No.10 June 1968

P E G A S U S

University of Exeter Classical Society Magazine

Editor: C. A. M. Evans

CONTENTS

A C T A D I U R N A

Some time ago the Editor of 'Acta Diurna' suggested that we should exchange copies of his publication for those of 'Pegasus' and we were glad to agree. We have now received a number of issues and they are available in the current periodicals room in the University Library, where those who remember this delightful periodical from school and others who have not yet had that pleasure are at liberty to examine and read them.

If anyone is interested in subscribing to Acta Diurna for himself, enquiries should be made to Centaur Books Ltd., 284 High Street, Slough, Bucks.

C. A. M. Evans.

P E G A S U S

Mention of Mr. Harvey and Exeter recalls to mind that admirable little publication Pegasus which the Classical Society of Exeter University has been producing since 1964 with great success. Two numbers have reached me this year, both full of serious as well as entertaining material, lively and provocative, and costing only sixpence each for about forty to fifty pages.

(from 'The Proceedings of the Classical Association, 1967)

AN OVID REMINISCENCE IN SHAKESPEARE

> For 'tis the sport to have the enginer
> Hoist with his own petar
>
> Hamlet III, iv, 287-8

Thus reads the second Quarto of 1604[1]; a typically succinct but colourful Shakespearean metaphor, but one that has not, perhaps, received the attention it deserves.

The means of hoisting, namely the petar, is a most intriguing feature of these lines. "Petar, now spelt petard", concludes Rev. H. Hudson, and Johnson goes so far as to add the "d" in an emendation. "Petard" was in fact the most commonly found spelling, as the Concise Oxford Dictionary tells us:

> PETARD (Also petar, petarr, petarre, petarh, petarde, petarra, patar, pettar, pittar, pittard). A small engine of war used to blow in a door or gate, or to make a breach in a wall etc.; originally of metal and bell-shaped, later a cubical wooden box, charged with powder, and fired by a fuse. (Now nearly or quite out of use).

This explanation of the term suits the sense to a certain extent, but even allowing for the vigorous abandon of Shakespeare's language one would be hard put to maintain that a petard's (or petar's) natural motion is one of hoisting. Nor was Shakespeare in the habit of summoning the petar whenever a violent image was needed: this is the only occurrence of the word in all his writings.

So for a possible explanation let us look for a moment at a small passage of Ovid:

> Ponite iam gladios hebetes: pugnetur acutis;
> Nec dubito, telis quin petar ipse meis.
>
> Ars Amatoria III, 589-90

To find the verb "petar" in the midst of a sentence that deals with being attacked by one's own weapons is really quite striking. But as one who was ever incredulous, during his Classics career, of similar "verbal echoes" or "associations", I would myself have dismissed it out of hand had it not been for some enlightening and substantiating facts.

Firstly, Ovid was part of the Elizabethan schoolboy's curriculum, and so intelligences such as Shakespeare's would have been conversant at an early age with the author and his style even if the "Ars Amatoria" itself was considered unsuitable as recommended reading for young minds. We also know that, school age past, the dramatist did not neglect his Ovid, and a copy of the "Metamorphoses" bearing his signature is still in existence. "Shakespeare's .. beloved Ovid", says Reese in his "Shakespeare's World and Work", "was an inspiration to him all his life"[2], and later he suggests that he was the only classical author whom the playwright had read in the original[3]. He could not, indeed, have read the "Ars Amatoria" in translation, for unlike the "Metamorphoses" and "Tristia", there was no Elizabethan vernacular version.

But the fact that Shakespeare very probably knew the "Ars Amatoria" as it was written does not necessarily establish a link between our two passages. What does add weight to the argument is the vivid nature of the image, coupled with the fact that Ovid - like Shakespeare - uses "petar" nowhere else, although other forms of the verb "peto" occur more than 400 times in his work. Are we then to regard this as no more than an interesting coincidence? I would like to think not, and to suggest that there was some recollection of Ovid's words, if not of the exact sense, in Shakespeare's mind when he gave these telling lines to the Danish prince.

M. J. HANDSCOMB

1. Although the pirated and incomplete first Quarto of 1603 does not.
2. p.13 3. p.389

P R A E T E R M I S S A

1. Errare cum Scaligero

In an article about some of the correspondence related to Joseph Scaliger's famous attempt to square the circle and the débâcle which followed (1), I have dealt, among other things, with a passage from John Aubrey's life of Sir Henry Savile. The full passage in Mr. Oliver Lawson Dick's edition (2) runs as follows:

> I have heard Dr. Wallis say, that Sir H. Savill has sufficiently confuted Joseph Scaliger de Quadratura Circuli, in the very margent of the booke: and that sometimes when J. Scaliger sayes AB=CD ex constructione, Sir H. Savill writes sometimes in the margent, Et Dominatio vestra est Asinus ex constructione. One sayes of Jos Scaliger, that when he erres, he erres so ingeniosely, that one had rather erre with him than hit the mark with Clavius.

The last sentence, about 'erring with Scaliger', may not belong here (3). But it certainly appears in the MS and all printed editions in Aubrey's life of Thomas Hobbes (4). There, the words 'hitt the mark' are written above the line, as an alternative reading for 'doe well' which is what Aubrey wrote in the text itself (5). This, it will soon appear, is no mere pedantry or afterthought on Aubrey's part.

Another fact - reported by Andrew Clark and some other editors (6), but not in Mr. Dick's edition - is that in the margin of his MS, as note to 'one sayes', Aubrey wrote 'qu. (= quaere) who?'. He was obviously anxious to remember who was the author of this bon mot. But neither he nor Wood and Blackburne who used his MSS later on, found an answer to this question (7). I think I can suggest one.

Two letters of Isaac Casaubon, both available in Almeloveen's 1709 edition but only one of them available before, ascribe this saying to the mathematician Vieta, one of Scaliger's greatest opponents in the controversy over his mathematical adventure. Moreover, the second of these letters makes it clear that Vieta expressed this opinion in a conversation with Casaubon and an anonymous friend. Casaubon, therefore, must be the first source for Vieta's saying. But let us hear his own words.

The first passage comes from a letter to Sir Henry Savile, written in 1611 and first published in Almeloveen's edition as Epistola MXLIX:

> Scaligerum τον μαχαρίτην fuisse in Mathematicis ὄνον πρὸς λύραν, non omnes existimant, qui in illis libris excellunt. Clavius hostis illius aliter de ipso loquitur. Mihi quod magnus Vieta dixerit scio ipse. Erravit Scaliger, & fortasse consultius fecisset, si abstinuisset. Solebat Vieta dicere, non esse cujusvis errare cum Scaligero; cujus ipse divinum ingenium in aliis demirabatur. etc..

The second comes from the more famous letter to Thuanus, which is practically an obituary of Scaliger written soon after his death. This letter was included in the two printed editions of Casaubon's letters available in Aubrey's lifetime, as well as in Almeloveen's edition (Ep. CCLXIII), printed twelve years after Aubrey's death. It was also used as a preface to Scaliger's Opuscula Varia of 1619, a book which may have been more widely read than Casaubon's letters. The

relevant passage is:

> Omitto Mathematica studia, & nobilissimam temporum disciplinam. qua in parte, ut non assecutus sit semper, quod quaerebat; ea certe praestituit, quae justam admirationem doctis aestimatoribus non possint non exprimere. Quod equidem eo confidentius dico, quia scio Franciscum Vietam, subtilitate & inventionum acumine mathematicorum nostri saeculi facile principem, non aliud iudicasse. ad quem aliquando quum venissemus ego & amicus quidam meus, vir optimus & eruditissimus, essetque de Scaligeri id genus scriptis ortus sermo, postquam exposuisset Vieta quid in iis desideraret; hoc ad extremum suo candore dignissimum elogium adiecit: quidquid hujus fit, inquit, tanta me illius praestantissimi ingenii incessit admiratio, ut auctores rerum mathematicarum, praesertim Graecos, solum Scaligerum perfecte putem intellegere. Addidit etiam huc idem: pluris se Scaligerum vel errantem facere, quam multos κατορθοῦντας.

The choice, I believe, is not difficult. Aubrey may have had access to the MS letter to Savile - or he may have heard its contents from John Wallis, who certainly had access to Savile's books and papers (8). But the words he quotes are almost exactly Vieta's dictum as it appears in Casaubon's letter to Thuanus. Even Aubrey's hesitation between 'doe well' and 'hitt the mark' can be explained as a translator's doubt about the best was of rendering a Greek word.

How did Aubrey come by this saying of Vieta, and how did the name of Clavius creep into it?

I have no evidence to show that Aubrey ever read any of Casaubon's or Scaliger's writings (9). But he was much more a man about town and a friend of the famous than a reader of many books, and most of his information is of the 'I heard X say that...' type. He probably heard the Vieta episode from one of his friends who had read it in one of the books where Casaubon's letter to Thuanus is printed. The name Clavius - Vieta's mathematical opponent in later life, long after his controversy with Scaliger had subsided - would be an obvious gloss on 'multos'. This is most probably what Vieta had in his mind when he talked to Casaubon and his learned friend, and someone memorizing his nice phrase would supply the obvious name without checking.

Who could have been Aubrey's source? This is difficult to determine. Thomas Hobbes, Aubrey's lifelong friend, is one candidate. His own attempt at squaring the circle was compared by Wallis to Scaliger's effort, and Hobbes's answer was that he was proud to find himself in such company (10). But Wallis himself may be a better candidate. He was Aubrey's contemporary as Fellow of the Royal Society, and Aubrey 'heard him say' quite a few things. Moreover, it is Wallis - as Aubrey admits in the passage I quoted above from his life of Savile - who told him about Savile's confutation of Scaliger 'in the margent'. The opportunity for this sort of information was, one imagines, a conversation between the two FRS's about Hobbes's attempt to square the circle, some time when the question was actual and both Hobbes and Wallis submitted their respective views on the subject to the Royal Academy for adjudication. The example of Scaliger was an obvious thing to remember, and Wallis, who was a much better scholar and reader of books than Aubrey, probably told his friend what Vieta had said. Aubrey had a good verbal memory, and later on reproduced this quotation accurately, down to his two attempts at translating κατορθοῦντας.

A curious echo of this phrase reaches us from nineteenth century Germany. In his book on Scaliger (11), Bernays quotes August Böckh's remark '... und im schlimmsten Falle bleibt mir der Trost mit Scaliger geirrt zu haben' (12). It is quoted by Bernays with no further comment. But Böckh probably knew his source.

So, for that matter, did Vieta, whose education, like that of most mathematicians and scientists of his age, was essentially Classical. Cicero, Orator 42; Pro Balbo 64; and especially Tusc. I 39: 'Errare mehercule malo cum Platone ...

quam cum istis vera sentire'.

A strange attitude, this. For did not someone (quaere who?) say - though not in these exact words - 'Amicus Socrates, amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas'?

2. Redating an undated letter.

In a more recent article (13), I have published, with some comments, the text of a letter from Richard Thomson, of Clare Hall, Cambridge, to Isaac Casaubon, which is now among the latter's MSS in the Bodleian Library. I dated it as 'some time in 1596', basing my date on the fact that, from the internal evidence, it must have been written between the publication of Justus Lipsius' De Militia Romana (1596), and his Poliorcetica (also 1596). I should have known better.

Lipsius published the first edition of his De Militia Romana in 1594. I was misled by the 1596 edition which is mercifully available in our Cathedral Library, and which has nothing on the title-page or elsewhere to indicate that it is a second edition.

Moreover, in a letter to Bongarsius dated a.d.VIII Iduum Octobris MDXCV (14), Casaubon writes: 'Richardus Thomson scripsit ad me, nescio vigilans an somnians, haec verba: Lipsium plurimum in edendo Polybio sudasse; multa tamen peccasse, ut pagina pr.' etc.. This is undoubtedly a reference to the letter published and discussed in my article, and it should therefore be redated 'some time before October 1595'.

Library conditions in Exeter, where old books are very few and far between, and where an essential text like Almeloveen's edition of Casaubon's letters can only be available by inter-library loans and for a short period, can be pleaded in extenuation.

3. Mark Pattison's Ajax.

Talking of our glorious Library brings me to my next subject. Great - really great - libraries like the Bodleian and the British Museum have many books which belonged to great men of the past, and the most one does about this fact is mention it in the catalogue. Exeter University is not so fortunate, and the existence in it of any book which bears the signature of a famous man is worth mentioning - if only to prove that Exeter has books at all. Previous issues of Pegasus contained a letter from Scott to Liddell in our possession, published and annotated by Professor F. W. Clayton, and a note by the present writer on a presentation copy of Casaubon's Athenaeus in Exeter Cathedral Library. The present book is not as valuable or exciting - interesting it is nonetheless.

It is a copy of Campbell and Abbott's edition of the Ajax of Sophocles, published in the Clarendon Press Series, Oxford M D CCC LXXVI. Inside the cover it contains the following bookplate:

Somerville Hall
Library

--- GIVEN BY ---

Mrs. Mark Pattison
Use of Students

Date 1884.

It is obviously one of the Rector's books given away by his widow during her stay in Headington after her husband's death and before her marriage to Dilke and removal to London. There are some verses underlined in ink in the text, and a few variant readings written in the margin, but nothing of great interest like marginalia or papers. It is, however, a nice document, showing how the ageing Rector still kept alive his interest in Greek literature. It has Thornton's bookplate in it, and at some stage was sold for 6d., half its original price. It is now kept in the Classics Department's collection of texts and commentaries for the use of students and it may encourage scholars to flock to Exeter, knowing that here they can find at least a text of the Ajax of Sophocles in the original Greek.

4. A catching phrase.

John Sparrow, Mark Pattison p.63 (quoting Pattison's Memoirs):

> It was certainly in order to study that he himself went up to Oxford. He tells us in his Memoirs that his father was fond of repeating a sentence from the Eton Latin Grammar: Concessi Cantabrigiam ad capiendum ingenii cultum - 'I withdrew to Cambridge to improve my mind'. This, he says, 'was the proverb which presided over my whole life... I think no other sentence of any book had so large a share in moulding my mind and character as that one'.

Blackburne's Vitae Hobbianae Auctarium, in Molesworth's edition of Hobbes, Latin works, vol. I, p. xxiii:

> Anno 1503, ad percipiendum uberiorem ingenii cultum, Oxonium missus est, in aulam Beatae Mariae Magdalenae etc...

J. GLUCKER

N O T E S

1. An Autograph Letter of Joseph Scaliger to Sir Henry Savile, in Scientiarum Historia 8, 4, 1966, pp.214-224. Esp. p. 219 ff.
2. Peregrine Books 1962, p.329. Original edition, Secker and Warburg 1949, p.268.
3. There is no trace of this sentence in Aubrey's own MS notes for the life of Savile, Bodleian MS Aubrey 6, fol. 84, or in any edition other than Mr. Dick's. I take it that Mr. Dick is here following the practice he mentions in his preface (Peregrine ed. p. 4; 1949 ed. p. xxii): '... I have taken Aubrey at his word, and, using his manuscripts as if they were my own notes, I have constructed the following book: with the important reservation that I have nowhere departed from the original text, although I have ruthlessly rearranged it'. From this point of view, the last sentence may fit in here as well as in the life of Hobbes, which is where it comes from. Especially since, as we shall see, Wallis may have been Aubrey's source for it. But why Mr. Dick has decided to spell 'hitt the mark' - Aubrey's own spelling - in the original passage, but change it to 'hit the mark' in the present context, escapes me.
4. Bodleian MS Aubrey 9, p.36. Dick's 1949 ed. p. 151.
5. Andrew Clark in his Oxford edition, vol. I, p.333, makes the same mistake and prints 'hitt the mark' in his main text, giving 'doe well' as duplicate in the notes.
6. Clark ibid.; Anthony Powell's 1949 edition, p.243.
7. The whole episode is not mentioned in any of Wood's books or in Blackburne's life of Hobbes. They may have considered it as one of Aubrey's irrelevant pieces of gossip. But could it be that they omitted such a gem because they, like Aubrey, could not detect its source?
8. See article quoted in note 1, passim.

9. No book by either is included in Gunther's Catalogue of Aubrey's library, Appendix B (pp. 295-303) to Anthony Powell's John Aubrey and his Friends, London 1948. This, of course, is no proof of anything, since Aubrey was in the habit of selling or giving away books to pay his debts, and only some of his books ever reached the Ashmolean.
10. See article quoted in note 1, p. 220; Wallis, Hobbius Heautontimoroumenos, Oxford 1662, p. 114; et al.
11. p.2, and note 2 on p.19.
12. Manetho und die Hundssternperiode... von August Böckh, Berlin 1845, p.11.
13. Richard Thomson to Isaac Casaubon, 1596, in Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance XXX, 1967, pp. 149-153.
14. Almeloveen Ep. XLII, pp.25-7. The passage quoted here comes from the postscript, pp.26-7.
15. More discussion of Thomson's letter can be found in another letter to Bongarsius, dated 1596, Alm. Ep. LXV, pp.37-9. It is interesting that in this letter Casaubon makes extensive use of Thomson's criticism of Lipsius' position, without mentioning his debt to Thomson or Savile.

V I V A T L I N G U A L A T I N A !

I am thoroughly sick of the apathetic attitude of even the most long-established and distinguished classicists towards the slow murder of what they profess to consider the world's greatest languages. We have all at some point in our arduous classical apprenticeships experienced the discouragement expressed in the oft-chanted plaint, "Latin is a language, as dead as dead can be; first it killed the Romans, and now it's killing me!" What we fail to notice is the extraordinary behaviour of this deadest of all dead corpses, which is alleged to be capable of a course of conduct with somewhat distressing homicidal tendencies. In fact it shows all the symptoms of considerable aliveness, if such a word exists. Of course the Latin language is alive; it is only the ancient Romans that are dead. Latin will only die if we kill it, and as I see it we are well on our way to achieving this.

There is a league in this country against vivisection because it is known that death or at best considerable pain results from treating a live subject as a dead one. Classicists are guilty of the same attitude towards Latin and Greek. We treat these languages as a meaty subject for endless and destructive intellectual dissection. Don't misunderstand me - I am not one of those who believe that the learning of syntax should be dropped in favour of the new humanism. Analysis is necessary for the comprehension of a language. Texts must be reconstructed to give us something to read, syntax and vocabulary give us the tools to read it with, metre has to be counted to show us how to read it, and so on. But in the contemplation and pursuance of all these lovely emendations and collations and comparisons, it is far too easy to forget the human heart that beat once as the words were written. Analysis should never be allowed to become an aim in itself, but only as a means to fuller understanding and, most important of all, <u>appreciation</u>. What insults we heap on our ancient authors! These people have toiled for days and nights, burning candles all ends at once, writing, polishing, scrapping, recommencing, all to give us a tentative offering of the very kernel of themselves - and what do we do? We bite our pencils and stroke our beards and mutter, "Ah, yes, that subjunctive - rather curious in this construction - put it down to virtual O.O. with 'vix' understood." This is pure desecration of the author-reader relationship. We must spend more time getting to know the author's personality and <u>why</u> he wrote and <u>what</u> he wrote. We do this with English and French authors. Why do we not treat Latin and Greek authors with at least equal respect? Is this a devious form of racialism? Or do we imagine that Vergil is somehow deader than Keats?

Another form of this attitude is illustrated in the reverse direction, as it were. Everyone knows that Latin so-called composition consists in the conversion of Macaulay narrative into authentic Livy, and of Macaulay rhetorical into authentic Cicero. I recommend anyone thinking of taking up plagiarism on a criminally organised scale to pay particular attention to this valuable exercise. Why do we think that the Romans could not understand anything unless it had been said ten times by Cicero and attested by a doubtful reading in Sallust? Surely, surely if we are capable of understanding D. H. Lawrence's peculiar, to say the least, metaphorical prose, the Romans would have understood, nay, appreciated an original turn of expression in their own language? And why on earth do we shrink from original composition in Greek and Latin? We know enough now to avoid corrupting the language like those sainted mediaeval monks of whom we have all heard so much bad and very little good. At least they had the courage to try.

I have another question to ask, which always creates great alarm and despondency when it crops up, but nevertheless I'll ask it again. Why is Latin not spoken? Just hang on to your shields for a moment and think. We have all the information necessary for doing so; conjugations, declensions, accidence, syntax, vocabulary of prose, poetry, and of everyday speech. Admittedly there are limits outside which we

may not pass, but a lot could be achieved within these ample horizons. If people are capable of learning fluent Russian and Modern Greek, they are capable of learning fluent Latin and Ancient Greek. If the task is surmountable, it is only laziness that stops us doing it, and lack of practice. We must teach ourselves before we can accustom our children to it and this is what we are not prepared to do.

There are so many advantages to be gained. The persistent mispronunciation of these languages must be depriving us of a very great number of unsuspected assonantal effects. When there are such books as "Vox Latina" on our library shelves, there is no excuse for us to read Greek like English and Latin like English Italian. How can we feel the beauty of deliberate onomatopoeic effects in poetry if we continually distort the sounds out of all recognition (if an Ancient should ever return to listen, Lord help him)? How can we appreciate the full sonority of Ciceronian invective unless we roll our r's and spit out our consonants as he did? There are dozens of known speech-habits like "plebs" being pronounced "pleps" and "adsum" as "atsum", which we ignore all our lives. We will discover a great deal about how Latin was spoken if we speak it, or at any rate <u>read</u> it, correctly. We should also learn about accent and <u>practise</u> it. We will never hear the poetry of Aeschylus until we pronounce the vowels and consonants as they were and observing both ictus and tonic accent. Language is quite flat without intonation. And should we not make a point of reading Latin and Greek aloud as much as possible? When we know that these languages were never read silently, are we right to study them by scrutinizing their symbols? We must teach ourselves to hear again. Our visual education has erected huge mufflers around our ears so that we have to transmute sounds into vision before they will penetrate our consciousness. It is hard for us to realise that written words are only inadequate symbols of sounds which mean something.

The view which I have heard expressed, that if Latin is to be attempted to be spoken, it should logically today be Italian, is blatantly ludicrous. If this hypothesis stands, the Aeneid should be read in Italian and the Iliad in Modern Greek! Is it so very difficult to see that if a language has been a fit medium for literature of such a high standard that people are still reading it two thousand years later, it is also a natural vehicle for communication between its devotees? To think that this is impossible, or anything less than desirable, is surely an indication of laziness, stupidity, cowardice, or an outsize inferiority complex. The point is that when we have learnt to speak and communicate in these languages, the literature will come into its own place, and at last, after centuries of muddling, we will attain a truly balanced and <u>vivid</u> perspective of Greek and Latin as they live again.

ROSEMARY E. BANCROFT.

BOOK REVIEW:

M. I. Finley: Aspects of Antiquity,
228 pp. London 1968.

Mr. Finley is always readable. He brings a lively commonsense to bear on the facts accumulated by his tremendous erudition. He neither repeats the old clichés nor gives uncritical assent to the new ones; for example, on the essential importance of slavery in ancient economics, and on the inferior position of women in ancient societies, he has no use for the modern attempts to minimize them.

This book can be divided into four sections: the Prehistoric, dealing with Crete, Troy, Etruria and early Rome; Classical Greek, dealing with Pindar, Thucydides, Socrates, Plato and Diogenes; Rome (Roman women, Diocletian, population, and the slave-trade); and Christian Origins.

His preface quotes some rather obscure remarks by Mr. John Jones on Sophoclean Tragedy, which suggest that we cannot understand the ancients except in our own idiom, which may or may not involve anachronistic misjudgements. This may be too strong; some classical scholars in the past have wildly misinterpreted things, sometimes by looking through spectacles tinged with High-Church stained glass which has shown them a picture of wild heathens with no virtues but patriotism and few motives other than self-advancement or self-gratification, and some have looked at classical Greeks as if they had been Hottentots or Trobriand Islanders, but many of us have felt that the ancients had much the same emotions and reactions as ourselves, but simply expressed them in a different, sometimes a franker, idiom. Finley's spectacles distort less than most - they are the spectacles of an American liberal humanist. The picture may be blurred at the edges, but it is a full picture, not a reflection in the archaeologist's microscope or the crystal ball of the amateur mythographer.

Crete has, most recently, been peered at through microscopes, and the microscopes have revealed much that is probably not there. Who outside the world of classical scholarship would believe that whole empires have been built out of tax-returns and lists of goods in palace stores; or that the economic system of a country, and the racial and cultural affinities of its people, had been deduced from the fact that some property is described as KEKEMONO and some as KEKIMENO? Finley begins, very reasonably, with the mythology of Crete, and goes on to its geography, its history, and to the history of Minoan archaeology, from Pashley in the early 19th century to the Palmer controversy today. He admits that the quarrel is a difficult and a risky one, and concludes that remarkably little can be deduced except that the real Minoan culture was Asiatic in origin. On Troy, he says that Troy did exist, and stood on Hissarlik; but the Trojan War cannot be fitted into any real historical pattern. The tradition knows Mycenae, but says nothing of its fall (but what about Hera's willingness to allow Zeus to destroy Mycenae if she is to be granted the destruction of Troy?), and the Hittites are conspicuously absent (but what about Eurypylus and his mysterious Ceteioi?) The Gods, too, cause difficulties. (But what about the Deity whose hand guided Washington and Lincoln?) Here, too, it is simplest to reject; there may have been some war at some time, but the poets have mixed up the periods and the persons, as they did with the Nibelungenlied and the Chanson de Roland.

With classical Greece, he is more committed. On Pindar, he deals with Bowra's sympathetic study, but he blasts off with a searing quotation from Ezra Pound. This is really a case of Satan rebuking sin. Pindar was

often obscure, but seldom as obscure as Pound; often arrogant, sometimes querulous and even catty, but never screamingly venomous. He may not have shared so exuberantly in the joy over Greek victories and Athenian freedom as did Simonides and Aeschylus; but he did not, as Ezra Pound did, spend the war in enemy territory broadcasting enemy propaganda. Finley is, of course, less savage than Pound, but he does not let Pindar off easily. Pindar sells his art to the highest bidder; he extols himself, he blackguards his rivals in the rat-race, and he eulogizes himself. (Finley suggests that these are Renaissance characteristics; but he might find them, and probably has found them, nearer in time and space than that). He has no values beyond those of conventional aristocratic athleticism; he mentions Marathon but says nothing about the battle. (Unfortunately for Finley's thesis, he does mention Salamis, commonly thought, by Athenians at least, to have been a more democratic victory than Marathon had been). In any case, Thebes had been pro-Persian. (This is ungenerous; Theban soldiers fought loyally enough at Thermopylae, and Thebes only went over when Boeotia was overrun. Most of the nobility probably collaborated to some extent, but the blame for collaboration was passed, first on to two leaders only, and then on to a "clique of a few men". In fact, gallant little Phocis had done exactly as Thebes had done, and Delphi had done considerably worse). The image of Pindar is the familiar one; he was a kind of poetic Dornford Yates, a kind of human Tatler and Bystander. To him, nothing matters but wealth, daring, and success. This was all said by Benjamin Farrington thirty years ago; Farrington added, as Finley does not, that Pindar and Aeschylus are opposed not only in their attitudes to contemporary questions but in the literary forms which they use. Pindar writes for the peers in their stately homes, Aeschylus writes for the people gathered in the new democratic Theatre of Dionysus. Much of this is true, though there is little that is said against Pindar that could not be said against Shakespeare. Pindar's Odes are no more obscure, and certainly no more subservient, than some of the Sonnets; Pindar was glad to see the Persians out of Greece, as Shakespeare was glad to see the last of the Armada, and both Pindar and Shakespeare saw the future in terms of country sport for rural gentlefolk and splendour for the higher nobility, with goodwill all round but little sympathy or understanding for the common man's demand for social justice.

Thucydides is even more hardly done by than Pindar. He gets full credit for his concept of scientific history, but his style is "complicated, crabbed.. neither pleasant nor easy to read". That is true enough, but it would have been fair to say that the style, like the science, is a contemporary gimmick; the scientific method comes from Hippocrates and Ionia, but the stylistic packaging comes from Gorgias and the rhetoricians of Sicily. And Finley is more than unfair about the speeches; he says correctly that Thucydides rewrote some of his earlier passages after the end of the War, but he seems to accept almost uncritically some of the outrageous nonsense that German critics have written about the speeches, in spite of the clear arguments raised by Gomme twenty years ago - and of Thucydides' own equally clear statements. Nor does he seem to appreciate the real points of the speeches; he sees that they are not simply ornament, but he regards them as an emphasizing, underscoring and heightening, of the issues at stake. They are that, of course, in some cases, especially where, as in the Melian Dialogue, Thucydides is closest to drama; but they are also one half of the essential Word-and-Deed combination, the Thoughts and Arguments which (except, perhaps, in Sparta) must guide action. Some of the Thoughts are correct - the thoughts of Pericles are, indeed, so correct, and the prognoses so accurate, that some, including Finley, think they must have been invented <u>post eventum</u> (as if Churchill's prophecy of "sunlit uplands" could not have been made before he had seen the Affluent Society of the 1950's); others, like the Corcyraean promise that their navy would be a great help to Athens, or

the Corinthian view that the War would be short and easy, and above all the magnificent clanger of Athenagoras when he said that Athens would not possibly be planning to attack Syracuse, may illustrate either the folly of the speakers or what Pericles himself described as the awkwardness of facts.

Socrates is treated with sympathy; here, as so often, the Athenian public gets the blame. Finley expressly rejects the possibility that it was essentially a political prosecution, since if that had been so, Plato and Xenophon would have been glad to emphasize the fact. Xenophon does, in fact, mention the accusation that Socrates had been responsible for Critias and Alcibiades, and rejects it; neither he nor Plato could have done much more without seeming to sympathize with the Thirty - and it was in the interests of both parties that as little should actually be said about the Thirty as possible. The democrats would face trouble under the Amnesty Law if they drew much attention to them; and the oligarchs would seem to be trying to extenuate the behaviour of the Thirty, which was too much even for oligarchs. (Though Xenophon later fought, virtually, for Lysander, and Plato proposed Orwellian tyrannies of a kind which made the Thirty Tyrants seem liberal philanthropists in comparison). The death of Socrates is blamed on Athenian conservatism, acting in a rather arbitrary way; any number of "new Gods" had been brought in, but Socrates was the only person to be punished; there were many prophets with their Spirit Guides, but Socrates' Daimonion was the only one which brought trouble to its possessor. Finley adduces the trial of Anaxagoras, without making it clear that it, too, had been a fundamentally political trial, intended to discredit Pericles. More blame than is reasonable, too, is attached to Aristophanes. The "Clouds" certainly rankled, but it is surely going too far to say that an image produced by a music-hall sketch can have contributed very much to the decision of a mass jury, a quarter of a century later, on a matter of a fellow-citizen's life. Finley correctly says that the condemnation was unique and exceptional; he might also have added that the prosecution would have been happy to settle for far less then the death-sentence, and to connive later at a jail-break, but Socrates, with the wisdom of his obstinacy, chose to be dead rather than to be discredited.

Plato is treated more generously than some might expect. He makes what most people would consider appalling mistakes, not to say downright lies; but he is not, as the Popper school holds, simply a vicious oligarch living in the evil past; he is a perfectionist who makes no allowances for human necessities. Finley ends his article on Plato with an argument about the Ship of State which had already struck Grote, as it probably strikes most people who read Plato's rather offensive arguments about carpenters and cobblers managing the ship; the passengers, says Finley, do not decide how the ship is navigated, but they do decide where they want to go. In fairness to Plato, it should be remembered that he had grown up in a time when Athens had been a ship with passengers who did want to go in the same direction, because there was no other; that is, in the Peloponnesian War, when passengers, officers and crew alike wanted victory, or at least survival; and the ship sank. Plato's argument is valid for wars and extreme emergencies (and, of course, in his thinking, all human life was an emergency); but any ship with Plato as a captain would have set sail direct to 1984. Diogenes, on the other hand, is a complete anarchist, a proto-beatnik, though no ascetic (Finley perhaps underrates the simplicity of Diogenes' sexual and nutritional requirements); but his anarchism was purely personal, and he was a kind of licensed jester. A closer study might have shown Diogenes as, essentially, a decayed gentleman; a parasite in that he feels that Society owes him a living, but also a man with a message, a person who accepts some obligations, especially the obligation to tell the truth and do his duty - to humanity, if the day of the city-state is indeed over. Surely too little credit is given to Diogenes' concept of Humanity; it is commonly concealed by his emphasis on the word "Man", which

suggests a Pindaric-Spartan cult of toughness and ambition, but Diogenes made it clear that those values, though good in themselves, were adolescent values; adult values, as his Stoic successors saw, were more the values which are now known as Humanism. Surely credit should be given to the philosophers who made those values acceptable to the Hellenistic Kings? Plato, mercifully, failed to make Dionysius II a Philosopher King (whatever Dionysius' failings, he would surely have been a far greater disaster if he had tried to found Plato's Republic, or even to enforce Plato's Laws); but the Cynics and Stoics did partially succeed in producing Humanist Kings.

With Etruria, Finley sees that ancients and moderns alike are in a world of fancy. He is more sympathetic than some modern Etruscophiles are to the Romano-Greek fancies, that the Etruscans were gluttons and sex-maniacs, rather like Hollywood's Romans. Their funerary statues are corpulent, and there is at least one gross indecency in a tomb, a phenomenon rare in any culture (Finley may be unaware that Hellenistic vases found in some Cypriote burials were so horrifying that archaeologists, not normally the most prudish of scholars, hurriedly reburied them); otherwise, we can tell very little, and there is no need to accept the modern suggestion that the Etruscans held Rome until 450.

In Rome, women were "silent" - a statement which would have surprised the Greeks, who thought they were unusually emancipated, and the men of Rome, who thought they were domineering. Rome, however, is virtually unique among great civilizations in having failed to produce "a single really important woman writer or poet", any "truly regal queen"; she produced "no Deborah, no Joan of Arc, no Florence Nightingale, no patron of the arts". The absence of "truly regal queens" in a Republic is not surprising, and a state which had no occasion for a Resistance Movement would hardly produce a Deborah or a Joan of Arc; where the circumstances permitted, Rome could certainly produce - or at least invent - a Tanaquil, a Tullia, or a Cloelia, and the Republic produced a mother of the Gracchi, a Caecilia Metella in the Social War, a Servilia to preside over the debates of Brutus and Cassius in 44, a Hortensia to lead a demonstration in the Forum in 42. No societies other than Victorian England have produced a Florence Nightingale; male patrons of the arts were not particularly common in Rome, and few of them were more munificent than Julia Domna. His points are really two: Roman women do not speak for themselves; and they do not have much say in their own marriages. In both of these respects, they differ from the women of modern America, but their condition is certainly not unique even among "great civilized states". Most of us know little about more than a few civilizations, so we are prone to generalize on inadequate data; but do we hear less about Roman women, or did Roman women enjoy fewer liberties, than women in Babylon, or Baghdad, or Venice - or Periclean Athens?

On the slave trade he is interesting, pointing out that the ancients, like America's Southerners, felt uncomfortable about it while accepting, almost without question, the institution of slavery. He might have added that the word "slave", like the words "lunatic" and "prostitute", tended to generate euphemisms; just as Southern gentlemen talked about "my people", so a Greek slave-owner would talk about his "house people" and a Roman about his "familia". The connection of pirates with the slavetrade may perhaps be overrated; a superficial reader might deduce that Delos lived exclusively on the slavetrade, and that all slavetraders were pirates, and might not realize that, for a time at least, the pirates were a tolerably effective anti-Roman resistance movement, comparable to the Buccaneers in the seventeenth-century Caribbean. Slave rebels simply wanted to become slave-owners themselves; this is doubtfully true about the Bagaudae, of whom Finley says it, and certainly earlier slave rebels seem to have wanted little more than

to obtain freedom and a livelihood, if possible in their own homes, perhaps after a short orgy of vengeance. Jewish revolutionaries might sometimes have a pipe-dream in which hostile states paid tribute, but they envisaged a free peasant society, of vines and fig-trees, not a vast latifundia with themselves on top.

On Diocletian, Finley speaks with two voices. His state was worth saving, and he saved it for another thousand years; at the same time, there were "large groups of people" within her borders for whom it was not. He does not join the chorus of amateur economists (British as well as American) who complain that Diocletian's interference with free enterprise was economically absurd and politically tyrannical, but he does quote, with apparent approval, a querulous epigram by Henry James (of all people; the present reviewer sometimes wonders whether Henry James ever said anything worth recording, since all the recorded statements he has seen are either platitudinous or misconceived) who finds "a certain stupidity" in the Pont du Gard - some people would think that the provision of fresh water for great cities was one of the most meritorious achievements of antiquity. His age was brutal, though no more brutal than its predecessors; Finley quotes some bloody-minded remarks by Lactantius, not emphasizing that Lactantius, as a victim of persecution, was being understandably vindictive, rather than gratuitously sadistic. For Diocletian's persecutions, he accepts Lactantius' statement that Diocletian ordered them in a fit of temper after he had seen some Christians making the sign of the cross at a sacrifice; even in Lactantius, we can see that there was a little more to it than that. Nor does Finley make it clear that Diocletian abdicated while the persecution, though ultimately unsuccessful, was still in operation; and he suggests that Christian emperors almost immediately began persecutions of their own, against the pagans. In fact, anti-pagan measures of one kind or another began some seventy-five years after Diocletian's death, there were no official pagan martyrdoms (although some pagans were lynched by Christian mobs) and a century after Constantine's accession there were still pagans sufficiently numerous and vocal to blame Christianity for the sack of Rome in 410.

On Christian Origins, Finley succeeds both in sticking his neck out and in saying very little. That is an occupational hazard. Any historian who touches Christian Origins is liable to fall into Scylla and Charybdis at the same time. He will be marked in the public eye (if it sees him at all) as a blasphemer; he will alienate all except the most liberal-minded of his Christian friends; he will, if he feels at all strongly on the subject, inevitably cause confusion and disunity among men of goodwill; if his opinion is to be of any value at all, he will have to devote a lifetime to the study of innumerable difficult documents; and above all, he is liable to find that some other suggestion turns up to convict him of writing unscholarly rubbish. (Robert Graves produced, within seven years, two separate and completely irreconcileable rationalizations of the Gospel story). Finley here reviews one devotional manual which purports to be a work of scholarship, and he shows, clearly enough, that some theologians live in a different world from historians, and speak a different language - the language of Plato and Lactantius, not the language of Thucydides and Aristotle. From Sherwin-White, Goguel, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, we learn much the same as we have learnt from Evans, Schliemann, and the Linear B Documents; that is, much interesting information with practically no relevance to the central theme of a tradition. Oddly, the one thing in a very thorny subject which Finley admits is likely to be "abhorrent to many" is a tentative suggestion that St. Peter may never have gone to Rome. An even thornier subject is the question of "collective Jewish guilt" for the Crucifixion. Finley doubts whether anti-Semitism might "quietly disappear if one could only demonstrate decisively that no Jews, or just a few Quislings among them, shared in the responsibility for the crucifixion".

His doubts are, alas, justified - after all, Pharaoh and Haman, Mesha, King of Moab, and Antiochus Epiphanes had no idea of avenging the Crucifixion - but the demonstration would at least show, as most Christian Englishmen have realized for generations, that at least there is no Christian justification for anti-semitism.

With The Year One, Finley moves further away from Christian origins than the title would suggest. He deals very largely with Augustus, and he does not like him. He feels "discomfort" when he reads Vergil's forecast of a Golden Age in Italy, later spreading to the rest of the world, and he takes the title pater patriae as an authoritarian, rather than a paternally benevolent, title - though it would be difficult to think of a more benevolent title, and Roman literature gives no hints at all that paternal authority in Rome provoked any of the Oedipal reactions that have been traced in so many other societies, not least our own. He provokes domestic conspiracy on the part of his own daughter and granddaughter - an activity which, combined with adultery and murder, is the contemporary equivalent of movements for female emancipation -, he exiles Ovid for falling out of line in his campaign for moral regeneration, but it never enters his mind to abolish "concubines, mistresses and brothels". (There were, in fact, laws about stuprum, and Dio Chrysostom advocated the suppression of brothels, a measure which has been attempted through the ages, by autocrats and democrats, by Frederick the Great and by the Fourth French Republic, but never with any degree of success). In general, the Empire was an unenlightened tyranny, life for most free people, and for practically all slaves, was barely worth living, but some people did well out of it; nevertheless, it was not economically viable, and neither the rich nor the poor could reproduce themselves in sufficient numbers to keep the land tilled and the frontiers defended.

Is this a fair picture? Imperfect as they were, Augustus' Principate and Diocletian's Dominate were an improvement on the half-centuries of bloodshed which preceded them, and Augustan Italy and Imperial Byzantium were probably happier places and periods than most others in history (which is not, of course, to say that all, or most, of their inhabitants were consciously happy). We should remember that it was the Western Empire that collapsed; in Constantinople, and even in Ravenna, there is a continuity of a kind that did not survive Visigoths in Spain, Clovis in France, and (still less) Hengist and Horsa in this country. If a culture is to be judged by success, and success to be judged by survival, then Diocletian built more successfully than Augustus. If we are to judge by utilitarian standards, probably both should be marked fairly highly; they did provide stability and some measure of prosperity for many. Their problems, as Finley admits, were in some cases problems which even we ourselves, given their resources, could not have solved. But the main impression is that antiquity has been weighed in the balances and found, on the whole, wanting. Poets sell themselves to the highest bidder, philosophers fail to organize revolutions, epicists and historians alike do not come up to the exigencies of modern scholarship, women are downtrodden, religion whether pagan or Christian is escapist and irresponsible, Emperors are brutal and autocratic, and the real problems are insoluble without an Industrial Revolution. If Finley wants to warn us against idealizing antiquity, he is successful, and his object is a sensible one; if he is suggesting, as many have done, that all history until our own times has been a chronicle of the follies and miseries of mankind, that is reasonable enough. But these essays are a collection of separate articles and broadcasts, not one continuous argument on a theme, and perhaps they should be taken each as a separate window opening on to a different scene, sometimes a philosopher's study, sometimes a chamber of horrors. Taken simply as Aspects of Antiquity they are brilliantly illuminating. Sometimes the picture is dim because there is not enough light available, but we are

given all there is; sometimes the picture is bright enough, but its subject is a macabre one. Some of the factors - autocracy, intolerance - appear in our own world; some - technical inadequacy, chattel slavery - may have been overcome. As a picture of past civilizations, it is on the whole gloomy; as a presentation of otherwise unappreciated facts, it is brilliant.

H. W. STUBBS

****

SOLUTION TO CROSSWORD IN PEGASUS 9.

ACROSS		DOWN	
4.	OPS	1.	????? *
9.	IACCHUS	2.	ACESTES
10.	CALLIAS	3.	AUGURES
11.	ARA	5.	PARADOXA STOICORUM
12.	PAESTUM	6.	CARINUS
13.	MINUCIO	7.	ALAUDAE
14.	IDA	8.	CAPITOL
15.	CURETES	18.	SPE
16.	CURATOR	19.	AMO
17.	AXE	20.	EOS
26.	POMPONIUS BASSULUS	21.	DIO
30.	ION	22.	PAN
34.	ACASTUS	23.	USU
35.	TANAGRA	24.	ALO
36.	ACE	25.	AST
37.	SALACIA	27.	OCEANUS
38.	GALATIA	28.	ASPASIA
39.	ARS	29.	BUSIRIS
40.	AUXILIA	31.	PAGANUS
41.	EUDEMUS	32.	PANACEA
42.	EMO	33.	TROILUS

M. V. MATTHEWS.

* We regret thatl between the production of Pegasus nos. 9 and 10, the original of this crossword was unfortunately lost. So the compiler was asked to produce a solution by solving the crossword herself. No. 1. down, however, defeated even her ingenuity and memory. Therefore if any reader can provide a plausible answer to this clue, we should be very glad to hear of it.

C. A. M. Evans.

FIVE TRANSLATIONS FROM HORACE

Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa

In your rose-scattered bower,
All smothered in scent,
What lanky young lover
Upon you is bent?
With grace unaffected
And effortless care
For whom are you now
Letting down your bright hair?

Ah Pyrrha! how often
With sorrow he'll find
That faith can be broken
And heaven unkind!
Your fair-weather sailor
Will start and turn pale
To see the dark waters
Whipped up by a gale,

Who clasps you, all golden,
And dreams that you'll stay
Forever adorable,
His, every day.
So little he knows
Of the shifts of the breeze,
And of unseasoned timbers
In bright summer seas.

On a wall of the chapel
A tablet is nailed,
To tell that I also
Those waters have sailed;
And vowed to great Neptune
The clothing I wore,
When drooping and sodden
I stumbled ashore. I.v.

Vides ut alta stet niue candidum

See how on high Soracte gleams
Piled deep with snow immaculate;
The forest bows beneath its weight
And ice has glazed the silent streams.

Pile high the hearth with logs of pine,
And bid the boy, to thaw the cold,
Go tap a hogshead four years old
And fill the jug with country wine.

For all the rest, let God dispose:
When He has stilled the storms that lash
The foaming seas, no more shall ash
Or cypress shake beneath their blows.

What's still to come seek not to prove,
  But count each added day a gain
  And cherish while they still remain
The dancing years of youth and love,

Till grizzled age your look shall sour.
  Now parks and colonnades invite
  To loving whispers in the night
And meetings at the appointed hour,

And laughter from some dark retreat
  Acknowledges a trophy seized
  From arm or yielding finger, pleased
To grant a not too swift defeat. I.ix.

Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi.

'O Robin's cheek is rosy,
  And smooth as wax his arms.'
God! how my bile erupts, to hear
  Of Robin's ruddy charms!

The furtive tears run down my face,
  Brain and colour turn;
White my cheeks, but red the fires
  That in my entrails burn.

I burn to see your silky skin
  Inflamed by drunken fights,
Your swollen lips betraying
  Robin's rabid bites.

Hope not to hold him, whose assault
  Those lovely lips must harm,
Where Venus lavished all her store
  Of quintessential balm.

Thrice blest are they whose mutual love
  No jealousy can sour,
Who keep perpetual wedding-day
  Until their dying hour. I. xiii.

Parcus deorum cultor et infrequens.

I wandered in the uncharted seas
  Of Wittgenstein and Ayer;
I never thought the Lord to please
  And seldom said a prayer.

But now fresh evidence prevails,
  Compelling me once more
To put about and trim my sails
  And hug the well-known shore.

Instead of driving through a cloud,
  As is the usual way,
The Almighty thundered clear and loud
  Upon a cloudless day,

Whose force the stubborn earth can rend,
  The wandering streams compel,
And Atlas at the far world's end,
  And horrid gates of Hell.

His truth revealed the weak can raise
  Or bring the mighty down:
His angel stoops, with wings ablaze
  To snatch, or grant, a crown. I. xxxiv.

Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero.

Now shake the floor with pounding feet
  Now let the wine flow free, Sir,
A Salian banquet for the Gods,
  A drink for you and me, Sir.

No time before to broach the cask
  While Egypt's queen was brewing
Confusion for the Capitol
  And for the Empire ruin.

When, drunk with power and Fortune's kiss,
  By catamites surrounded
And wethers of the tainted flock,
  She cherished hopes unbounded,

A single ship survived unsunk
  Her vapoured brain to clear,
Which Caesar, driving from the West,
  To sense restored, and fear.

As hawks hunt doves, and harriers hares
  Across the wintry plains,
So Caesar on the Fury swooped
  To bring her home in chains.

But noble birth craves noble death:
  No coward soul she bore
To fly from Fate, and in defeat
  Steer for a distant shore.

Her kingdom falling round her ears,
  Still unafraid she stood
To take a serpent in her hand
  And poison in her blood.

A woman's pride unbowed contrived
  Her captors to defy:
To spite a Roman holiday,
  She chose a queen to die.

(So shake the floor with pounding feet
  And let the wine flow free, Sir;
A Salian banquet for the Gods,
  A drink for you and me, Sir.) I. xxxvii.

I. R. D. MATHEWSON.

HOW DEAD ARE THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES?

Should Latin and Greek be considered as languages well and truly dead and should they be studied in this light? Let us consider some situations. It is the 4th century B.C. in Athens. Plato the philosopher gets up, comes to breakfast and all the while chatting merrily away to slaves, etc. After about an hour, Socrates turns up and they sit down to discuss the book that Plato is going to write περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικά. Two hours later and they are still talking and Plato has made several 'pages of notes', and all this in fluent Greek. The book will finally be published to torment 20th century A.D. students under the title 'The Symposium'.

The scene now changes and it is April 52 B.C. in Rome. Cicero gets up, breakfasts, etc., etc., and afterwards sits down to get on with his daily work. He writes a letter to Atticus about various topics, complaining about Julius Caesar who is now beginning to really make trouble as far as the political scene in Rome is concerned; and then Cicero gets on to the real business of the day. He must do a draft copy of the speech which he is to deliver the following month 'Pro Milone'. He works steadily and within 4 or 5 hours has some substantial idea of what he is going to say. All this, of course, is in fluent Latin.

Yet again the scene changes and we are in Paris. It is 1967 A.D. and General de Gaulle and Chancellor Erhard of Germany are conducting some high-level talks about matters of mutual concern to both of them. As neither speaks fluently the language of the other, there are interpreters present who without any great difficulty explain to the other what the one is saying. The talks continue and 4 or 5 hours later they come to a stop and both men go into dinner. Yes, the talks have gone well and have been of interest to both of them. Thus is the bulletin which is issued.

For the last time the scene changes and we are again in Athens, but now the date is 1968 A.D. and King Constantine is the character with whom we are involved. Incidentally, how strange to find in Athens, the home of democracy, a king and furthermore a king with royal powers! He is reading the daily papers which are written in a type of Modern Greek which if read by Plato, he would understand almost completely despite the differences that the language has undergone. In the afternoon he writes several letters and of course all this is in fluent Modern Greek.

Now let us come to the point of all this! What have these situations all in common? Yes, we know that they are or were all influential people; and that each of them are writing or speaking about things that will have a profound influence on the circumstances of their countries. But the important thing, I feel, is that each is writing or speaking <u>fluently</u> in his own language; Plato and Socrates in ancient Greek, Cicero in Latin, Erhard in German, de Gaulle in French, and Constantine in Modern Greek. Let us continue! In this our university of Exeter there are people who study French, German, Modern Greek, and Latin and Ancient Greek. The students of all the modern languages would more or less fluently understand what was being said in those languages. In fact, if any person was unable to do these things, then the students, and certainly the lecturers, of those subjects would say that they should not deserve to be given a degree in the subjects. And this is quite reasonable and right! For such are the natures of Modern Languages! Furthermore not one of the students would say that they should not do proses, or at least not try to express themselves in those languages. But rather they would go to the other extreme and say that by translating into the foreign language they get a far better understanding of the language. It is an undoubted fact that people who can only understand a language cannot be truly said to know the language.

How different is the case in Latin and Greek! Here Plato speaking in Greek and Cicero speaking in Latin very few of us would understand and if anyone was to expect us to understand them, then we would all question that person's sanity! And quite rightly as things stand at present. But if Cicero and Plato were to write out their respective languages, even then there would be chaos and we would all have great difficulty in understanding straight off. We would all need translations, and then and only then would we be able to understand. And this is not right! After years of unseen translation and set book reading, still it is very difficult for the great mass of us to understand and translate straight off pieces of Latin and Greek. One does not find this happening in Modern languages. Any student of French and German after 3 years of university understands more or less fluently his language. In fact, it is very doubtful whether one could give such a student any book or piece to translate that he would not fluently understand. He would certainly not need translations right, left and centre. And is it unreasonable to ask for this in Classics? I think not!

One must remember that to Plato and Cicero, their languages were as alive as is German, French, etc., etc., today. That Plato and Cicero have been dead for many, many years does not alter the fact that they used to speak fluently their languages and that there exists today languages that are just as difficult to speak and understand as Latin and Greek. I doubt if many people reading this article will know both Greek and Welsh, but even there one can say that to the beginner the latter language is just as 'cock-eyed' as the former, but this does not stop Welsh pupils, who do not speak Welsh naturally, from studying and speaking quite fluently that language, and this after only 4 or 5 years of study.

Let us also consider German. I will readily admit that the word order and the general set-up of the language are not so difficult as Latin or Greek, but nevertheless the fact remains that the German language is approaching the classical languages in its structure:

(a) The Nouns and adjectives decline and in 3 different forms depending on whether it is accompanied by the indefinite article, the definite article or nothing at all.
(b) The verbs conjugate and there are far more irregular verbs than in Latin.
(c) The word order goes differently from the English word order quite regularly and to a comparative beginner in such a manner as to cause considerable. (This is personal experience talking.)
(d) And in general, the sentence is more of a jumble than any English sentence.

These difficulties do not however stop us from not only writing the language but even speaking it. And why? Because we are taught with the aim of being able to speak it. Well, why not this in Latin and Greek? "Because," you will say, "Latin and Greek are dead languages and there is no point in being able to speak them." This is correct, but surely the reason why French, German, and certainly Modern Greek are understood so much better by English students is because those languages are studied with a view to being able to speak them. If we stopped considering Latin and Greek as so dead and buried, then we would be able better to understand them and translate into them. By learning the languages as Modern languages we would pay less attention to just translating them and more attention to what they say. Even now in University, far too many of us students are more concerned with being able to translate the set books and other texts than with understanding and appreciating what they say. That this should be so is the fault not of us ourselves, but of the way the language is being taught.

And because the languages are considered so difficult, this is the main reason why questions come about whether or not proses should be done. If the majority of the students in the world who complain about doing proses were to have their motives examined, I am sure that it would be discovered that the reason why they are so against such translation is because they cannot do proses and cannot adapt themselves to 'thinking' in the language. By this I mean that the Greek or Latin word for anything is not at one's fingertips and one has to look in a dictionary for even the simplest thing. As has been stated by many a lecturer, the best dictionary is one's mind. And if that mind had been trained to remember vocabulary for prose-work and not just for translation-work, then proses would become easy overnight. And the same applies in the Grammar of the languages. There is not one of us who would not immediately recognise any part of the common verb καθίστημι in a translation passage, but if required to give the aorist optative of it in a prose, then out would come the grammar books immediately. One would not even try to remember it first. But in French or German, the various parts of the verbs are considered as nothing and they come immediately to one's memory. And why? Because we are taught to speak them and remember them and not just recognise them.

Let us remember one important thing! If all the students in the 2nd year pass their Part I exams, then they will not have to do another prose that will be marked for the rest of their lives, and will be qualified to even teach Latin and Greek prose-style and general prose-work to pupils in schools. What a laugh! This would make Demonthenes turn in his grave if he knew of it. And there is not a student in the Classics Honours 2nd year who would deny this! I can even see myself 'swotting' up the way verbs in -mi are conjugated before teaching it to my pupils the following morning. But if only proses and the classical languages were taught properly in schools, then there is nothing which is a better test of one's intelligence in doing Latin and Greek than to write either an essay or a prose in those languages. Surely this is a far better test of one's intelligence in doing Latin and Greek than to write either an essay or a prose in those languages. Surely this is a far better test of one's intelligence than to be able to give back in the space of 3 hours all the information given in lectures about Horace, and to know that ⏑⏑– ⏑⏑– ⏑⏑– ⏑ is an anapaestic dimeter catalectic and has the special name of Paroemiac.

All right! So Classics is not the study of only the practicalities of Latin and Greek; but rather is the study of the civilisation and culture of the Ancient World with reference in the original languages to the texts written in those times about those times. Fair enough! This does not alter the fact that in England one has to have an 'O'level pass in a language in order to be able to go to a university to study something like Science or Maths., and that very often the only language available in schools is either Latin and Greek. It also does not alter the fact that 'O' level in Latin has now deteriorated to being mostly an examination to see whether a pupil can decline a few nouns, conjugate a few verbs, understand a book of Caesar's Gallic War and answer a few questions on it. Nor does it alter the fact that Latin is universally hated by every pupil, apart from the comparative few who are able to do it, or those who had the luck to have a teacher who did not agree with the poem:-

Latin is a language as dead as dead can be,
First it killed the Romans and now it's killing me.

If it is decreed that Latin must be studied up to 'O' level by a terrific number of schoolchildren, then the least that we, who must carry on the Classical tradition, can do is to make the language interesting and worthwhile. And this means teaching it as a Modern language so that children consider it as a language and not as something out of date that must be declined and conjugated and not understood and spoken. Any person that knows Latin

and Greek is well-equipped for learning other languages; Classics also train one's mind for other, more difficult things. For many reasons that I will not go into now, it is of use for pupils to study the Classics. But not as it is being taught now! Latin and Greek are destroying themselves and not as slowly as some people might think. This situation must not be allowed to continue and it is up to us to stop it. By means of tape-recorders, language-labs, etc., the Classics can become alive again, and pupils can learn to enjoy the study of it; just as happens in French, German, etc. Translation will become easier, and there will not be the constant moans about the word order, and the word-mutations.

That even now University students have difficulty in understanding, and even more difficulty in translating into Latin and Greek is an intolerable situation. A hundred years ago, lectures were delivered in Latin, it was spoken regularly and essays were written in it. This can happen today, and should happen, unless we want Latin and Greek to just sink away into oblivion. And this is why we must continue to do Proses; the abolition of such work will be the beginning of such a decline.

Latin and Greek must live again and furthermore NOW!

ROBERT D. NUTT

CLASSICS IN SCHOOLS - A COMPARATIVE STUDY

England, France, and U.S.A.

In those halcyon days of the nineteenth century when Andrew Amos could stress the utility of the classics as enabling one 'to maintain with comfort and respectability the station of a gentleman' and when the classics were the only subject which men knew how to teach and for which there were teachers available, there was no fear that the study of the classics would decline. However, in the hundred or so years since this was the proud boast, classics has gradually fallen from its lofty perch to the status of a minority subject. In those days when the grammar school was the only school, grammar (latin grammar) was the subject to learn. Since our education system has altered so that those members of our population other than the 'élite' can now be educated, and 'secondarily' educated, classics has lost its grip. From various sectors disturbing questions are asked about the relevance of classics in the modern world, and fewer and fewer pupils are willing to take up the classics course. Since the Board Schools developed and turned into Modern Schools, providing a different curriculum from that of the established grammar and public schools, without the classics, the study is seen to have less and less value. The classicist is now the exception rather than the rule. Most of us can give examples in this country where the numbers taking Latin or Greek are dwindling, or where the classics have fallen from the curriculum entirely. However, before we sink into utter despair, let us examine the state of the classics today.

In France, as in England, the study of Latin follows the purely vocational schools set up to educate in the classics. Under the Jesuits the study of the Classics flourished and the teaching methods used set the basis of classical education in the future. The 'Ratio discendi et docendi' by R.P. Joseph de Jouvancy published in 1692, set forth the Latin course as:

(i) to read good authors
(ii) to do invention and imitation exercises
(iii) to translate into French or make a résumé of the text, put it back into Latin and compare the two
(iv) to analyse a discourse, then reconstruct the text which has been dissected
(v) to imitate an author by treating a similar subject and
(vi) to compose something each day (a letter, brief discourse, etc.).

However, Greek was not in a privileged position even in those days, for at Caen out of the 106 pupils in 1692, "52 ne le savent pas du tout, 12 très insuffisamment, 21 passablement." The Latin text was studied for thought, clarity, conciseness, civilisation, customs, historical references, style, rhetoric, poetry, Latinity and moral lesson, if there was one. It is interesting to note that they included Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Velleius Paterculus, Claudian, Valerius Maximus, Herodian and Theophrastus, and yet studied no Plato, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Lucretius, Seneca the philosopher, nor elegiac poetry. The textbooks were written entirely in Latin, in fact the first grammar with any French was not produced until the 18th century.

On the other hand the Port Royalists were revolutionary even for our day, their idea being that one should go from the known to the unknown, from French to Latin. Certain of them preferred the 'inductive method', learning Latin as a modern language, in the way of the new English Cambridge Classics Project, but Nicole condemned this method with the words "C'est obliger les enfants à apprendre cent fois ce qu'il leur eût suffi d'apprendre une fois." Translation was considered to be more important than composition; a translation was provided to the pupils which they learned by heart and then were shown the Latin and recognised in it what they had learned.

In 1761 the Jesuit colleges were taken over to become 'collèges royaux', in which the Jesuit methods were, on the whole, retained, but the French language used to a greater extent. Rollin, in his 'Traité des études' in the eighteenth century, proclaimed that French, and not Latin and Greek, should be the basis of education, and this gave rise to the whole question "What <u>good</u> is Latin" towards the creation of a secondary education with no Latin or Greek.

In 1802 these collèges were replaced by the lycées, in which Greek lost its importance, though Latin still held a privileged position in the schools. In 1808 the baccalauréat, the University entrance examination, was introduced, at first consisting of oral examinations on:

(i) explanation of authors (according to style, context, etc.)
(ii) history and geography and
(iii) philosophy (in Latin).

It was possible to pass without Greek, though this would bar the candidate from the faculty of medicine or public education.

From this year onwards the history of the baccalauréat can show how Latin and Greek gradually fell from importance. By 1830 the oral examination on philosophy was to be conducted in French; in 1852 the 'baccalauréat ès sciences' was introduced as entirely separate from the 'baccalauréat ès lettres'; in 1874 the 'baccalauréat ès lettres' was divided into two parts,

(i) Latin translation and composition and
(ii) philosophic composition in French and translation of a modern language;

in 1880 the Latin composition was replaced by one in French on a literary topic; 1890 saw the 'baccalauréat ès lettres' divide into the 'classique' (French composition and Latin translation) and the 'moderne' (French composition and prose in a modern language); in 1880 the Latin composition was replaced by one in French on a literary topic; 1890 saw the 'baccalauréat ès lettres' divide into the 'classique' (French composition and Latin translation) and the 'moderne' (French composition and prose in a modern language; in 1902 a clase approximation of the present-day system came into being, namely four divisions:

1. Latin and Greek
2. Latin and science
3. Science and modern languages
4. Latin and modern languages.

Since then a Modern languages without Latin, and a technical baccalauréat have been added.

When England established its colony on the American Continent, all the Classical traditions of England at that time went across the Atlantic as well, but there suffered a slightly different fate. After the Civil War there was a need for education, and in 1862 the Morrill Act set up colleges for agriculture and mechanics, but also liberal education which included the classical studies. This was the beginning of the loss of prominence of the classics in the United States. The curriculum of Harvard in 1636 consisted of Latin, Greek, grammar, rhetoric, Aristotelian logic, rudimentary mathematics, philosophy, ancient history, Hebrew and theology, the training for clergymen. Classics was essential for admission to college and for a bachelor's degree. Latin Grammar Schools were founded to prepare entrants, who would be trained to 'serve church and state'. Latin, Greek and Mathematics formed the core of the curriculum of all schools at this time. However, the number of students was small (20 at Harvard in 1680) and, according to European visitors, the standard low. Other subjects began to appear, in Philadelphia medicine was added in 1765 and law at Harvard in 1817, and science schools at Harvard and Yale by 1850. By the 1880's academies were set up for the sons of merchants and farmers who would not require University entrance, and hence the classics and divinity were dropped from the curriculum. In 1827 a law was passed in Massachussetts stating that all schools in populations in excess of four thousand should include Latin and Greek in their syllabus. After the Civil War subjects such as science, technology and practical affairs

became far more important. As physics, chemistry and biology came upon the scene they also fought for inclusion in the school curriculum. Also, the increase of the numbers receiving education meant that the emphasis was on the community and careers. In 1882, following the German principles of Lehrfreiheit and Lernfreiheit, Harvard allowed its students a wide choice of curriculum, introducing the 'major and minor' system. This elective system spelt doom for the classics. Latin in schools was still required for the B.A. degree at Harvard, but the dying need for classicists had led to the introduction of Classical Studies (non-linguistic) before 1900 in the States. In 1899 50% of those in school took Latin, but only 5% did any Greek; by 1915 only 1% took Greek, and Latin began to slide (39%). In wartime studies of a practical nature were more desirable, and between 1920 and 1930 all classical requirements were dropped except for certain Roman Catholic institutions.

What facilities are available today for the potential Classicist? In England he will have to enter a grammar school. To take the English education system as it was before the circular 10/65 which delineated the six ways of 'going comprehensive' and as it still is in certain places, it can be briefly described as primary school from the ages of five to eleven, at which point an examination is set, which will decide whether a child is suited for an academic or non-academic career. The child who is seen to have 'academic potential' then proceeds to the grammar school, where Latin is provided, usually on a compulsory basis for the first two years. After this selection is made, and either two streams taking Latin will result, or only the 'A' stream will take Latin. At this stage Greek is introduced. After four (or sometimes five) years, an external examination is taken (the G.C.E., which is an examination peculiar to England, no other country provides an external examination at this stage) after which pupils continue towards University entrance. By this stage the ninety originally taking Latin have dwindled, in the best cases, to as many as six.

In France the pattern is not dissimilar. Elementary school is attended by all from the ages of six to eleven. At this point a selection is made. Not by anything as crude as an examination, but by a two-year 'cycle d'orientation'. The pupils are assessed over this period by members of the public education service, academic and vocational guidance experts, the doctor from the School Health Service, and representatives of the parents. The idea is to assure 'the selection of the best through the advancement of all'. The five possibilities open to the child at this stage are vocational education (long or short), general education (long or short) or terminal education (completed in a shorter period.). Our budding Classicist would be enrolled in the long general education stream, provided in the lycées or collèges, in which he will be situated in the Classical section. The other sections are Modern and Technical. In his first year he will be placed in the 'Classique et Moderne', and in his second year separated from the modernists. In his third year he can take up Greek or a modern language. In the fifth year, choices appear; the courses offered are

A Latin and Greek
A1 Latin, Greek and Maths. (in which the most intellectually gifted are enrolled)
B Latin with a modern language
C Latin and mathematics
C1 Latin, maths. and natural science.

In the final year, before the baccalauréat, the specialisations offered are

(i) philosophy
(ii) experimental science
(iii) elementary mathematics,

all with Latin and Greek

It is interesting to note that at this stage the French classicist has not divorced himself entirely from maths. and science.

When we turn to the United States of America, we come to true democracy in action. Whereas England offers specialised intellectual fare, the USA provide varied intellectual fare; whereas the Americans take part in liberal and humane

studies, the English do not; whereas the English educational system seeks to produce well-honed intellects, the American emphasises socialisation, character-forming, and wit-sharpening. It is undemocratic to distinguish against anyone for his lack of ability in the USA. The later specialisation occurs the truer it is. The educational system, in its public form at any rate (by which they mean public and not private, which is what an Englishman understands by 'public schools') involves elementary and high school. According to which system the state has adopted this involves

A. six years elementary (from the age of six), followed by three years Junior High School, and three years Senior High School (35%)
B. eight years elementary school followed by four years high school (40%) or
C. six years elementary school followed by six years high school.

At the age of 18 the student is then entered into a college, and a very high proportion at that, especially when we consider that wealthy Americans can pay the fees for the college, which are not all of like merit. The budding American classicist can choose from the varied fare offered, assuming his school runs a Classics course, a six-year course in Latin and a three-year course in Greek. He will usually find that Greek is not offered outside the very 'best' schools. He will also need to steer clear of the many 'social' aspects of the course to keep his mind on the academic study of the Classics.

What does the Classics course entail? In England, although we are experimenting with various methods, the course usually runs:-

L A T I N
years 1 & 2:

ACCIDENCE

Nouns: five declensions with common irregular forms
Pronouns: personal, interrogative, demonstrative, relative
Adjectives and adverbs including interrogative and demonstrative with common irregular forms
Comparison of adjectives and adverbs with common irregular forms
Numerals: cardinals 1 - 1,000: ordinals 1st - 100th.
Verbs: four conjugations, active and passive all moods; deponents; esse, capere, ferre, velle, nolle, malle, fieri, ire. Principal parts of irregular verbs.
Prepositions: common prepositions

SYNTAX

Simple sentences: statement, command, prohibition with noli, questions, exhortations and wishes for the future (to be introduced with the subjunctive when learned). Subordinate clauses, relative clauses, adverbial clauses -purpose, result, time (with verb in the indicative); noun clauses (indirect statement, indirect command, indirect question).
Participles: uses, including ablative absolute.
Common case usages: subject, direct and indirect object, possession, place and time, common prepositional usages.

Years 3 & 4

ACCIDENCE

Most will have been learned, but revision must be constantly undertaken.

SYNTAX

Ablative absolute, sequence of tenses, direct and indirect command, infinitives, gerunds and gerundive attraction, supines, indirect statement, indirect questions, impersonal verbs, time, place, space, genitive of value, price, objective and partitive genitive, predicative dative and dative with intransitive verbs, ablative of origin, separation, association, price, respect, manner, comparison, quality, difference. Gerund and gerundive expressing obligation,

verbs of fearing, causal clauses, qui with subjunctive, quin and quominus, temporal clauses, conditional sentences, concessive clauses, comparative clauses and continuous oratio obliqua.

G R E E K

Year 1

Regular dedlension of nouns, adjectives and pronouns; regular and contracted verbs in full, -mi verbs, perhaps only in indicative, adverbs, prepositions, etc., a few very elementary syntactical constructions.

And so on for the three-year course to 'O' level, after which reading commences.

The French Classics syllabus, retained in the original language for aesthetic value, runs as follows:

L A T I N

Year 1 Epitome historiae Graecae - choix de textes faciles et gradués

Year 2 De viris illustribus urbis Romae - Phèdre, choix de fables - Cornelius Nepos, extraits

Year 3 Morceaux choisis de prose et de poésie - César: La guerre des Gaules - Cicéron: Récits anecdotiques et moraux - Ovide, extraits des Métamorphoses.

Year 4 Morceaux choisis de prose et de poésie - Salluste, La conjuration de Catilina, La guerre de Jugurtha - Virgile, Enéide I, II, III.

Year 5 Morceaux choisis de prose et de poésie - extraits notamment des oeuvres dramatiques - Cicéron: de signis, de suppliciis, les Catilinaires, de senectute - Tite-Live XXI-XXX - Virgile, Bucoliques, Enéide IV-VIII (le chant VI de l'Enéide initiera peut-être certains jeunes latinistes aux mystères de la passion amoureuse!) - Tacite: vie d'Agricola.

Year 6 Morceaux choisies de prose et de poésie, extraits notamment des oeuvres lyriques - Cicéron: pro Muréna, Pro Archia, pro Milone, de amicitia - Virgile: Georgiques, Enéide IX - XII - Horace, extraits - Tacite, Annales, Histoires - Sénèque, extraits.

Year 7 Lucrèce, extraits - Cicéron: extraits des traités de rhétorique et des ouvrages philosophiques - Tacite: dialogue des orateurs - choix des pages et pensées morales.

G R E E K

Year 1 Choix de textes faciles et gradués - Esope: choix de fables

Year 2 Morceaux choisies de prose et de poésie - Xénophon: Anabase - Lucien: dialogue des morts.

Year 3 Morceaux choisies de prose et de poésie - Homère, Odyssée - Euripide, Alceste, Iphigénie à Aulis - Xénophon: les Mémorables - Chefs d'oeuvre des orateurs attiques - Plutarque: extraits des vies des hommes illustres.

Year 4 Morceaux choisies de prose et de poésie - Homère, l'Iliade - Sophocle: une tragédie - Aristophane, extraits - Platon: apologue de Socrate, Criton - Démosthène.

Year 5 Eschyle, une tragédie - Thucydide, extraits - Platon, Phédon, extraits - Choix des pages et pensées morales.

This is, however, an unfair comparison. A typical English Classical scholar will leave school with 'A' level having read, in one particular instance,

Vergil Aeneid I (550 lines); Caesar: Bellum Gallicum (the parts of IV and V which deal with the invasion of Britain); Horace Odes I, Tacitus 'Germania', Homer Odyssey IX & X and Thucydides III (1-52). This may seem puny in comparison.

The American Classicist will study:

L A T I N

Year 1 Grammar and elementary reader

Year 2 Caesar

Year 3 Cicero 'Catiline orations' and Ovid 'Metamorphoses' (selections)

Year 4 Aeneid I - VI (III & V in translation)

Year 5 Catullus and Livy and Cicero 'Pro Caelio'

Year 6 Horace 'Odes' and Tacitus 'Annals' (selections)

G R E E K

Year 1 Grammar and Xenophon 'Anabasis'

Year 2 Plato 'Apology' and Herodotus (selections)

Year 3 Homer and Tragedians (perhaps).

This is the syllabus of a small boarding school in Massachussetts which is provided for the 'A' stream, the 'B' and 'C' stream do a similar programme at a slower rate. Behind the authors the Roman world is taught as follows:

Year 1 Introduction to and use of myth in literature; ancient religion, and its various antecedants; the spread of culture from the East.

Year 2 Information about camps, arms, geography of France and Britain, roads, military basis of Roman State, and life of Caesar. Then reading of the 'Gallic Wars'.

Year 3 Caesar leads naturally to Cicero. Introduction to soldier versus orator, civil law and military force, the failure of Roman government; Roman forum, cursus honorum, Age of Cicero, then read 'Catilinarian orations'.

Year 4 Classes become smaller. Cicero leads to Vergil (Having noted in Cicero the way he emphasises points, uses word order, patterns, superlatives, rhetorical questions, and arguments used - they should read it aloud). Essay work on various topics from the Roman world. At the age of 15/16 they are more ready to receive Vergil.

At this school it is said that boys at the age of 15 can read Latin as fast as boys of the same age in England, although the latter will have studied Latin longer. They favour one author for fairly long periods, with one style and vocabulary making a gain in speed and confidence. Prose composition is used in the early stages to help with the understanding of grammar. This leaves more time for cultural and literary aspects.

However, it is to be noted that the American school here described, in Groton, Mass, is privileged in its quality of students and strength of Classical tradition. In American private schools economics is important and rich men's sons gain admittance on the payment of fees. The best teachers will go where they find the best salaries, which helps Groton provide this course. Classical courses are very small and bad apart from about 20 schools in the North-Eastern States, and of these twenty, half have the requirement of two years Greek or Latin for graduation, and these not the better half. None requires more than two years.

In many English schools the curricula are not as grammar-based as the syllabus would tend to show. We read synthetic Latin for the first two years of the course, and in the third year are introduced to the delights of Caesar. However, after this we tend to lapse into general snippets from various authors with no set pattern, either in author or subject-matter. When 'O' level arrives, set books, inevitably Vergil and Caesar, are set, although it is possible to pass 'O'level without reading an author continuously at all. 'A' level entails, in the wors case, two set books for Latin and two for Greek, and if the course is mis-managed, the whole sixth form will be wasted on these two books alone. Mercifully, changes are being made, and a wider syllabus introduced in Advanced level, which comprises four set books, authors to be read for unseens, and a general paper about topics from the Ancient World. The aim of the classics teacher should be to give to his pupils a clear picture of the Ancient World, its literature and its lessons, and the wider and more deeply the pupil reads the easier it will be to achieve this aim. The French syllabus includes authors specifically for this purpose, and although it is impossible to read all the authors mentioned for each year, it is possible to cover the majority, which should give a balanced view of the ancients. Similarly the American system will give a picture of the Roman State, and some literature in depth. All three have to lay a sound basis for grammar, and the earlier classes in the French lycée are known as the 'classes de grammaire'. The differences appear in the selection of authors read, and the amount of background given. However, it has to be pointed out that although the 'official' syllabus may show a bias in one particular direction, the individual teacher can adapt the material to his own particular likes and dislikes, and it would be possible for a Frenchman to teach grammar to the exclusion of all else, or even for an Englishman to teach some literature.

It is now the time to try to find out how successful these various courses are for attracting recruits to the Classics. In England the Grammar or Public School entrant will find a Latin course available and, in some cases, Greek. Should he begin it in the first year, the chances are that out of ninety entrants, forty or so will complete the course to Ordinary Level. Possibly five to ten will begin Greek. However, after Ordinary level, the Classics master can deem himself lucky if four Classicists stay on, and possibly the same number in addition for Latin only. Taking the figures for 'O' and 'A' levels taken in 1964, the numbers entering (<u>not</u> passing) the examinations are as follows (comparisons being made with other languages).

1964 Ordinary and Advanced level G.C.E. entrants

Ordinary level		Advanced level	
Latin	53,514	Latin	7,578
Greek	2,670	Greek	1,408
French	169,435	French	21,772
German	31,962	German	6,049
Italian	2,860	Italian	505
Spanish	9,171	Spanish	1,839
Russian	2,021	Russian	426
Totals (all subjects)	2,195,162		317,648

The totals given are not of pupils entering the examination but of examinations entered for. If we assume 5 passes as average at Ordinary level, this would give approximately 450,000 entrants at 'O' level and if 2 advanced levels are taken as the average, 160,000 at 'A' level. This gives, very approximately indeed, a figure of 12% of 'O' level candidates taking Latin, and ½% taking Greek. At advanced level 5% taking Latin and ·9% taking Greek. These figures do not vary greatly from year to year, and so it can be seen that half those taking Greek stay the course, whereas 1/8 continue with Latin. It is very difficult to interpret these figures, although in an illustrative

rather than definitive role, they can serve to show that Latin still retains its position as the second language at both levels, but Greek is only marginally less popular that Italian, and more popular than Russian at Ordinary level, and catches Spanish at 'A' level, leaving Italian and Russian far behind.

In the United States, figures available show that Greek has almost entirely disappeared from schools, in fact only 60 of all public schools offer any Greek. If private and Roman Catholic schools are included, the figures given show that out of 15,000,000 pupils, only 5,000 take any Greek at all. 600,000, on the other hand, take Latin, a figure of 5%. It should be pointed out that twice as many do French and Spanish, though only half as many take German or Russian. This serves to illustrate the fact that foreign languages in general do not figure highly in the syllabuses of the American schools, but Latin holds the position of third most important foreign language learned, but Greek, unfortunately, has almost died the death.

In France Classics are to be found in the Lycées and collèges providing long general education to the baccalauréat. The figures are slightly more comparable with the English grammar/public schools than with the American system. However, the numbers given for those in the lycées and collèges in the classic and modern sections are as follows:

	Classic	Modern	Technical
Year 2 of secondary education -	92,800	270,565	
Years 3 & 4	127,468	479,917	
In the lycées who continue beyond:			
Years 5 & 6	84,295	178,324	118,163

Year 7: Philosophy 35,734; Maths. 28,392; Science 25,094;
Maths. & tech. 5,083; Tech. & econ. 743; Tech. 10,496

Roughly, 28% are in the Classical section after the end of the Premier Cycle, the fourth year. This means that 28% are taking Latin, although nowhere near that number will be taking Greek. In the Deuxième Cycle it is encouraging to see the high numbers taking Philosophy, though some of those taking maths. and experimental sciences are also taking Latin.

From these rough comparisons, it would seem that France maintains the highest Classical tradition of the three countries. It would appear that in France the Classics still have much prestige, which is rapidly vanishing from the Classics in England, and which vanished long ago in the United States. The French still make much of the 'mental gymnastic' element of the Classics, which has lost favour elsewhere on the strength of the psychological evidence that transfer of training is very limited. Very recently, however, this advertisement for Classics text-books appeared in France:

$$\begin{array}{r} D\ O\ N\ A\ L\ D \\ \underline{+\ G\ E\ R\ A\ L\ D} \\ R\ O\ B\ E\ R\ T \end{array} \qquad D = 5$$

Trouvez la valeur numérique de chaque lettre vérifiant cette addition. Notez les démarches que vous faites. Ce problème de Bartlett illustre la necessité d'une stratégie, c'est-à-dire, d'une organisation des démarches de la pensée.
Une version latine, comme une problème mathématique, offre à l'élève la possibilité d'apprendre à penser, à condition que dans l'apprentissage, on tienne compte du processus d'abstraction de la formation des concepts. La méthode active en latin permet à 80% des élèves qui sortent du primaires de comprendre de faire du latin avec profit.

However, there have been reductions in the classics in France, and the reasons put forward are (i) the excessive philological emphasis (ii) the con-

ception of Latin as a mental exercise and (iii) the conception of Latin as a preparation for modern languages. This seems to be a matter of conflict among French Classicists, for against Schilling, Cuénat says that the idea of a 'mental-gymnastic' cannot be ruled out; there is joy to be had in triumphing over the complexity of a ciceronian period! The course should, however, concentrate more on the civilisation,and this is the feeling of classicists in all three countries. The background is very important, says Cuénat: "faire sentir la permanence des préoccupations humaines à travers l'éloignement des siècles; c'est là le sense même des humanités.'

For the philosophy section of the baccalauréat Latin is no longer necessary for the successful candidate. How far the abolition of the need for Latin for examinations or University entrance will serve to annihilate the study remains to be seen. Although the eager Latinists begin with ideas of forming 'esprit', and benefitting from the historical and cultural aspects of the Classics course; and are also persuaded by their parents who have also studied the Classics, or consider that the classical sections have the higher standard of scholarship, or for the ease of transfer from the classical to the modern section, though not vice versa, or for social climbing (sic), only the most gifted can continue with the course as the archaic methods, as opposed to the 'audio-visual' methods of the modern section, tend to cause the numbers to dwindle. The results at the baccalauréat are disappointing. It is acceptable that none of the present students could understand the baccalauréat of 1925, but of those taking the present examination, only a quarter can cope, the majority advancing little beyond the standard of two years before the examination. By great 'indulgence' this quarter can obtain half-marks for their translation, although there are usually twenty out of 120 who merit no marks at all. After three or four years they could not translate the simplest Latin. However, English 'O' level candidates would be hard put to remember a single Latin word. The standard of Greek can be seen from the fact that of 101,799 candidates at baccalauréat in one year, 37,434 took Latin but only 7,408 Greek. This represents a 70% decrease on the numbers who began in the Classical sections. This brings about the idea, prevalent in the United States since 1900 and practised in many English schools, especially at C.S.E.-level, of Classical Studies, the ancient world without the Latin.

However, in the United States the picture is far worse. The figures have been quoted showing the rarity of Latin and Greek in school syllabuses, and this problem becomes worse as this also moans there are very few Classics teachers. The best ones are those from England or who have run out of money on their way to a Ph.D. but these rarely stay for more than two years. Advertised posts have applicants, but most of them are completely unqualified. Groton is, in fact, one of the few schools where a full Classics course is in operation. Classics consists mostly of a crash course for Advanced Placement, which, if passed, gives credits to a first degree course. Most pupils finish their study after two years, and as the general pattern for Latin is, in years one to four respectively, grammar, Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, it is clear that the majority only learn grammar and read some Caesar, a not too joyful state of affairs. In fact there is so little Classics in the United States, that we are considering the swing away from Classics as almost completed, and not on the way as in England and France.

The situation in England is also rapidly deteriorating. Many grammar schools are excluding Greek from the curriculum; many grammar schools are entering on comprehensive schemes which almost certainly do not include Classics in the curriculum, or on an exceptionally uncertain basis. A sixth form with four classicists is a strong Classical sixth form. We acknowledge that the methods need updating to increase the numbers willing to take

on the subject, and the Cambridge Classics Project (inductive method) and the oral and direct methods are all being tried in this country. The classicist is finding it harder and harder to justify the position of Latin, let alone Greek, in the school curriculum. Posts available for Classics teachers are few and far between. It seems, with the comprehensive system taking over, and the Classics dying, we are moving closer and closer to the American system of education. It would seem that where there is an educational system which preserves an élite (as the present French system, and the English grammar or public schools) Classics can survive as there are those with the intellect to manage the studies, but other trends may lead us away from the Classics.

The warning comes from R. Lattimore: "Their (USA) interest has been more in social studies and, lately, science. Greek has almost entirely vanished from secondary schools, and Latin has vanished from some, while the amount available has been reduced in almost all. The student who wants to be a classicist can still be one, if he goes to the right college, but he will be doing work at eighteen which, forty or fifty years ago, was being done by schoolchildren of fourteen. The teachers at University level have had to streamline their methods as best they can. Britain is still far from such a situation, but it might serve as a warning of possible things to come."

R. J. ABBOTT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

England

'The Teaching of Classics'	I.A.A.M
'Classical Education in Britain 1500 - 1900'	M. L. Clarke
'Classics in the Secondary Modern School'	J.A.C.T. pamphlet
Statistics of Dept. of Education & Science 1964.	

U.S.A.

'Classics in the U.S.A.'	J.A.C.T. pamphlet
'On teaching the Classics in Groton'	Macdonald (Didaskalos II 1)
'Classics in Groton and elsewhere'	Rose (Latin Teaching xxxii 3)
'World survey of Education'	UNESCO

France

'La situation des langues classiques dans l'enseignement français'	Schilling (Didaskalos I 1)
'Education in France'	UNESCO pamphlet
'Encyclopédie de l'éducation en France'	Institut pédagogique National
'Cahiers pédagogiques' 58 (Jan. 1966)	
'Informations statistiques' 63-64 (Oct-Nov. 1964)	