (vv. 569–570). These lines uttered by Ulysses change the perspective of his character's utterances from earlier parts of Act III. They fully show the protagonist's empathy, expressed, for instance, in the following passage: "znieś, nędzna, co zwycięzca na cię ustawuje" (v. 252).

Does the admission of Ulysses' empathy not make it impossible to classify the phenomena described above as his *ethos*? After all, Book II of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* places pity among passions. The answer to this dilemma has to encompass two factors. One of them is the value given to mercy in the culture of the translator. By making love of others the foundation of morality, Christianity largely modified the patrimony of antiquity. As in many other instances throughout the translation,[87] Górnicki's religious beliefs may have also influenced his

[87] Cf.: Löwenfeld, *Łukasz Górnicki*; Wiśniowolski, "*Troades* Seneki".

interpretation of this particular part of the Roman tragedy. Another important element of the literary depiction of Ulysses' mercy is also the broader idea behind it. The empathy displayed by the protagonist is not sentimental, like in a tearful drama, but consists in the tragic comprehension of other people's motives alongside the awareness of political necessity. This allows us to indicate an ethical element in the behaviour displayed by the king of Ithaca. In consequence, despite the contamination of the original text with Christian philosophy, the complex depiction of Ulysses' *ethos*, aimed at reconciling political necessity with empathy for Andromache's misery, retains its fundamental duality, radically alien to the Biblical spirit which values total commitment and indivisibility of the soul.[88]

H o m o n o i a

The ethical aspect of Ulysses' speeches and actions emerges in the distinction between the character's diplomatic function and his *pathos* as well as in what I have defined as the maieutics of suffering. Its deeper nature, however, seems to consist in something other than the protagonist's respect for his opponents. In this context, the key aspect of his personality is his attempts to make Andromache admit the validity of the Greek postulates. This is displayed in the following verses: "Ciężki ból sprawiedliwie rzeczy nie szacuje; / Przypuściszli k rozsądku, który szczery będzie, / Greczyn swe rzeczy krzepiąc praw ci będzie wszędzie" (vv. 236–238). The respectful and understanding relationship between the defeated and the victors executing cruel but uncontested justice falls within the boundaries of the coherent system of all-encompassing values mentioned by Eugene Garver in his analysis of the Aristotelian *ethos*. This common space presumes that all parties accept the rules, regardless of the amount of suffering incurred by their implementation. In case of entities less ethically perfect than characters in a tragedy, passions could potentially obscure sound judgement.

A similar, lofty ideal of respect for justice is most explicitly expressed by Ulysses in the following passage: "Dobrej matce to mężne miłość serce daje; / Nie dziwuj: taż też miłość nam rady dodaje, / Żebyśmy naszych dzieci rzeczom dogodzili, / A pokój wieczny z Troją onym

[88] Cf. "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand"; Mt 12:5. In the context of duality of words and actions also: "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not"; Mt 23:3.

zostawili" (vv. 299–302). The most important aspect of these verses seems to be the mention of Andromache's mediation in the political experience of the Greeks. The emotions analogical to those shown by the queen "dodają rady" ("provide council"), which corresponds with the original phrase "amor / consulere parvis liberis Danaos monet" (vv. 589–590). Apart from the idea of observing the enemy and drawing conclusions, which constitutes an element of *consilium*, the cited fragment puts emphasis on the existence of certain common experiences.

By recognising the superindividual ethical space, Ulysses is able to avoid the pitfalls of passion. A similar effort – though achieved at a much higher cost – is expected of Andromache: "musisz nam odpuścić w tej mierze / I zbawić nas bojaźni" (vv. 246–247). These verses constitute what Eugene Garver describes as the essence of the ethical application of rhetoric[89] based on the idea of *homonoia*.[90] In this context, one can venture to find metaphorical meaning in the following utterance by Andromache: "Spalone piersi choćby miecz srogi przeraził" (v. 295). On the one hand, it is a translation of the Latin "ferrum inditum / visceribus istis" (vv. 584–585), but on the other – the imagery of the excerpt may have evoked the echoes of another text in the mind of the Renaissance writer, namely the words uttered by Simeon during the Presentation of Christ at the Temple as described in the Gospel of Luke: "A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed"[91] (Lk 2:35). The juxtaposition results in the depiction of Andromache as somewhat equivalent to Holy Mary and evokes the long tradition of Bible commentary. The interpretation of the cited verse from the Gospel of Luke was largely influenced by the medieval theories of two swords (the temporal and the spiritual), elaborated by such scholars as Marsilius of Padua or Bernard of Clairvaux.[92] While the sword piercing trough Mary's soul would be interpreted as the Word of God – *logos* from the beginning of the Gospel of John – in traditional

[89] As E. Garver puts it in the fragment of the article cited before: "I can refer to these arguments on an ethical basis by respecting your involvement and your rules, and by joining you in order to consider their consequences"; idem, "La découverte d'èthos". This is also the reasoning of Ulysses.

[90] Garver cites the definition of *homonoia* from *Nichomachean Ethics* (IX, 6, 1167a, 22–30).

[91] *The Bible. Authorized King James Version* (Oxford, 1997).

[92] Cf. H. De Lubac, *Medieval exegesis*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1998), p. 142.

exegesis of the Biblical passage, in Górnicki's work it symbolises the force of the same kind. This is further emphasised by its semblance to an excerpt from the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose Polish translation by Wujek features the expressions *miecz* ("sword"), *serce* ("heart"), and the adjective *przeraźliwy* ("sharp" or "frightening"), here used in accordance with its etymological meaning: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" (Lk 4:12). The fact that Andromache understands the reason for her downfall so well that she accepts it shows her as having some form of *logos*, since – by abandoning her individual limitations – she fully embraces the intersubjective plane of common ethical values.

P a t h o s

Another aspect of Act III of *Troas* which needs to be discussed in this analysis is the theme of *pathos,* which has key importance for the entire text. Classical linguistic and literary thought distinguished between at least two important meanings of the term. In *Rhetoric* – as evidenced by the excerpt of Aristotle's treatise cited before – it is used to describe the ability to incite emotions, with Latin authors placing additional emphasis on how abrupt the reaction of the audience is.[93] Another meaning of the term can be found in Aristotle's *Poetics*, which describes *pathos* as conjured by "a destructive or painful action, such as death on the stage, bodily agony, wounds, and the like".[94]

The theme of *pathos* understood this way seems to have crucial significance for Seneca's tragedies, which, as is commonly known, abound with scenes of more or less literal violence. The most famous of those is probably the infanticide committed by Medea before the very eyes of the audience. While *Troas*, and Act III in particular, does not feature any instances of on-stage death, it nonetheless falls in line with the Senecan poetics of the macabre as it shows a child begging for mercy, torn away from the embrace of his lamenting mother. The dialogue between Andromache and Ulysses is also filled with depictions of violence, with the threat of physical pain constituting an important element of the king-envoy's strategy.

---

[93] On the opposition of *ethos* and *pathos* cf. Goyet, *Le sublime*, p. 265.

[94] Arystoteles, *Poetyka*, 11, in: Arystoteles, *Retoryka, Retoryka dla Aleksandra, Poetyka*, trans. and ed. H. Podbielski (Warszawa, 2004).

In the context of the central focus of the analysis carried out in this paper, the issue of the Senecan macabre needs to be presented in a particular framework. What is most significant in this regard is how the diplomatic elements of Ulysses' mission can be reconciled with the violent and chaotic culmination of Act III.[95] How does resorting to direct violence fit into the depiction of the king of Ithaca as the equivalent of a European diplomat?[96] And, despite all justifications provided by the protagonist, did Renaissance readers not consider the act of dragging Astyanax away from Andromache to be radically at odds with the ethical tendencies described above?

I believe that both the attempt to balance the two members of the above alternative and the pronunciation of the issue as inherently irresolvable run the risk of creating an incorrect interpretation the text. On the one hand, considering Ulysses' cruelty a part of the image of an ideal diplomat would be an example of eristic, but on the other, painting the protagonist as a pure tyrant (like Nero from Pseudo-Seneca's *Octavia* or Nebuchadnezzar from Garnier's *Les Juives*) would constitute a very limited reading of the text and at the same time would negate the masterful, nuanced depiction of the protagonist of *The Odyssey* developed in Ancient Greek and Latin literature. I therefore suggest to interpret Act III of Górnicki's *Troas* not as an element of the ideal image of a politician or a total disgrace of his function, but a situation in which – due to exterior circumstances – diplomacy reaches the point of crossing the boundaries of an ambassador's *ethos*. This breach does not result from a conscious choice made by Ulysses, but rather

[95] In the context of Racine's *Andromaque*, which is close to Seneca's *Troades,* Timothy Hampton discusses the disjunction between the two planes of Orestes' diplomatic mission: "a disjunction between the literal gesture of the Greek tearing a baby form the arms of his mother in the sack of Troy, on the hand, and the metaphorical 'tearing' of Astyanax out of Pyrrhus's arms through negotiations on the other hand. Though the bloody goal of both moment is the same – the murder of the child Astyanax – the procedure is different. And this difference connotes a different order of representation. The passage from one moment to the other is the passage from the world of pillage to a new dispensation relying on negotiation. At the level of representation this passage – enacted by the shift from literal to metaphorical 'tearing' – In a passage from direct violence into the mediated violence of diplomatic action"; idem, *Fictions of Embassy*, pp. 171–172.

[96] As mentioned in the definition by Rajnold Przeździecki cited before, in its broad understanding ("general meaning"), diplomacy "is the art of agile, often cunning, but refraining from violence or rape, fulfilment of certain political objectives according to a premeditated plan"; idem, "Dyplomacja".

constitutes a bitter consequence of the pressure of a higher power – it derives from political necessity. This involuntary infringement of diplomatic *ethos* in Górnicki's translation gains additional meaning when juxtaposed with Jan Kochanowski's *Odprawa posłów greckich*. If we combine the two plays into a diptych[97] with the overarching theme of Troy and parallel reflection on the function of diplomacy, we will notice that the finale of Kochanowski's work largely justifies the ending of Act III of *Troas*. The inability to fully conform to the ideal image of a diplomat does not result from succumbing to passions or any other factor which Renaissance society would consider a significant ethical flaw – it rather constitutes a logical consequence of the debacle whose formula is contained in the very title of Kochanowski's piece. The dismissal of Greek ambassadors does not consist solely in sending back Ulysses and Menelaus but also in casting all envoys – current and future – out of Troy. This constitutes the end of diplomacy (as the art of peaceful conflict resolution), which is a clear indication of disturbance in what Janina Abramowska describes as the Order reflected in Renaissance tragedy.[98]

In this post-apocalyptic world, Andromache's attempts to save her son are rendered futile. It is no longer possible to draw a parallel between the confrontation of Astyanax and Ulysses and the earlier meeting of Priam with Hercules.[99] The events from the youth of Hector's father which led him to face the greatest hero of the Greeks did not unravel in a world as degenerate as the one after the abduction of Helen of Troy. This is why Andromache does not achieve anything by making a distinction between the heir to the tradition of the ancestors and the inheritor of their actual political power: "U nóg twych leży Pryjama nie mniejszy, / Jako zabity głowy nie podnosi, / Królestwa nie chce, o żywot cię prosi" (vv. 492–494).

---

[97] The idea of combining the two texts into a sequence was conceived by J.Z. Lichański: "*Troas* constitutes a continuation of *Odprawa posłów greckich* as it shows the final fate of Troy"; idem, *Łukasz Górnicki*, p. 89.

[98] Abramowska, *Ład i fortuna*. *Troas* and *Odprawa…* would therefore create a diptych illustrating the unavoidable tragic consequences of an initial error, which – on the basis of an anachronistic analogy – can be compared to the relationship between *Das Rheingold* and *Götterdämmerung* in Richard Wagner's *Der Ring des Nibelungen*.

[99] What I refer to here is the conflict which led to the confrontation between Heracles and Priam's father Laomedon. After the death of the latter, Heracles spared the life of the heir apparent, cf. Ł. Górnicki, *Troas,* w: idem, *Pisma*, v. 471–485.

In the context of the ancient concept of war (still cultivated in Scholasticism and the Renaissance), it should be concluded that Andromache creates a false image of the conflict which turned her family into the enemy of the Greeks with the use arguments which would be decisive in case of war for dominance or glory. The term derives from the works of Cicero. In his *De officiis* – on the sidelines of his oft-discussed just war theory – he includes the following statement: "Sed ea bella, quibus imperii proposita gloria est, minus acerbe gerenda sunt".[100] The act of sparing the life of the offspring of the defeated dynasty while fully depriving him of power (which is what Andromache pleas for) would undoubtedly constitute an example of "minus acerbum" and as such would be appropriate to use in a conflict for political repute, one example of which was the confrontation of Heracles with the dynasty of Priam. The argument used by Andromache, however, loses its *raison d'être* in the context of the conflict whose only stake is the eradication of the enemy. According to the terminology used by Cicero in *De officiis*, the Greeks and the Trojans are not rivals but enemies.[101]

It seems that the breach of the diplomatic *ethos* signalled in the text corresponds with the Renaissance fascination with the politically devised collapse of discourse in the face of a conflict which begs to be resolved with violence. In this respect, the events of the sixteenth century allow us to re-evaluate the popular stereotype according to which discussion is a means to move the conflict to a "safe" plane, if only because it is not a manifestation of physical violence. The history of the century of Kochanowski, Górnicki, Ramus, and Ronsard shows that an intellectual dispute can be one of the links in the chain of events leading to bloodshed, such as the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre.

In the context of the discussed issues, the fact that Ulysses is equipped with certain features of a good ambassador does not serve to ridicule the art of diplomacy but rather to venerate the character of the king of Ithaca (in accordance with the conventions of tragedy). In the post-diplomatic world, Ulysses attempts to live up to certain requirements of a political ideal which has no chance to be truly fulfilled.

As I attempted to show in this paper, Górnicki emphasises and develops the elements of the text which – in the eyes of himself and his

[100] Ciceron, *Des devoirs*, trans. and ed. M. Testard (Paris, 1974), p. 123.

[101] R. Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace. Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 10–11.

contemporaries – could bring to mind various associations with a mission of a politician representing the interest of an immobile centre of power outside of its sphere of influence. The key object of analysis in the present paper, that is the depiction of activities which are directly or indirectly associated with diplomatic missions, provides a framework for the interpretation of other changes introduced to the Roman original by the translator. One of these is the articulation of the importance of sympathy in the actions of Ulysses: in Christian Europe it ceased to be perceived as an exclusively negative emotion, as it used to be seen in antiquity, with Górnicki depicting it as nearing Biblical *misericordia*. Nonetheless, *Troas* is still a translation of the text by Seneca, despite the numerous transformations introduced by the Alderman of Tykocin and the poetic licence he took to adjust the piece to the aesthetic sensibilities of the era. This is why Górnicki had no other choice but to retain the scene in which Ulysses eventually resorts to direct violence. The result is a largely heterogeneous vision in which *homonoia* based on the idea of *ethos* (understood as a plane of common values), hinted at in the speeches of the king-envoy, is rendered impossible in the tragic world emerging after the fall of Troy.

The aforementioned conflict is not coincidental in the context of the era which the translation hails from. By combining religious themes with the issue of peaceful negotiations and violence, the text makes overt references to the most pressing problems of the sixteenth-century Europe. This leads us to the conclusion that Górnicki's interpretation of Seneca reflects – not directly but certainly visibly – the antinomies of the unstable Renaissance world. One of their clearest symbols is the use of ambiguous language, which is applied consistently throughout the translation and does not always constitute merely a passive reproduction of the logic of the original. Górnicki instead uses the ambiguous statement of Andromache as a textual mould generating new, analogically structured utterances.

This well-defined convention can be seen as part of a larger system of cultural connections which expose one of the biggest problems of the Renaissance literature, that is the almost obsessive distrust of language. In France, the phenomenon was perhaps best exemplified by the surrealist depiction of the "island of frozen words" in Book IV of Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel*.[102] A bit farther north, in a text

[102] F. Rabelais, *Gargantua i Pantagruel*, vol. 2, trans. T. Żeleński-Boy (Wrocław, 1996), pp. 251–257.

radically different from *Troas*, another reader of Seneca will put the following words in the mouth of one of his protagonists: "To see this age! A sentence is but a cheveril glove to a good wit. How quickly the wrong side may be turned outward!"[103] Similarly to Górnicki, the Bard associated this "wit" (equivalent to the Italian *ingegno*) with the act of "turning something outward". Borrowing Shakespeare's metaphors, we can conclude that the Polish translator of *Troades* depicted his characters as peers not only to Holbein's *Ambassadors* but also to Olivia, Viola or Malvolio. He, too, equipped them with utterances resembling cheveril gloves, clothes made of changeable taffeta, and minds like opals.[104]

Bibliography

Abramowska J., *Ład i fortuna. O tragedii renesansowej w Polsce* (Wrocław, 1974)
Ammendola G., *Le "Troadi" di Seneca. Motivi e reminiscenze* (San Marino, 1971)
Badalo-Dulong C., *Trente ans de diplomatie française en Allemagne. Louis XIV et l'électeur de Mayence (1648–1678)* (Paris, 1956)
Baertschi A.M., "Drama and Epic Narrative. The Test of Messengerspeech in Seneca's *Agamemnon*," in: *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to Middle Ages*, ed. I. Gildenhard, M. Revermann (Berlin and New York, 2010)
Bajer M., "Problem spójności tekstu w staropolskim przekładzie tragedii. Stanisław Morsztyn i Andromacha z Racine'a," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 106, no. 1 (2015)
Ballard M., *De Cicéron à Benjamin: traducteurs, traductions, réflexions* (Villeneuve-d'Ascq, 2007)
Barłowska M., *Jerzy Ossoliński, orator polskiego baroku* (Katowice, 2000)
Barret J., *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy* (Berkeley, 2002)
Bély L., Béranger J., Corvisier A., *Guerre et paix dans l'Europe du XVII siècle* (Paris, 1991)
Bieńkowski T., *Antyk w literaturze i kulturze staropolskiej 1450–1750. Główne problemy i kierunki recepcji* (Wrocław, 1976)

[103] W. Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night* (modern edition: New York, 2007), p. 161.
[104] "Now, the melancholy god protect thee; and the tailor make thy doublet of changeable taffeta, for thy mind is a very opal. I would have men of such constancy put to sea, that their business might be every thing and their intent every where; for that's it that always makes a good voyage of nothing"; ibidem, p. 137.

Calder W.M. III, "Originality in Seneca's *Troades*," *Classical Philology* 65, no. 2 (1970)
Carré M.R., *La folle du logis dans les prisons de l'âme. Les essais sur les théories psychologiques au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1998)
Chojowska A., "Retoryka w renesansowej tragedii humanistycznej," in: *Retoryka a tekst literacki*, vol. 2, ed. M. Hanczakowski, J. Niedźwiedź (Kraków, 2003)
Corsaro F., "Andromaca, Astianatte e Ulisse nelle *Trades* di Seneca. Fra innovazione e conservazione," *Orpheus* 12 (1991)
Declercq G., "Le manteau d'Ulysse. Poétique de la ruse aléthique," in: *La Parole masquée*, ed. M.H. Prat, P. Servet (Genève, 2005)
De Lubac H., *Medieval exegesis*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh, 1998)
D'Hulst L., *Essais d'Histoire de la traduction. Avatars de Janus* (Paris, 2014)
Dolce L., *Le Troiane, tragedia recitata in Venetia l'anno MDLXVI* (Venetia, 1593)
Fumaroli M., *Les héros et orateurs. La rhétorique et dramaturgie cornéliennes* (Genève, 1995)
Garnier R., *La Troade, tragédie* (Paris, 1579)
Garver E., "La découverte d'èthos chez Aristote," in: *Èthos et pathos: le statut du sujet rhétorique. Actes du colloque international de Saint-Denis, 19–21 juin 1997*, ed. F. Cornilliat, R. Lockwood (Paris, 2000)
Goyet F., *Le sublime du "lieu commun". L'invention rhétorique dans l'Antiquité et à la Renaissance* (Paris, 1996)
Górnicki Ł., *Dworzanin polski*, in: idem, *Dzieła wszystkie*, vol. 1, prepared for print by R. Loewenfeld, ed. P. Chmielowski (Warszawa, 1886)
Górnicki Ł., *Pisma*, vol. 1, ed. R. Pollak (Warszawa, 1961)
Hampton T., *Fictions of Embassy. Literature and Diplomacy in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, 2009)
Juste Lipse (1547–1606). Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 1994, ed. Ch. Mouchel (Paris, 1996)
Kułtuniakowa J., *Odprawa posłów greckich Jana Kochanowskiego wobec tragedii renesansowej* (Poznań, 1963; Prace Wydziału Filologicznego, Seria Filologia Polska, no. 4)
Levi A., *French Moralists. The Theory of the Passion* (Oxford, 1964)
Lichański J.Z., *Łukasz Górnicki. Sarmacki Castiglione* (Warszawa, 1998)
Löwenfeld R., *Łukasz Górnicki, jego życie i dzieła. Przyczynek do dziejów humanizmu w Polsce* (Warszawa, 1884)
Mathieu-Castellani G., *La rhétorique des passions* (Paris, 2000)
Mattingly G., *Renaissance Diplomacy* (New York, 1988)
Ménager D., *Diplomatie et théologie à la Renaissance* (Paris, 2001)
Nahlik S.E., *Narodziny nowożytnej dyplomacji* (Wrocław, 1971)
Noworolska B., "*Troas* Łukasza Górnickiego czyli tren dla Rzeczypospolitej," in: *Łukasz Górnicki i jego czasy*, ed. B. Noworolska, W. Stec (Białystok, 1993)

Płachcińska K., "Oracje z *Odprawy posłów greckich* w świetle mów sejmowych z czasów Jana Kochanowskiego," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 97, no. 4 (2006)
Rusnak R., "Seneca – Kochanowski, Kochanowski – Seneca," *Pamiętnik Literacki* 99, no. 3, (2008)
Rusnak R., *Seneca noster. Studium o dawnych przekładach tragedii Seneki Młodszego* (Warszawa, 2009)
Le stoïcisme au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle. Le retour des philosophies antiques à l'Âge classique, ed. J. Langrée (Caen, 1994)
Tobin R., *Racine and Seneca* (Chapel Hill, 1971)
Tomasz z Akwinu, *Traktat o człowieku. Summa teologii 1, 75–89*, trans. and commentary S. Swieżawski (Kęty, 2000)
Trinacty Ch.V., *Senecan Tragedy and the Reception of Augustian Poetry* (Oxford, 2014)
Tuck R., *The Rights of War and Peace. Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant* (Oxford, 1999)
Vida M.G., *Poeticorum libri tres* (Padova, 1731)
Wisner H., "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1572–1648," in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. 2: *1572–1795*, ed. Z. Wójcik (Warszawa, 1982)
Wiśniowolski M., "*Troades* Seneki w adaptacji," in: *Łukasz Górnicki i jego czasy*, ed. B. Noworolska, W. Stec (Białystok, 1993)
Wojtkowska-Maksymik M., *"Gentiluomo cortigiano" i "dworzanin polski". Dyskusja o doskonałości człowieka w "Il Libro del Cortigiano" Baldassarra Castiglionego i w "Dworzaninie polskim" Łukasza Górnickiego* (Warszawa, 2007)
Wolfe J., *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, 2004)
Zanta L., *La Renaissance du stoïcisme au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1914)
Żelewski R., "Dyplomacja polska w latach 1506–1572," in: *Historia dyplomacji polskiej*, vol. 1: *Połowa X w. – 1572*, ed. M. Biskup (Warszawa, 1982)
Żygulski Z., *Dramat i teatr średniowiecza i renesansu w Polsce* (Warszawa, 1981)
Żygulski Z., *Tragedie Seneki a dramat nowożytny do końca XVIII wieku* (Lwów, 1939)

Abstract

The study is an analysis and interpretation of a scene from Łukasz Górnicki's tragedy *Troas* (1589), a translation of Seneca's *Troades*. A comparison to the original as well as the description of changes introduced by the translator serve to capture a special phenomenon of emphasising the analogy between Ulysses's and a diplomat's activity. Starting with the main character's first

line, the words: "durae minister sortis" were translated as "Ja, co poselstwo niosę". The analysis of this issue shows that the role of Ulysses (who does not negotiate with a representative of a sovereign country, but with a captive woman) cannot be equated with the role of an ambassador. Conversely, it combines in itself the features characteristic of diplomatic staff of various ranks, including characters operating on the edge of the law. The *consilium* ascribed to Ulysses enables to explore the secret of Andromacha by observing physical symptoms of emotions. This makes it possible for Górnicki to define the main character's ingenuity as "dowcip odwrócony na nice" which, irrespective of Seneca's original, refers to the terminology used earlier in *Dworzanin polski*, where *dowcip* (wit) is the equivalent of *ingegno*. Among the ethical elements of Ulysses's speeches one should name, above all, his desire to convince Andromacha to accept the Greek's line of argumentation. This, in turn, provides good framework for parallelism with the New Testament (Lk 2:35). The last part of the work, devoted to pathos, addresses the problem of a mismatch between the role of Ulysses and diplomacy codes in Górnicki's times. The main character does not limit himself to conducting well thought-out negotiations, but he also uses direct violence. Similar dissonance in character construction seems to make the representation of diplomatic practices in Górnicki's translation a problematic task, given the socio-political tensions in Europe in the second half of sixteenth century.

K e y w o r d s: Łukasz Górnicki, Renaissance, diplomacy, Renaissance tragedy, Stoicism, Humanism

Michał Bajer, PhD, assistant professor in the Department of Romance Philology at the University of Szczecin. In his research he focuses on the historical poetic of drama and the theoretical and practical aspects of translation of dramatic texts from the sixteenth to nineteenth century.
E-mail: ljerz@interia.pl

Trans. by Natalia Kłopotek

First published as: "'Słowa moich ust będą, ale Greków chcenie'. Reprezentacja poselstwa w III akcie *Troas* Łukasza Górnickiego," *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* 59 (2015), pp. 5–45
The publication of this English translation has received additional funding from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland