

Reg. 8th Aug. 1906.

Reg. 8th Aug. 1906.

Ad. 8th Aug. 1906.

—The Greeks—

Greek tragedy was religious. The idea began with the dances and festivals held in honour of the great god Bacchus, and from this sprang one form of the drama. Another form was due to the celebration of victories or physical feats at the games. The Greek theatre houses consisted of a small space, open to the heavens, with a long and narrow stage against a wall at one end. The women were put at the back of the tiers of seats which rose up from the stage—(laughter)—and the audience passed the time by blowing primitive tobacco, throwing—"I am quoting," said Professor Dettmann—apple peel, sausage ends, and such things at the players and at one another. Shakespeare's theatre was more realistic. Aeschylus and other Greek dramatists wrote their works from all sorts of horrible tales of murder and worse crimes, in which gods and men were all mixed up. The Greeks recognised three unities. The unity of action, in order to command but one interest, admitted of only one plot, and often took place in only one act. The unity of time compelled the play to take place over such a period as would correspond with the time it took to produce it. The unity of place was the rule which forbade the playwright to keep his scenes within reasonable geographical limits. Greek tragedy was, as Wordsworth had said, "tragedy recollected in tranquillity." Aeschylus said:—"When the fool to folly listens the gods send him to his doom." The gods to the Greeks were inscrutable, but they were just. Every curse that the gods sent to the people was caused by some wrongful act, and was just and deserved. Aeschylus believed above all in the inexorableness of heaven. Sophocles, too, felt that to take a broad view of things, all would be ill with the wicked and well with the good. He felt, too, and preached, that this life was the opportunity for the soul. Sophocles came to the conclusion that all men know of life was that they lived and suffered; they had to live their best. Many of their trials were due to the malignity of the brute forms which old writers had elevated to gods. They had to look for their reward from the true gods.

—Shakespeare's Tragedies—

Shakespeare wrote his tragedies mainly between the years 1600 and 1608, a time when he was in the prime of life, when he saw all things in the glare of the midday sun—plainly and practically. During these years Shakespeare knew many noble natures—men who were paying penalties for acts of wrong or indiscretion—men who had done great works; but, men who, however much they might be idols of marble, had feet of clay. Shakespeare's heroes and characters in these plays were the reflections of the thoughts induced by the sight of such things. He saw men's passions—the "tragic flaw"—and what punishment they brought, and with blood hot from the seeing he wrote down the curse of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, the crime of Brutus, the crimes of Antony, Troilus, and of the heroes of his other tragedies. And the result of all this was to induce in Shakespeare a sort of despair, and it left him wellnigh friendless. The effect of all great tragedy—and especially was it true of Shakespeare and the Greeks—was to make one feel that the end was as it ought to be. It induced sympathy. Lear's punishment was just, but did it seem so in the case of Cordelia? Did it not seem that Shakespeare's art had failed him in giving Cordelia a shameful death as recompense for what was only a small fault? On the other hand they would agree with Lamb and hate the "ribald trash" which made all things end happily. That was not human nature. Cordelia's death was not death then, but victory, for her shameful death was her own wish and her own price for the finding again of her father's love. Pascal said of man that he was a reed, but a reed that thought. The universe might overcome man; but while man knew that he must die the universe did not know that it had overcome him. Schiller thought the victory of spiritual over the physical was true sublimity. And these ideas were identical with those of the ancient Greek writers.

LACROSSE AND FOOTBALL

RECEPTION BY THE MAYOR OF ADELAIDE.

The members of the Melbourne University Lacrosse and Football teams arrived by the express on Tuesday morning, and were tendered a reception by the Mayor of Adelaide in his parlour at the Town Hall.

Mr. Bruce extended a cordial welcome to the visitors, and hoped that they would thoroughly enjoy their stay in the city. It was gratifying to him to meet so many handsome students—(laughter)—of such great seats of learning as the Melbourne and Adelaide Universities, and he was glad that they could find the opportunity to occasionally unbend from their absorbing studies. So far as he could perceive there was not a dull fellow among them—a fact which spoke volumes for their training and the realization of the truth of the adage—"Too much work makes Jack a dull boy." (Applause.) The visitors had come over to play the highly intellectual—(Hear, hear, and "That's right")—games of lacrosse and football. (A football player—"Football and lacrosse, you mean.") No, he did not. Lacrosse was one of the most scientific games at present, and football was rapidly becoming so. (Applause.) He could assure them that they would receive absolutely fair treatment at the hands of the local men, because all South Australians prided themselves on the purity of their play. Before calling upon the Adelaide University representatives to drink the health of the visitors, coupled with the names of Messrs. C. H. Clowes (manager), H. Corder (captain of the football team), and H. Plante (secretary of the Lacrosse Club), he invited Cr. Roberts to say a few words.

Cr. Roberts joined in warmly welcoming the visitors, and referred to the value of such pastimes as football and lacrosse in developing the physical qualities of the people.

The toast was drunk enthusiastically. Mr. Corder thanked the previous speakers and the members of the Adelaide University for the hearty reception which had been accorded to the visitors, and especially the football team. (Laughter and applause.) Unfortunately the combination was not the best they could put into the field; nevertheless, it would provide a stiff battle. (Hear, hear.) Owing to the necessity for the team to return to Melbourne as early as possible after the match on Wednesday—they had an important engagement on Saturday—they regretted that they would not be able to be present at the ball on Thursday evening.

Mr. Plante endorsed the sentiments expressed by Mr. Corder. He was glad the lacrosseurs were not in such a hurry as the footballers, and that they therefore intended to participate in the ball which was to be given in their honour. (Applause.)

Mr. Clowes, after adding his thanks on behalf of the combined teams, proposed the toast of "The Adelaide University football and lacrosse teams," coupled with the names of their captains, Messrs. H. W. D. Stoddart and C. A. Edmunds respectively.

Mr. Edmunds, on behalf of the visiting and local students, heartily thanked Mr. Bruce for his courtesy in receiving them, and hoped that the inter-university contests would become annual fixtures. (Hear, hear.)

The following players will take part in the football match at the Adelaide Oval this afternoon:—Adelaide University—H. W. D. Stoddart (capt.), T. H. Donnelly (vice-capt.), H. M. Muirhead, S. Jeffries, E. Jones, S. G. L. Catchlove, A. T. Jeffries, C. C. Okely, E. Nancarrow, L. W. Gill, W. G. Reid, C. E. Dolling, C. R. Dundy, J. S. K. Maclellan, R. W. Tassie, N. E. Seppelt, R. Rudall, and J. Jona; emergencies—M. H. Moses and A. E. Kain. Melbourne University—H. Corder (capt.), E. Corder, E. Fleming, W. Williams, and F. Dossiter (Trinity College); A. C. Fogarty, J. P. Fogarty, C. A. Cameron, C. E. King, W. D. Marshall, and M. W. Ratz (Ormond College); M. L. Spiers (Queen's College); E. P. Kendall, A. Burke-Saffrey, F. McCooey, E. McDougal, B. Richards, and R. Upton (non-collegiates).

THE LACROSSE MATCH.

The following will be the teams to play in the lacrosse match on the Adelaide Oval on Saturday afternoon:—

	Melbourne.	Adelaide.
Goalkeeper	M. A. Ley	G. C. Campbell
Point	W. W. Summons	C. A. Edmunds
Cover point	H. Plante	G. Boocout
Third man	C. M. McLaren	L. Betts
Right defence	M. Cantor	R. Brummitt
Left defence	W. Cascaden	H. Goode
Centre	R. R. Wettenhall	D. Steele
Right attack	V. Conrick	R. Plummer
Left attack	L. B. Davies	E. Russell
Third home	E. Tyrie	J. Verco
Second home	J. C. Campbell	H. H. Hanton
First home	J. J. Black	H. Greenway

SHAKESPEARE AND THE GREEKS.

The Prince of Wales' Theatre was well filled on Tuesday evening when Acting Professor Dettman gave the second of his three lectures on classical and romantic drama, entitled "Shakespeare and the Greeks." The lecturer began by stating that he must insist on the root difference between the scansion of romantic and classical writings. They must first obtain clear ideas of what romantic drama and what classical drama was. All beauty was the outward expression of an inward sense. Modern art, when it did succeed—as in Shakespeare—was perfect in the content which it possessed. Sculpture was the typical ancient art, and this appealed to the intellect, while music, which appealed to the emotions, was the typical modern art. Another difference between ancient and modern art was that the former strove after a perfect ideal only, and could not admit any of the comic element, while the latter embraced everything. Although he could not in that lecture treat of Aeschylus the thunderous, Sophocles the artist, and Euripides the human, he could trace some analogy between these three and Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Fletcher. Perhaps the most important thing was to consider the thoughts and motives of Greek tragedy. They had been often told that the underlying idea of Greek drama was fate. This was scarcely correct, for even the fatalism of Aeschylus was not exclusive of free will. Aeschylus certainly believed in the hereditary curse, but also thought it was necessary for the victim to do some act before the curse descended. The genealogy of wrong was according to Aeschylus, prosperity, wanton arrogance, sin, doom. Sophocles went one step further by fixing attention on the human sufferer. Euripides believed in none of the gods, but he was no more of an atheist than Shelley. What he was fighting against was the malignancy of the then idea of the gods, and for the first time they found in his poems a god as chief villain. He also held a wide sympathy for humanity. He would deal in conclusion with the so-called "tragic flaw," and would commend for their consideration in this respect the middle period of Shakespeare's dramas. It was at this time that Essex, Southampton, and Sir Walter Raleigh, three of the heroes, patrons, and friends of Shakespeare, suffered. Lofty natures they were all, but not one of them could stand up and say, "I am guiltless of my doom." And it was this lesson that Shakespeare tried to bring out in his dramas. As an example of this they saw Brutus discarding private morality, and Macbeth was brought to his doom by the very means with which he had earlier tried to "make assurance double sure." The taint of luxury in the character of Mark Antony led him to lay himself at the feet of Octavius, and Coriolanus' pride of race that led him to turn traitor to his country, and perish finally as the result of a low cabal. Finally, it was Timon's indiscriminate bounty that gathered round him that band of time-servers and summer friends, who, when the tide of his prosperity turned, left him friendless. Shakespeare took them down into the valley of the shadow of death, but he did not leave them till he had led them to the sunny fields on the other side. He showed that all this was not the work of blind fate, or arbitrary chance—it was all part of the law of retribution—a law that had in it nothing mechanical and nothing accidental. They might not understand the laws of the "fated sky," but they were not arbitrary. It had been said that all Shakespeare's poems were in illustration of the proverb, "As a man sows, so shall he reap," and this was to a large extent true. There was some difficulty in considering the case of Cordelia, who, although a heroine of goodness, died when a moment or two would have saved her. How could they justify Shakespeare here? Dr. Johnson had said he could never bear to bear the end of King Lear. It was not so hard after all to give the reason, for it was really cowardice at bottom—because they did not like to see such things happen. Shakespeare knew that such things did happen, and he depicted them. Could they doubt what Cordelia's answer would be if asked if she would suffer the most shameful death, that King Lear's love for her would be restored? No! her answer would be the same every time. Where was the injustice if a person got what she most wanted? Cordelia's death was not death, it was victory. She had found her father—she had found herself. Suppose they told the story of the crucifixion to an intelligent Mohammedan, would not he say that it would lose a great deal of its human interest and value if the crowning point were omitted? They could say something the same with regard to Cordelia. They could say that even if Shakespeare had forgotten his art in this, he had climbed above the highest limits of art to the peaks of the sublime.