Performing Greek Tragedy in School - I

DAVID RAEBURN

Drama is now an established part of our educational curriculum. Should Greek Tragedy occupy a regular place in the repertoire? Enthusiastic teachers of Classics may claim with some fairness that the best way of putting a Greek play across to our pupils is to make them act it and so identify themselves with the characters as creatures of flesh and blood in real situations. Furthermore, if the play is given in the original, the Greek tongue is suddenly revealed no longer as a series of difficult paradigms but as a living language in all its majesty. There is another more cynical school of thought which holds that performances of this kind, particularly those given in the original, are no more than a pious tribute to our classical heritage and, though we hardly dare admit it even to ourselves, an unmitigated bore for the audience, if not for all concerned.

This point about the audience is cardinal. Drama is essentially a form of communication and depends on a relationship of mutual response between actors and audience. If, as happens all too often, a Greek Tragedy can only inspire the reactions of ennui or mirth, the production may have been a worthy, though time-consuming, piece of classical 'group project work', but it will hardly be valid as a dramatic experience. Fortunately that need not be the case. School performances of Greek plays have been given, both in the original and in translation, which have not only delighted devotees of the Classics, but have also

surprised and excited spectators who attended reluctantly from a sense of duty.

It must be emphasized, though, that this result depends on a great deal of careful thought and diligent preparation. The old adage that, if something is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well was never more true than here. But if we insist on a form and standard of presentation which will really engage an audience's sympathy and attention, the whole enterprise ceases to be a mere adjunct to our classical teaching and becomes a form of education in its own right. No less than with Shakespeare, to give boys or girls the chance of becoming familiar with one of the Greek tragic masterpieces through taking part in an imaginative and well-rehearsed production is to add to their experience and awareness as human beings. In addition, there can be few aesthetic lessons so valuable as that of coming into such intimate contact with the Greek sense of unity and form which produced such economical and perfectly balanced works of art.

There is no need, then, for the Greek Play to be confined to the Classics Department and no reason why one of the great tragedies should not be chosen for performance in translation as the main School Play, given an intelligent producer who will be alive to the special problems which these plays present. The thoughts and feelings expressed in them may well be immediate to our own experience, but in point of dramatic form Greek Tragedy is remote from the theatre to-day. The aim of this and one further article is to suggest how some of the difficulties can be approached.

But before embarking on this discussion, it may be as well to insist that the unfamiliar idiom of Greek Tragedy should not distract our attention from those basic respects in which a Greek play needs to be treated like any other play of whatever period. It is axiomatic that a producer should fully 'understand' the particular text of which he is to be the interpreter, entering into sympathetic communion with the mind of the dramatist and discovering the central theme, if one is there,

which represents the core of the play's meaning. The means must be found of presenting the plot and interplay of personalities as clearly as possible to the audience. The play's emotional impact as a piece of 'theatre' must be carefully measured and the requisite effects achieved with technical assurance. A decision must be made for the actors' guidance as to how far the characterization should be realistic or formalized (the answer here will certainly differ for each of the three Attic tragedians). Above all, a producer must ensure that the sum total of so much concerted endeavour is a satisfying artistic unity. No consideration of the formal problems of presenting Greek Tragedy should blind us to the special requirements implicit in the content of each individual play.

One other preliminary question is best considered now. What are the relative merits of acting Greek plays in the original and in translation? It is obvious that in several vital respects a translation is only a pale shadow of the original. Not only is some distortion of meaning inevitable, but rhetoric is at the heart of the Greek tragic style and modern English is not rhetorical; while most of the translators, whether rightly or wrongly, have shied off reproducing the exciting complexities of the choral metres and substituted more commonplace rhythms of their own. To one familiar with a text in Greek, a modern English version can appear, for sheer sound, as inadequate as one of Wagner's most sumptuous orchestral effects played on the piano. On the other hand, a translation has the undeniable advantage of intelligibility. When Professors of Greek sit through performances at Bradfield College with texts on their knees, what hope is there for the vast majority of the audience with their small Greek or even none? More, in fact, than one would imagine, to judge from the response of many 'un-Greeked' visitors to Bradfield who discovered that, with the aid of a synopsis, they could derive the same sort of pleasure from Aeschylus or Sophocles as they obtained from hearing an opera in a foreign language. Nevertheless, to miss the detailed meaning is a major loss.

Again, the fact must be faced that a performance in Greek takes at least twice as long to prepare. Before the actors can start to rehearse their movements on the stage, they must be trained to speak their lines with accuracy in pronunciation and phrasing and with the confidence which only comes from familiarity and understanding. Without this thorough spadework the labour will be in vain. And are we to restrict the cast to our Greek-speaking pupils, who may not be the best actors available? A talented Oedipus or Medea will be indispensable. The custom at Bradfield has been, if necessary, to cast even the longest roles from outside the classical ranks and this, with all the additional work involved, is justified by a distinguished tradition and the eagerness of visitors, especially from other schools, to make the triennial pilgrimage to see a Greek Play in the College's beautiful open-air theatre. But for most schools this practice, even if it were feasible, could hardly be recommended.

One is forced to the conclusion that a good performance in the original, while immensely valuable for the actors and by no means unrewarding for a non-specialist audience, is bound to be a highly ambitious venture which can only be attempted in special circumstances. For the most part, we must be content to use translations, especially if we mean to justify our productions on general educational rather than on departmental grounds. We need to choose good modern versions, not because the old ones like Gilbert Murray's were bad (some of them were, in their own way, better), but because they are now outmoded. In practice, the best of the new translations, such as Louis MacNeice's *Agamemnon*, are thoroughly actable and can indeed be most effective.

We can now proceed to our main question: how can a tragedy composed for performance at Athens in the 5th century B.C. be revived for an audience nearly 2,500 years later? There are three possible lines of approach.

The first is to reconstruct, as closely as is possible, the conditions of the original performance. Here we come up against difficulties at every turn, as the evidence for the 5th century is sketchy,

beyond what we can legitimately infer from the texts of the plays themselves. Assuming we could supplement by conjecture what we know of the stage architecture, scenery, costumes and masks, we should have little to go on when it came to instructing our actors and chorus, apart from a few characteristic attitudes and ritual gestures which can be found in the friezes and vase-paintings. On the vital matter of chorus grouping and movement, for example, we should be almost completely in the dark. But even if there were ready answers to all the questions we should need to ask, the result would be of antiquarian interest only, simply because a modern audience comes to the theatre in a different spirit and with different preconceptions from those of the 5th century Athenian. It is obvious that fashions in production changed even among the ancients themselves. A posthumous revival of the *Oresteia* in the new Periclean Theatre doubtless involved many departures from Aeschylus' original *didaskalia* a few decades earlier. At all events, many details in the ancient method of presentation would certainly strike a modern spectator as so curious as to be merely quaint, if not positively distracting. The music, surely, would be so weirdly unfamiliar as to stand in the way of our enjoyment. It is even highly doubtful whether masks, about which we have some evidence and without which an ancient performance was unthinkable, are a help or a hindrance to appreciation today.

Another approach is to go to the opposite extreme and to approximate as far as possible to modern theatrical conditions. The argument runs thus: 'This play is worth reviving because it still has a meaning for our own times. We must therefore persuade our audience into seeing it as something contemporary. They must forget, in fact, that it comes from ancient Greece. To preserve the meaning, we must alter the form'. A production of the *Troades* given by Belgian students in French a few years ago was conceived on these lines as an up-to-date indictment of the horrors of war, and steps were taken to obscure the ancient conventions. For example, the long set speeches were severely cut, the opening dialogue between the two gods Poseidon and

Athene was relayed in semi-darkness over a loudspeaker, while the Chorus of captive Trojan women was completely deformalized and consisted of four individual characters, two male and two female, who were interspersed over the stage among the principal actors. The result was an interesting experiment after the manner of Anouilh or Giraudoux and a point was made, but something of the essential Euripides was missing. Part of the play's truth may have been revealed, but little of its beauty was manifest, and it seems a fallacy to suppose that the content of drama can be so violently divorced from its aesthetic without some distortion of the meaning itself.

Clearly we need to attempt a synthesis between these two approaches. Here it is helpful to consider the principle which has guided the performance of Shakespeare during the last half-century. It was William Poel who started the reaction against the spectacular productions of Irving and Beerbohm Tree, in which scenic considerations had been allowed to dictate the transposition of scenes, large-scale 'cuts' and frequent interruptions to the play's continuity, which all combined to destroy its essential rhythm and thus much of the dramatic effect. In reintroducing the Elizabethan method of staging, Poel demonstrated the importance of a respected text, musical verse-speaking and, above all, of uninterrupted continuity between scenes, but his productions seemed too drab and academic to catch the public imagination. The right solution was found by Harley Granville Barker, who realized that it was neither necessary nor desirable to reconstruct the Globe if we wanted to do Shakespeare full justice. In his own productions he aimed to revive rather than to reconstruct the original theatrical experience, in the light of what we know about the Elizabethan theatre but also remembering the tastes and preconceptions of the 20th century. By using stage settings which were modern in style but allowed the action to proceed unbroken, he established the basic pattern which, despite their many superficial variations, almost all productions of Shakespeare follow today.

We must apply the same line of thought to the production of

Greek Tragedy. It is not enough to admire its substance. We have to ask what formal features are an indispensable part of the dramatic experience and fully master the point of the ancient conventions, so that if we decide to compromise, we at least know what we are compromising with.

Perhaps the most striking formal characteristic of Greek Tragedy is its structure, as clearly defined in its way as that of a Doric temple. We are not speaking here of plot structure, important as this must be to the producer (the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, for example, is typical of a shape which slowly builds up to a single great climax and then relaxes to a quiet ending). Much more remarkable is the way in which Athenian drama, with its startlingly rapid development from early Aeschylus to late Sophocles and Euripides, remains set in the same basic stereotype, with prologue, parados, episodes alternating with stasima or kommoi, and exodos. Each of these phases needs to be thought of as a clear-cut 'movement' in the musical sense as much as a 'scene'. The whole genre indeed bears certain external resemblances to 18th century opera or oratorio. Of these the employment of a chorus is the most obvious, but the long rhetorical set speeches have the dignity of great arias, with *stichomythia* rather nearer to the level of recitative. Again, the *kommoi* are not embarrassing and turgid expressions of protracted grief but peculiarly moving 'numbers' for soloist and chorus which offer producer and actors a special opportunity.

It is worth reminding ourselves how Tragedy came to assume this particular form. The origins of Tragedy may be a vexed question, but it seems reasonably certain that Thespis' original performance amounted to a marriage of two pre-existing art forms, choral lyric and epic narrative. In other words, Tragedy begins with a Chorus and a Messenger[1]. Later on, when Aeschylus introduced the second *hypokrites* or 'answerer' who could

[1] This, surely, is the simple reason for the Messenger convention rather than Greek reluctance to show scenes of horror on stage. Not all the Messenger speeches report catastrophe and certain visible moments, e.g. the Furies on Orestes' trail, the agonies of Philoctetes, or Agave with Pentheus' head in her arms, are horrific enough.

reply not only to the questions of the Chorus but also to the first actor, a new element of conflict became possible. Hence the *agon* or formal debate between characters which was such an important feature in Euripides. We may say, then, that the Chorus, the Messenger and powerful conflicts between two personalities or points of view are the very stuff out of which Greek Tragedy is made and that a production which fails to high-light these features as such is in danger of going astray.

We must also remember that for the Greeks, at least to begin with, the Chorus came first. This is not only evident from the predominance of the choral element in early Aeschylus but from the root meanings of terms such as 'episode' and 'prologue' which imply that it is the actors who are intruding upon the Chorus and not the other way round. Nor must we forget that the Chorus is in essence performing acts of ritual, deriving from hymns to the gods sung and danced at a religious festival. Many movements preserve the character of specific religious acts, such as the invocation of Agamemnon's ghost in the *Choephoroe*, but all the long explorations of the past in the *Agamemnon* choruses are great acts of ritual in which, for all the Elders' good-will, words of bad omen are found to triumph over good and so in themselves help to seal Agamemnon's doom more and more irrevocably. In the *Oresteia*, in fact, ritual is no mere outward form but right at the heart of the poet's dramatic technique. We can be sure that in such cases the Athenian audience did more than watch a magnificent spectacle or listen to a choir singing ritual songs as part of a familiar myth dramatized for their entertainment. The context in which they visited the theatre was that of a religious festival. Their frame of mind was more that of a 'congregation' than an audience, for they sat in their thousands as a united community round the orchestra, in the midst of which the Chorus solemnly processed about the altar of Dionysus.

Naturally we cannot hope to reproduce this kind of atmosphere with Greek Tragedy today, but the ritual element is something we cannot ignore in our treatment even of plays composed

when tragedy had become more secular and the choral portions more like interludes. Even then the feeling that the audience itself was part of the play was not entirely lost, for the Chorus never abandoned its intermediary role as a link between actors and audience, at times closely involved in the main action and at others, even in the same play, as detached from it as the spectators[2]. This 'linking' function made it perfectly natural in practice for Attic Tragedy to preserve the 'gnomic' aspect of Dorian choral lyric and to use the Chorus' general moral utterances as a means of universalizing the particular action and of pointing to a central idea in the mind of the poet. Needless to say, the poets were usually skilful enough to integrate the lyric element with the flow of the narrative. Transitions of thought between episode and stasimon may be abrupt, but each ode contributes logically to the *emotional* continuum, the calculated succession of responses which the dramatist hopes to excite in his audience. It is a producer's task, at every stage, carefully and intelligently to assess the complex contribution made to the play as a whole by this subtle instrument, the Chorus.

[2]Such a shift of dramatic ground on the Chorus' part is very well seen in the *Oedipus Coloneus*.

DAVID RAEBURN
is now Headmaster of Beckenham Grammar School
In 1955 and 1958 he produced
the Greek Play at Bradfield College

Some practical consequences for the actual staging of Greek Tragedy which follow from these general considerations will be considered in a second article to appear in the next issue of Didaskalos.