The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Haigh's 'Attic Theatre.' *The Attic Theatre*. A description of the stage and theatre of the Athenians and of the dramatic performances at Athens. By A. E. Haigh, M.A., etc. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1889. Pp. 330. 12s. 6d.

A. W. Verrall

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 05 / May 1890, pp 223 - 227

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00190377, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00190377

How to cite this article:

A. W. Verrall (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 223-227 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00190377

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

HAIGH'S 'ATTIC THEATRE.'

The Attic Theatre. A description of the stage and theatre of the Athenians and of the dramatic performances at Athens. By A. E. HAIGH, M.A., etc. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1889. Pp. 330. 12s. 6d.

MR. HAIGH has here found and well used a good opportunity. The subject of the Greek theatre is one, as he says,

which has been practically revolutionised during the last half century, partly through the labours of various scholars in interpreting the notices of the old grammarians, but more especially owing to the rich discoveries of inscriptions relating to theatrical affairs, and the information supplied by excavations in the old Greek theatres.

A convenient re-statement in English has been much wanted. As it is impossible to discuss here the multifarious topics contained in the book, I will first say generally that Mr. Haigh has in my judgment supplied the demand. His work is judicious, careful, and pleasant to read and to use. This said, I shall occupy my space, as seems most profitable, with a single subject, which may be brought within moderate compass.

Of all the questions which fall within the scope of the book the most important, both in itself and for its bearings upon present research, is that which relates to the construction of the stage in the theatre at Athens during the fifth century B.C. The Attic theatre is chiefly interesting to us because it was the scene of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, and so far as it affects our conception of their works. If those who consult the book for direction in this matter come away, as it is to be feared they will, disappointed, this is the fault rather of the evidence than of the author. The practical conclusion of Mr. Haigh (pp. 157, 158), that we are without positive information on the subject and must be content with conjecture, is only too true. Nevertheless every reader of the tragedians must and will come to a provisional opinion, and it is worth while to carry the discussion a little further, if only that our conjectures may not be unlawfully limited.

The problem is this. In the Greek theatre of late Hellenic and Hellenistic times, represented to us by the canons of Vitruvius, the stage proper, or *λογεῖον*, was for general purposes entirely cut off from the orchestra, being placed twelve feet above it, at the top

of a wall which received architectural decorations and was therefore meant to be exhibited. It is held by some and denied by others that the theatre at Epidaurus (built *circa* 350 B.C.) is an extant example of this arrangement. This however is a side-issue and not very important, I think, for this reason. Some part of the antiquarian tradition about theatrical matters, from which our *scholia* etc. are derived, mounts continuously through the Alexandrian scholars as high probably as the time of Aristotle. Scanty as the tradition is, if in or after this time any marked change had taken place in anything so universally notorious as the general form of a theatre, we might expect to hear something of it. At all events let it be supposed that the 'Vitruvian' arrangement, or something like it, had become general before the end of the fourth century. Now on going back from this time two centuries we find a wholly different arrangement: the actor of Thespis, when he was to be distinguished from the chorus, mounted upon what is described as resembling a *table* or *dresser* (*τράπεζα, ἐλεός*), that is to say a very low wooden stage such as could be reached or quitted with ease. Between these two dates lies the whole period which for the purpose of extant literature is of much interest to us, and the vital question is this—How soon or how quickly was the change effected? Was the stage of Euripides 'Vitruvian,' or the stage of Sophocles, or above all the stage of Aeschylus?

I have said above that the Vitruvian stage was for general purposes entirely cut off from the orchestra; and I wish rather to insist upon this point, because Mr. Haigh, I think, makes too little of it, and too much of the means by which stage and orchestra might be temporarily connected. We hear that in the Hellenistic theatre steps or ladders (*κλίμακες*) were sometimes placed against the centre of the stage for actors to mount by, though we do not know when, or how often, or in what sort of plays, these steps were used. But such a makeshift does not affect the essential character of the plan. Either the steps must have been so steep that no man, much less a body of men, could mount them with speed or with grace, or else they must have stretched far into the orchestra and have much abridged its utility as a space for the movements of a chorus.

Whenever and by whomsoever the stage for actors was set twelve feet above the orchestra for chorus, the intention must have been that the two performances, or the two parts of a performance, should be sharply distinguished and separated. Now as the whole question is just this, whether such was the intention (let us say) of Aeschylus, the κλίμακες may be put out of the discussion.

For the same and stronger reasons we may put aside the modern fiction of a 'chorus-platform' higher than the orchestra and lower than the stage. With all that Mr. Haigh says upon this subject I entirely agree.

Neither are we at all concerned with another theory, which Mr. Haigh is at some pains to demolish, that there was a time in the fifth century when the Athenian theatre had no stage at all, and when the actor always stood upon the same level with the chorus. Such a conception would be equally inconsistent with practical convenience, not to say possibility, and with the historical data, which give for starting-point the Thespian τράπεζα. It would be gratuitous to suppose that this germ of the stage, in the course of development to the 'Vitruvian' type, actually disappeared altogether. Mr. Haigh, in refuting this view from considerations *a priori* and from the evidence of extant drama, attributes it to Dr. Dörpfeld; but as to this, we shall be more certain when we have a complete and authentic statement from Dr. Dörpfeld himself. At any rate the true question is not whether Aeschylus and his immediate successors used a stage, which may fairly be taken as certain, but what that stage was like.

Having thus disembarrassed the question of what is immaterial, what evidence have we to answer it? Briefly, so much as we can draw from the extant plays; that and no more. The ruins of the theatre at Athens furnish no evidence; for it is now settled that there is no stage-building there which can with certainty be assigned to the fifth century. Good authorities go farther, and assign the remains positively to the building of Lycurgus in the fourth century, but the more limited and safer proposition is only too sufficient. To the literary evidence therefore we turn, and it is upon this that something material remains to be said. In the treatment of it by Mr. Haigh (pp. 152 foll.) and generally, so far as I have noticed, in recent discussion, the fundamental assumption seems to be, that the literary evidence is homogeneous and may be taken

all together; that in a general way the witness of Aeschylus Sophocles and Euripides as to the relation which subsisted in their times between chorus and actors, and consequently as to the natural relation between stage and orchestra, is uniform. In stating his general conclusion Mr. Haigh says indeed very truly: 'We have no reason to suppose that the height of the stage was definitely fixed at that time; it may have varied at different periods.' But this proposition is not applied or developed in detail, and the illustrations are drawn from all the dramatists indifferently.

But in truth the evidence of the great tragedians is not for any one conception of the stage and orchestra as having prevailed throughout the fifth century, but for a total change in that conception. It is scarcely too much to say that the difference between the τράπεζα of the infant drama and the λογείον of Vitruvius is not greater than that which separates the Aeschylean treatment of the chorus and actors from the Euripidean. This difference is not to be measured by the reduced amount of lyric in later tragedy as compared with earlier, nor by the number of occasions, more or less, at which the chorus mounts the stage or the actors descend. It goes to the whole idea of a play and of the dramatic art. Of Euripides, speaking generally, it may be said that the chorus in his works is a mere survival. Its presence may be explained historically and justified or palliated by the literary skill expended upon the choric parts; but it has ceased to serve any vital function, and for once that it aids the purpose of the poet is many times a visible embarrassment. The two factors of dramatic interest in Euripides are the varied intrigue of the story and the pathos or subtlety of personal emotions. Nothing could be less adapted to either object than the perpetual presence of the same spectators upon the scene of action.

Take such a play as the *Medea*. The purpose of the murderess is such, that to broach it even to the trustiest confidant would be dangerous. The chief interest of her situation lies in the conflict of her own feelings, and the finest scene in the play is a soliloquy. She is living almost alone, among those whose natural sympathies are much more with her enemies than with herself. Nothing but an imperious external necessity could have induced the author of such a drama to admit in it at all a chorus of the Greek fashion. The difficulties thus created are insuperable, nor has Euripides, perhaps wisely, made any effort to surmount

them. He simply requires the audience to suppose, in defiance of reason and moral impossibility, that his 'women of Corinth' are in fact such passive creatures of Medea's will as they must be if the action is to proceed; and he trusts for his indemnity to convention. Or take again a play of a different class, the *Phoenissae*; take the scene, wonderfully touching and skilful after its kind, in which Jocasta fondles and 'dances about' her banished and recovered son. It is a scene fit only for an inner room. That it must needs be enacted as if in a public place is in itself disadvantageous enough, but the presence of the chorus aggravates the disadvantage tenfold. And the whole play is full of such matter. On this occasion the playwright has actually tried to cut the knot by a device which it is hard either to admire or to condemn. As a 'chorus' there must be, and as the chorus cannot but be irrelevant, Euripides takes it as such, and brings into the orchestra a body of persons quite alien from the action, who are present in the place by mere accident and have no more real connexion with the Theban personages who figure on the stage than the Athenian spectators who sit in the auditorium. Other examples may be found in Euripides *passim*; in fact, with the exception of the *Bacchae*, there is perhaps not one of his plays in which the chorus has a dramatic interest, and very few in which the story might not have been conducted better without the chorus than with it. For all this the poet deserves blame as little as he deserves praise; it was the inevitable course of development.

Now when drama had arrived at this stage, when (if a homely metaphor may pass) it walked with its chorus attached like a chick with the shell upon its back, it was only to be expected that the form should gradually adapt itself to the substance; and that the scene, like the tragedy, should be severed in two. A more or less 'Vitruvian' stage would not indeed make the *Medea* natural, because no device whatever could do so; but, as compared with a 'Thespian' stage, it might well appear the better symbol of the convention upon which the action depends. If in the dialogue between the Nurse and the Corinthian women the elevation of the player might be a little awkward to the eye, the sacrifice would be more than repaid when, in the later and far more important scenes, the audience were assisted by a barrier of stone, or timber to do what somehow they must do, and to regard the chorus as practically outside the field of

action altogether. Whether the Vitruvian type of stage was or was not actually developed as early as 431 B.C., dramatic art had then already reached a condition conformable to it; and as the art never went back on the track, it is no surprise to find that this type of stage became in the fourth century established and permanent.

But when we turn to Aeschylus, the case is wholly different. Nothing but overwhelming evidence (and there is none) should make us believe that the stage was 'Vitruvian', when the art was essentially 'Thespian.' The drama of Aeschylus really is, what the drama of Euripides, and to some extent that of Sophocles also, only pretends to be, a choric drama; that is to say, a performance of which the scene is properly laid in a public place, and which is designed to be executed throughout by a large number of persons playing together and to each other. If we except the *Prometheus*, a work *sui generis* and not really compassable by any stage, high or low, all his remaining plays are of this kind: speakers, singers, and mutes, all are indissolubly connected and equally essential to the action, so that to subtract the singers, or to sever them in any way from the whole body, would be as improper and as contradictory to the nature of the art as to put a barrier between the two actors in a dialogue. In Aeschylus the relations between the chorus and the actors are as close and as important to the plot as those of the actors to each other. In the *Septem* the fate of the brothers is caused and determined by the behaviour of the Theban maidens, without whose action the plot of the play would be destroyed. In the *Agamemnon* the fate of the king is bound up with the fate of the elders, and their conduct, not his, is the pivot of the dramatic machinery. In the *Persae* we may almost say that there is nothing but a chorus; the actors are for the most part little more than chorus-leaders. But the best marked example of all is the *Eumenides*. We have said that not only would the *Medea* or the *Phoenissae* admit a 'Vitruvian' arrangement of the scene, but such an arrangement, however unnatural in itself, would in the unnatural state of the drama have a certain corresponding utility. To say that the *Eumenides* could not be played in a 'Vitruvian' theatre would be too much. Probably it was sometimes so played by way of revival, with such help as might be from κλίμακες and the like, and with the co-operating indulgence of the audience. But there is not a moment in the action when the 'Vitruvian'

relations of stage and orchestra would not be felt as a gross inconvenience. That the back part of the scene should be somewhat higher in level than the front would be in the *Eumenides*, as always, practically necessary; but it is an equally plain condition that the whole scene should be one to the eye and one for the purpose of inter-action and inter-communication. This is no place to illustrate the matter fully, and I must leave it, with this statement, to the consideration of the reader.

It is chiefly with reference to Aeschylus that this question is important, but its importance for Aeschylus cannot be over-rated. The 'Vitruvian' conception of the scene, which really belongs only to choric drama denaturalized and on the point of becoming non-choric, when referred without warrant to the truly choric drama of Aeschylus, has caused more trouble than can be exhibited in the course of a review. His works all suggest to us (and there is nothing to set against their evidence) that in his time nothing like the 'Vitruvian' stage had yet been seen or projected.

How soon it appeared we cannot say. Mr. Haigh counts in the forty-four extant plays of the great period fifteen places where the chorus appear upon the stage either momentarily or for a length of time. To me this seems a very large number, and enough to show that the 'Vitruvian' arrangement was not fully developed during the period which these plays embrace. Authors dominated by that conception would have taken good care never to bring their chorus on the stage at all. On the other hand I am not greatly impressed by the evidence cited from this literature for the existence in the fifth century of an obstacle between the chorus and the stage. In the examples adduced (Soph. *Ai.* 328, Eur. *Hec.* 1042, *Androm.* 817) it appears that the poet, however free to make his chorus ascend, might well have preferred in practice to prevent the needless movement by an opportune entrance or other like device. All we can say is that in Sophocles, and much more in Euripides, the motives which produced the typical theatre are seen actively at work, and at any time in their days may have begun to produce the outward result. Choric drama was but an unstable moment in the evolution. By far the greater part of dramatic material refuses choric treatment of the Greek fashion, or submits to it only by compulsion and compromise. Aeschylus alone works in the fetters almost unconscious. Sophocles knows himself limited and conforms to his limita-

tions, though perhaps even his marvellous dexterity sometimes achieves rather a relative than an absolute success. Euripides is simply defiant, and the strange 'Vitruvian' theatre is a translation of Euripides into stone.

It is noticeable that the later writers sometimes erroneously extend the name *ὀρχήστρα* to the 'Vitruvian' *λογεῖον* (Haigh, p. 626, n. 3). Aeschylus would probably have held his stage to be merely a part of the orchestra elevated for convenience, and the later use may thus be rather a belated survival than a gratuitous blunder.

Space forbids me to enter into other matters at present. Mr. Haigh is everywhere careful and temperate in statement, and for the most part I have nothing to object. Very much to the point are the remarks (p. 174) on the rules of the Hellenistic antiquaries about stage-doors. Neither Sophocles nor Euripides, it is shown, were really bound as Pollux and Vitruvius would bind them. It is never to be forgotten that most of our Greek and Roman authorities about the drama were not only 'schematizers' by habit, but were treating, in this particular case, of a skeleton or anatomical preparation, whereas we are really concerned with the creature alive and growing.

Even modern writers sometimes show to Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople a more uncontrolled respect than those *musæa* did in fact deserve. 'The question has been raised whether the actors ever made their exits and entrances by the passages into the orchestra'; but, as Mr. Haigh himself shows, we have no proof that any dramatist of the fifth century had the means of understanding why such a question should be raised; and we have, I think, very strong reasons for believing that to Aeschylus it would have been unintelligible. So long as orchestra and stage were essentially one, it was in each case merely a matter of convenience in which part the actor should first appear; and, so far as can be judged from the extant plays of Aeschylus, his actors entered upon the level almost as often as upon the platform. For example in the *Seven Against Thebes* (369 foll. Dindorf), any one reading the scene would naturally suppose that Eteocles and the spy both enter in the place where the chorus are, and by entrances, such as the *πάροδοι*, full in their view; nor are we in any way bound to deny that they did so.

In the section on changes of scene (p. 178) I note that Mr. Haigh allows only two scenes to the *Eumenides*. But there seem to be three, Delphi, the Acropolis, and the Areo-

pagus. In general Mr. Haigh is rather for the simplicity of Greek scenery, and perhaps he is somewhat too parsimonious for the highest period of Athenian splendour. The *Peace* of Aristophanes, for example, suggests considerable elaboration; and I should be interested to learn how Mr. Haigh would suppose it to have been set.

From what I have said about the stage it may be inferred what line I should take respecting many other parts of the subject. May we not modestly venture to doubt whether one half of the 'rules' about this

and that, which we find in the Hellenistic tradition, were really known as rules to the great creators of tragedy in the fifth century? I agree with Mr. Haigh in thinking that some of the modern attempts to illustrate these rules from the dramatists have been sterile, if not mischievous. If Mr. Haigh should have, as is to be hoped, an opportunity of revising and republishing his useful work, I only hope that he will be still bolder, and his book even less 'Alexandrian' than it now is.

A. W. VERRALL.

Xenophon's Anabasis, Books I.—IV., with an Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by F. W. KELSEY, Ph.D. and A. C. ZENOS, M.A. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1889. [12mo. Map, plates iv. plans vi. pp. 404+160.]

THE most noteworthy feature of this school-edition of the *Anabasis* is an introduction, extending to fifty pages, which deals in a comprehensive and interesting manner with those general subjects that have a bearing upon the 'intelligent study of the Anabasis.' Thus we have a geographical sketch of the Persian empire; a historical sketch, extended to the time of Alexander's conquest and more briefly to the present day; civilization of the Persians, and the Persian army; the expedition of Cyrus; the organization of the Greek army and methods of fighting; life and writings of Xenophon. While parts of this may seem too far away from the main theme and too long drawn for an elementary book, nevertheless it marks a wholesome contrast to a barren grammatical treatment of the *Anabasis*. With so many excellent first-books available boys should be able on taking up the *Anabasis* to read it with some facility and so to enjoy its narrative and have some appreciation as well of its significance as history; for such this introduction cannot fail to be helpful and stimulating. There are also four pages of plates illustrating costumes and implements of war, coloured conventionally to show the different materials in them, a cut of a Greek war galley, a map, and six pages of battle and marching plans. The account of Xenophon is in the main fair and discriminating. The charges of lack of earnestness of moral purpose, of lack of patriotism, of selfishness, are not new, but are not to be admitted without qualification. The editors accept the improbable Delium story, and with it 444 B.C. as the date of Xenophon's birth and ninety years for his life against the weight of scholarly opinion and with no discussion of the matter. In the list of Xenophon's writings the *Rep. Ath.* is given as a genuine work of Xenophon's. The statement that Xenophon 'speaks of himself as writer in the first person, but as doer in the third' rests on the slight basis of a single first person plural in the final summarizing section, VII. viii. 25, generally admitted to be not genuine. We miss some reference to Themistogenes (*Hell.* III. i. 2), and the interesting question whether Xenophon simply issued his work anonymously or whether he did not assume a pseudonym.

That Cobet's text is 'clear and consistent' will scarcely be thought good reason for passing by Arnold Hug's recension, based on the Paris MS. 1640, the

pre-eminent excellence of which is generally recognized, though Cobet in his late editions made but superficial use of it.

In the notes grammatical annotation, with the hints on construction, references to grammars, and queries propounded to the pupil, is overdone even for beginners. Something should be left to the intelligence of the pupil and to the guidance of the teacher. A note on the first line of the *Anabasis* gives a reference to the grammars 'for the principal parts of γίγνομαι.' On II. i. 2 a reference is given to the paradigm for an ordinary periphrastic tense-form, while a series of eight abnormal indicatives for optatives passes unnoticed. The exegetical and illustrative notes are uniformly clear and interesting, if sometimes a trifle exuberant, as when at I. i. 9 the mention of Abydos gives occasion to introduce the story of Leander, with Lord Byron's hackneyed feat as a sequel. Of a piece with this is the allusion to a popular 'religious novel' at I. viii. 20.

A short list of helps is furnished: Dakyns' admirable essay on Xenophon in the volume *Hellenica* is noted, but we miss Roquette's life. Editions both of Rehdantz and Vollbrecht later than those noted were issued between 1886 and 1888.

Eight pages of idioms and phrases constitute an excellent feature. The vocabulary covers all seven books. The words are analyzed and the meanings are carefully developed, so that in a measure it avoids the common objection to special vocabularies, that of being a school-boy's 'crib.' The book as a whole hits its mark as the most attractive and the best equipped edition for school use.

S. R. WINANS.

Princeton College, New Jersey.

The Student's Cicero, by the Rev. W. Y. FAUSER, M. A. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1889. pp. xiii, 237. 5s.

THIS little book is by no means without its merits. It is a handy little volume giving a life of Cicero and analysis of his works which offer—if that be a merit—very little to dissent from; it is almost entirely free from serious blunders; it is fairly readable; and it has a really good frontispiece portrait, reproduced by the typo-etching process from the famous bust in the Uffizi Gallery. But it is difficult to say what place the book is intended to fill, and it is quite certain that it has no sort of claim to such a title as *The Student's Cicero*. It is simply a translation of the chapter, or section, on Cicero in the first volume of Dr. Munk's *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, with