

**2nd International Conference of Analytical
Psychology and Jungian Studies,
A & M University of Texas, July 2005**

***AN OEDIPUS – The untold story:*
A Gnostic drama under the sign of Hermes**

Armando Nascimento Rosa

(Playwright and teacher of Theory of the Theatre and
Playwriting at the Superior School of Film and Drama
of Lisbon; PhD in Dramatic Literature)

«Drama, more than any other literary form, seems to be associated in all cultures with the retelling again and again of stories that bear a particular religious, social, or political significance for their public. There clearly seems to be something in the nature of dramatic presentation that makes it a particularly attractive repository for the storage and mechanism for the continued recirculation of cultural memory.»

Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage – The Theatre as Memory Machine* (2002)

An Oedipus - The untold story is a one-act play whose action takes place during the one lasting hour of Tiresias' long life. I tried to recapture in it something of the old satiric drama; mixing tragedy and comedy in a serious parody with mythological characters. We know little about satyr-plays, because only one script in this style survived from ancient Greece: *The Cyclop*, by Euripides. I didn't include a choir in *An Oedipus*, to improve dramatic efficiency - although the first staging of the play, by the Portuguese director/actor Miguel Loureiro, had forged one, dividing by several voices the longest speech of Jocasta, retelling Tiresias' sexual transformations. However, the satyr form of drama, which closed the tragic trilogies presented at Dionysos' festivals, had a very special patron for the choir: the god Hermes, who guided my author's hand, I suppose, opening or closing my eyes (with the magic spell he used to do with all the mortals, as Karl Kerényi teaches us) (1), on a stage trip where the dead can talk with the living through the shamanic powers of both Tiresias and his daughter Manto. The dramatic atmosphere of *An Oedipus* allows a confrontation between ghosts and living humans, on a search for self-knowledge, all of them solving riddles with each other's personal sphinx.

The first motivation to write this play aroused from an observation I made upon the presence of Oedipus tale in the history of western drama: the almost complete absence of Laius' crime, which is the origin for Oedipus' curse, treated as dramatic and literary stage material (2). In fact, if

we take a look at any good mythological dictionary, we find that before the parricide and the incest, working on the plot of Sophocles tragedy, there was a primordial reason for the curse upon Labdacus bloodline (curiously, no trace of it emerges from the lasted Sophocles dramatic version of the myth): long before Oedipus was born, Laius, prince of Thebes, had to exile himself from his city (because the throne had been usurped), and went to Pisa, where king Pelops received him in his palace. But Laius is caught himself there by a *hybris* behaviour which is going to damage his progeny, according to the Greek ancient conception of guilt's inheritance. He feels sexually attracted to Chrissippus, the young son of Pelops, and breaks the rules of hospitality by kidnapping Pelops's son. Hence, Laius is considered the founder of pederasty in the Helad, among the humans (3) (competing in this foundation with Orpheus, who turned to pederasty after Eurydice have vanished into the Hades). But Laius is a damned founder indeed, because the most common and influential version of the mythic narrative says that Chrissippus commits suicide due to the shame he felt for being sexually assaulted. And when Pelops knew what had happened to his son, he throws a raging and terrible curse upon Laius. Pelops' vaticination is that Laius will never bear any children, but, if by any chance a son of him may born, this boy will kill his own father and afterwards he will substitute him on his mother's bed. We know that two ancient tragedies, with the name of *Laius* on their titles, were written by Aeschylus and by Euripides, but unfortunately both are lost (*Seven against Thebes*, by Aeschylus, echoes dramatic elements from this unknown play, because his tragedy named *Laius* belonged to the tetralogy from which only this single play survived).

Let's now take a look at a brief synopsis of *An Oedipus*. On a Greek ravine, lives the old shaman Tiresias, with his daughter Manto, an apprenticeship of her father's craft (whom I picked from Seneca's *Oedipus*), but whose real desire now is to become a theatre actress, in a time and place where women were forbidden to act. As she says to her father, in what constitutes for me a symbolic key-sentence of the play: «the actors are the children of shamans.» Tiresias receives the visit of the wandering ghost of Jocasta, after hanging herself. Nevertheless, she hides her neck with a scarf and begins their meeting by refusing to be considered dead. In spite of taking the boat to Hades, Jocasta searches for the healing word of memory which Tiresias is able to give as no one else can. But death made her a wise-woman, and she rivals in insight with the still living seer. Their dialogue prepares and precedes the heart of the plot. They apply a mutual

therapy to each other, and that will be the dramatic cornerstone to accede to the past of each own. Jocasta refreshes Tiresias' memory by recounting the episodes of his sexual transformations, first into a woman, beloved by Zeus, and then again into a man, when Hera, in jealousy, attempted to kill her/him. I always thought that the serpents' story was not convincing enough to depict the whole Tiresias' personality, and therefore, *An Oedipus* reinvents the past of the most peculiar case of shamanic hermaphroditism among Greek mythology. The young Tiresias here began to be (like Hyppolitus) devoted uniquely to Athena and Hermes, despising Aphrodite, and the goddess took revenge on him by inflicting on Zeus a savage erotic desire towards the ascetic Tiresias. He defends himself and wounds the erect serpent of Zeus, while in return the god steals Tiresias' serpent. As a woman, Tiresias will be the favourite mistress of Zeus, giving birth to a baby girl, named Manto. But on this reinvention I'll tell no more... The play speaks for itself, adding new lines to the old myth. Subsequently, it is the turn for Tiresias to make some therapy on Jocasta, remembering the events that caused her family's perdition. And when he evokes the young Chrissippus, seduced by Laius, the lad appears on stage as a living ghost, telling the story of how he was kidnapped in a black steed by the former Thebean king. Chrissippus falls on the abyss of Cerberus River, while escaping from Laius' advances in the dark night on the woods where they stopped to rest. In this theatre refashion, Chrissippus doesn't commit suicide, but instead of it, he is caught by an accidental death, for which Laius becomes morally responsible. We will hear then Pelops' curse through Tiresias' voice.

In the time of the drama, the blind Oedipus is also looking for the wise words of Tiresias, and Manto guides him to her father's presence. But Oedipus is the only character in the play incapable to communicate directly with ghosts, because he is a still living person without shamanic gifts. He needs the mediation of Manto and Tiresias in order to hear what Chrissippus has to say to him. Beyond his blindness, this inability to hear all that is said or done by the ghosts around him produces comic and pathetic results. For instance, when Jocasta's ghost embraces and caresses him, as a passionate woman, the troubled Oedipus asks Tiresias to get rid of that strange sensation of being tied by an unknown web. Later on, we become to know the details of the parricide on the road to Corinthus, thanks to the testimony of Chrissippus, who was there as a visible spectre, like an afterlife nemesis, a love and death messenger. That is the moment

when the spirit of Laius possesses Tiresias against his will. Jocasta tries unsuccessfully to throw him out of Tiresias' body. The shaman fears for his life because of the vital energy he has to spend incorporating Laius. This will be the reason for Tiresias' death at the end of the play. Manto, on her turn, gives voice to Chrissippus, who demands to speak with Oedipus. The scene shows the crime again, but the satiric tone is heightened by making Oedipus a homophobic who catch Laius in the act hypnotised by Chrissippus' ghost, whom he sees as someone returning from the dead. It is also the time for Laius to make touchstone introspection turning into words the complex which bears his name. Infuriated by those two men blocking the road for sensual reasons, Oedipus kills the older one, while the vision of Chrissippus' ghost is vanished. Some trace remains here from an alternative ancient mythical version of the killing; one we would call nowadays a radical queer version which claims that Chrissippus hadn't die before and becomes now to be disputed between father and son on the road to Corinthus. But dramatically speaking, Chrissippus presence, as a ghost at the crime scene, permits the possibility to have a peculiar witness for the parricide. The unknown circumstances of the murder are brought into light, and Laius' spirit can leave now the body of Tiresias, but the shaman dies shortly after. Jocasta will announce to Manto the last advice from her father's newly and yet voiceless ghost. Tiresias asks his daughter to abandon the desert ravine. She will not be a sibyl. On the contrary, she must follow her path towards the stage of the mortals, in order to praise Dionysos. The solution is to embark on a boat to Lesbos; on that island ruled by women, she can surely dedicate to the art of the theatre. And that's what Manto will do. The play ends with Manto, rejoicing with her father's final request, and guiding Oedipus to Hypnos' inn where his daughter Antigone is waiting for him. This synopsis of the play's action is obviously just a sketch of the dramatic skeleton of *An Oedipus*, giving clues for its thematic aims.

I wasn't aware of the events preceding Oedipus fate till I faced them in an essay by James Hillman: *Oedipus Revisited* (1987); when the author speaks about the filicide that occurs long before the parricide took place. Here we see a mythic pattern for the drive to kill the younger generations which may be called as Laius complex.

This issue raised my dramatist's interest on the subject, as I am deeply engaged with the archetypal power contained in mythical tales - specially in those who are so neglected as they are representative, such as

this one - in order to amplify a polysemous theatre communication; an orientation we find right on the primal sources of western drama. And above all, as we all know it quite well, Oedipus myth acquires, after Freud, a central place in cultural and psychological discourses.

It is true that Freud's formulation of Oedipus complex erases the mythical narrative covering the time before Oedipus' birth, but we must also stress that this happens the same way in Sophocles tragic version; which became the dramatic model to put Oedipus on stage (with the perennial influential aid of Aristotle, who considered *King Oedipus* the most perfect tragedy ever written). The sexual crime of Laius, as the primordial reason for Oedipus fate, is symptomatically ignored in Freud's presentation of the complex, as it was ignored in the two extant play-texts by Sophocles. In fact, *King Oedipus* - the Sophoclean Oedipus' inaugural tragedy - provides the narrative material basis for Freud's interpretation, even if his interpretation will look upon a rather different way out of the play itself.

But what if we look at Oedipus' tragedy, putting on scene at last the first repressed chapter of the plot? We could then have a quite different perspective of the well known legendary story; a perspective able enough to show on a different light the Freudian formulation for Oedipus' complex. That too was an exciting challenge when I began to write *An Oedipus*; not knowing consciously of what the results would be. When we deal, even deliberately, with archetypal tales, the previews of consciousness are exposed to multiple, unexpected, surprises, because we are inhabitants of that same setting we try to reshape once again.

For instance, in a diachronic reading of the whole action, from Laius' unreasonable action till Oedipus' self-punishment, one can conclude with a symbolic hint, about seeing and blindness. I became aware of it just now, while writing this paper, after the play had been written in the spring of 2002, after seeing it staged for the first time in the summer of 2003 (Lisbon, Comuna Theatre) and translated into English in the winter of 2004, by Luis Toledo. Oedipus blinds himself killing in him the first cause for his family's ruin. We must not forget that it was through the eyes that Laius fell when he was overwhelmed by the vision of Chrissippus' body. Oedipus' tragedy is the tragicomedy of never being him, of never knowing who he really was. Oedipus was just prolonging the shadow of Laius, being a valet hostage from his own biological father. Hearing the Pelops' curse upon Laius offspring, we would say today that Oedipus was nothing but the

clone of his father. He loses his individuality because of the curse which controls his actions. Oedipus took revenge on his father for a sexual crime he didn't know Laius had committed. But he took revenge on himself as well by murdering his father, without knowing it, and by taking the king's wife for his own. And when he discovers it, when he realises how he shares with murdered Laius a throne and a wife, he closes the door through which an evil fate had entered in his father's life: the eyes of the face are that door to danger. The eyes of unruly desire led Laius' family to misfortune. Oedipus and Laius were both betrayed by their demonic shadows. By blinding himself, Oedipus obeys again, paradoxically, to the tyranny of his inherited shadow; he takes the things literally once again and kills his eyes which saw the shadow.

Was there any chance for Oedipus to escape the trap which awaited him long before he was born? This may sound a pointless question, because if things went otherwise we would not have tragedy at all. But on the other hand, answering this question can shed light upon a literal way of being in life which appears to be a tragic feature pervading Oedipus story.

Oedipus repeats the literal way of proceeding which was the first cause for his father's sexual aggression. Laius behaviour towards Chrissippus revealed a literal response to sexual desire. Laius is possessed by the literal drive to submit the other to his instincts. By the kidnapping's violence over Chrissippus, he refuses any symbolic meaning that could be found in his fascination over the young man. Laius doesn't allow any other possibility to amplify his psyche (as Plato does, for instance, in the speech of Socrates in the *Symposium*, linking the erotic desire with the philosophical one). Therefore, Laius is bound to the literal and autocratic meaning of actions, in a way where he loses connections with a mutual relationship that could have happened as well between him and Chrissippus. Jung had also a traumatic experience of this kind in his youth, from a man whom he deeply admired. Curiously, Jung confessed it only in a letter to Freud. And we are all aware how Jung and Freud both showed a lot of contradictory feelings of seduction and conflict in a father-son duel where the complex of Laius is much more powerful than any other one we can imagine, with filicide and parricide, symbolically present in the psychic interchange among these two men, who both gave birth to depth psychology. But on the dramatic events concerning the myth of Laius and Oedipus, filicide and parricide are completely literal. Oedipus doesn't escape from it, and he is even more succeeded on his killing part than his

father was. Oedipus is a puppet of Pelops' curse when he kills on the road to Corinthus that unknown father of him, and when he consummates literally the mother-son incest, by marrying Jocasta. The literal feelings of anger and will-to-power close in Oedipus all the possible symbolic detachment from his immediate experience. The literal meaning becomes bloody, destructive and regressive, while the symbolic shows itself to be the real code of culture. The aesthetic mimesis of theatre is an example par excellence of this symbolic power, as long as it denies the literal approach to reality. Goethe wrote in one of his aphorisms: «it is not theatrical which had not been symbolic to the eyes». The theatre mimesis presents to us what the literal is, avoiding simultaneously its destructive consequences. Using a biological metaphor, theatre mimesis functions in us like a cultural vaccine. Oedipus kills his father and blinds himself on the stage in every theatre session, but that happens exclusively on the imagination pact the actors maintain with their audience. The game of theatre is able to transform the literal into the symbolic.

In the downfall of imperial Rome, the decline and the death of mimesis brought to the stage arenas pantomimes filled with literal human sacrifices. The art of theatre was no longer there, in those sadistic entertainments. Wherever mimesis dies, the symbolic power of culture dies with it. The wings of the symbol are cut down and we fall hopelessly in the deadly imprisonment of the literal. The characters of *An Oedipus* are all, each one in his/her own manners, looking forward to free themselves from this repressive prison: the closed cell of the literal. That's why I wanted this play to resemble a kind of psychotherapy in the most etymological accomplishment: a cure of souls. Dramatic gnosis mingles with emotional rescue and satiric smile, on a play where death brought some kind of enlightenment to the once tragic protagonists. Jocasta - the central role of the play, together with Tiresias - shows herself freed from the incestuous guilt, when she tells the shaman how symbolically all the love relationships flourish within themselves the seed of incest.

The multiple act of decoding symbols is an art of Hermes, the winged god who gave his name to the task I'm doing here: hermeneutics. In *An Oedipus*, Hermes, even absent from the drama, holds his divine and symbolic mastery of conducting the souls between life and death, preparing their rebirth. Jung's interpretation of Oedipus complex, as also containing the self's desire to be born again, is a message full of liberation under the sign of Hermes; a gesture of detachment from the universal fatality that

Freud associated with his dominating psychic syndrome, arising uniquely from the individual unconscious. If we analyse the whole Oedipal plot, staged by this play, we may perceive the complex of Laius standing as an originally cause for Oedipus complex, diminishing its psychic autonomy. The drive for killing fathers and mating with mothers is a terrible response for the fathers' drive to abuse and kill their sons, by preventing them to grow enough till they are capable to surpass their ancestors. The language of symbols, as long as it transcends the egotistical realms of literal self-reduction, can lead us out of the labyrinth of sheer cruelty. Commenting Vernant's interpretation of Oedipus unawareness, Hillman suggests: «Perhaps literalism is at the heart of tragedy itself.» (4) Hence, all tragic behaviour would be rooted on the grounds of literal meaning, while a dramatic work with Hermes on its way lies on the symbolic imagination.

As I've mentioned before, *An Oedipus* cannot be considered a tragedy, because of the satiric and insightful irony which permeates the play. I called it a Gnostic drama. In fact, I began to name my dramaturgy with the label of 'Gnostic theatre', right since my first staged play *Lianor in Nobatteryland* (directed in 2000 by João Mota, one of the two or three major Portuguese senior theatre directors, a Peter Brook's disciple in the 70's); a humanist and archetypal adventure for public of all ages, mixing fairytales with cyber-technology and ethnic-sociological features in a story of our times (5).

By Gnostic experience, I mean here essentially the open-mindedness which discovers within the individual psyche an interface with a wider archetypal source of knowledge (transcending personal biographic data) identified by Jung as the collective unconscious. But the conception of Gnostic theatre demands critical explanations. I'll try to give a comprehensible shape to a personal contribution on theatre theory, now in development, leaving here an introductory glimpse of it.

I wanted to define different lines of theatre expression, notwithstanding of seeing them mingling together in the theatre practice. It is obviously rare having one of these following lines in pure form on the stage or on a play-script, but, anyway, it makes sense their division into categories bearing distinct characteristics. Curiously, I became to the evidence of facing four different lines in theatre aesthetics, a quaternity which made me felt immediately on Jungian ground. But the bigger surprise came when I suddenly saw how this hypothetical taxonomy,

containing four types of theatre expression, can be linked with the four psychological functions outlined by Jung.

1) Dramatic Theatre: it is a theatre based on the emotional identification between the spectator and what happens on the scene. Empathy and catharsis are its goals, through a realistic aesthetics able to share experiences of life with the audience, stimulating the projection of each individual on the characters we watch on the scene. Compared with other differentiated forms which evolved from this one, Dramatic Theatre can be seen as the most direct theatrical mimesis of life as we commonly perceive it. Aristotle (the founder of theatre aesthetics in the west) and Stanislavsky (with his internal, psychological, realism methodology, which produced important American followers, such as Lee Strasberg, a former student of Boleslavsky, who added an emphasis on Freud's *homo neuroticus* in his famous Method, and Stella Adler, disciple of the physical actions technique, and whose methods, however diverse, both gained a historical relevance to the languages of theatre and cinema) are the most important theoretical sources for Dramatic Theatre. We may connect Dramatic Theatre with the feeling function within Jungian psychological types. The mythological patron to Dramatic Theatre is Dionysos, the symbolic founder of western theatre.

2) Critical Theatre: it is a theatre based on the cognitive approach to reality. It often uses narrative strategies or intentionally non-dramatic devices to detach itself from the pure emotional empathy that leads to catharsis. Irony and allegory are stylistic tools used by Critical Theatre in order to achieve its rational goals. Its focus is the call to the critical point of view of each person in the audience, considered as a living and active member of a society. Therefore, politics is a prime matter for Critical Theatre, which aims to provide the pleasure of thinking and doesn't avoid the label of pedagogical art. Plato (on his fierce opposition to tragic theatre, and on his philosophical defence of a theatre to teach the intellect, and not to excite the irrational passions), Piscator and Brecht (with their political/epic form of theatre) are the most influential theoretical sources for Critical Theatre. We may connect Critical Theatre with the thought function within Jungian psychological types. The mythological patron to Critical Theatre is Athena, the goddess of reason.

3) Scenoplastic Theatre: it is a theatre based on the enchantments of the senses: the visual scenic pleasure, as well as the ecstatic experience produced by the several other human ways of sensible perception. It is fundamentally a theatre concerned with the spatial conception, the sound aesthetics, the rhythm and the light, the appearance and the absence, the music and the silence. It may even renounce completely to the spoken word, moving closer to sculpture and painting, to dance and to music, in a performative event, resembling a dreamlike sequence of images. Scenoplastic Theatre takes for its goal the very meaning inscribed in the Greek designation for theatre: *the place from where we see*. Therefore, in the first place, Scenoplastic Theatre appeals for the creation of unforgettable visions, no matter how fantastic or devastating they may be received by the eyes of each spectator. As the name indicates, the actor is an element among the other components that belong to the specific language of the stage art in Scenoplastic Theatre. Adolphe Appia (the essentialist theorist of light and animated space in musical or word drama), Gordon Craig (with his views on the aesthetic autonomy of theatre, as an art with a life of its own), and, more recently, Bob Wilson (through his theatre of visions) are the most explicit theoretical sources for Scenoplastic Theatre. We may connect Scenoplastic Theatre with the sensation function within Jungian psychological types. The mythological patron to Scenoplastic Theatre is Apollo, the god of light and of architecture, of prophetic dreams and master of the muses.

4) Archetypal Theatre; it is a theatre based on the communication of archetypal materials, re-establishing the qualified power of mythical images and plots which are able to reactivate, in everyone involved with the theatre event, the links between the individual and the collective unconscious (with traceable lines since ancient Greek drama). It is an evidence that we can find the dramatic presence of archetypal imagery in every theatre forms, but Archetypal Theatre distinguishes itself from those other forms of theatre by prioritizing a psycho-activating role, awakening inner sparks in us, beyond rational consciousness, through the process of symbolic imagination. Archetypal Theatre is animated with existential and spiritual concerns. It can irradiate from the researching work of the actor, as a stage signifier of human condition, as well as develop a writing based script.

Artaud (with its visionary reawakening of mythical imagination in contemporary theatre), Jung (thanks, among many issues, to the theory of archetypes, and the concept of collective unconscious) and Grotowski (through his conception of poor theatre, which Peter Brook classified as *holy theatre*, together with Beckett's drama) are the most productive theoretical sources for envisioning Archetypal Theatre. We may connect Archetypal Theatre with the intuition function within Jungian psychological types. The mythological patron to Archetypal Theatre is Hermes, the messenger between worlds, the trickster and the winged god of inner knowledge.

Gnostic Theatre is what we may call a subspecies of Archetypal Theatre. But at the same time, Gnostic Theatre appears to be a dramatic manifestation of the Jungian transcendent function. What I mean with the use of this Jungian jargon (transcendent function) is that Gnostic Theatre, while emerging from an archetypal theatrical approach, and sharing the same intentions I summarized before, includes a wide range of expressive elements, strongly rooted on the multiple aesthetic types of theatre, joining them in a new and evolving amplification of consciousness, as a result of active imagination. This is the way I look for *An Oedipus*, a Gnostic play arising from an archetypal soil. But a lot of aspects remains to be discussed, because of the variation in the use of the word Gnostic (even to Jung himself, who was inspired and moved by the spiritual creativity of ancient Gnostics, reevaluating their repressed type of thinking, and considering them as his closest ancestors, but, on the other hand, refusing publicly to be called himself as Gnostic). I can hardly sum briefly here such a rather complex discussion, but I think that a fruitful sympathy between theatre and a Gnostic vision of the cosmos can arise from a gnosticism under the sign of Hermes, a symbolic tendency which rejects the more strictly dualistic and mutual excluding views associated with non-hermetic forms of Gnostic thinking, often haunted with a radical hostility towards the physical world of nature (and we must not forget that theatre is a physical as well as an intellectual and spiritual art). Far from subscribing such level of hostility, the hermetic gnosis holds the symbolic key to alchemy, in its redemptive quest for the hidden gold entrapped in nature, mirroring the psyche's condition and potentials for self-transformation, by means of what Jung called the transcendent function. Hermetic Gnosticism doesn't reject the living or inanimate matter as simply evil in itself, but tries to seek its

wonders and its shadows, synchronised with human's evolutionary condition. From my author's point of view, the final liberating message of *An Oedipus - The untold story* is understandable through the light of a Gnostic hermetic perspective, which in many ways we can recognize in Jung's visions of human life on earth.

College Station/Texas, 9/7/2005

NOTES

¹ KERÉNYI, Karl, *The Gods of the Greeks*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1958, p. 218.

² The closest example, that came to my knowledge, of a play openly concerned with Laius complex, is *Affabulazione/Afabulation* (1966), by Pier Paolo Pasolini. This play with contemporary characters is focused on a wealthy father possessed by a sexual killing obsession over his male son. Its affinity with Oedipus myth is given by the figure named The Shadow of Sophocles, who announces the opening and the end of the action.

³ The gods already had that practice towards the mortals, according to Greek mythography. I remember here that Pelops himself in his youth was kidnapped by Poseidon, who took him to Olympus where he served as a butler to the gods.

⁴ HILLMAN, James, and KERÉNYI, Karl, *Oedipus Variations. Studies in Literature and Psychoanalysis*, Woodstock/Connecticut: Spring Publications, 1995, p. 121.

⁵ *Lianor in Nobatteryland* is going to be staged again by the young director/actor Élvio Camacho, in November 2005, by the Experimental Theatre of Funchal (island of Madeira); Camacho was also the first one to direct *Daisy Live in Lisbon*, in 2003, my second staged play, which had four different productions throughout Portugal since then. Other staged and/or published plays of mine include *The Tunnel of the Rats* (directed by José Russo at the Dramatic Center of Évora, in 2004), *Hipatia's Last Lesson* (2004), *Apocryphal Awaiting* (stage-readings in 2000 and 2004, directed by Álvaro Correia), *Noria and Prometheus - Words of the Fire* (stage-reading in 2003, coordinated by Élvio Camacho) and *Mary of Magdala*, which is going to be premiered in October 2005 (in Portugal as well as in Spain), staged once again by João Mota, the artistic director of Comuna - Theatre of Research, one of the most important and historical companies of portuguese contemporary theatre.