

No. 12

June 1969

P E G A S U S

University of Exeter Classical Society Magazine

Editor: Robert D. Nutt
(Assisted by Rosemary Bancroft)

CONTENTS

	page
1. Jim Fitton 1933 - 1969	David Harvey 2
2. "Whether 'Tis Nobler "	Celia James 10
3. Professor Key and Doctor Wagner	John Glucker 21
4. Some Allusions in Greek and Roman Literature to the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, D.C., and its Director.	David Harvey 42
5. Hylas and Heracles	John Cowell 44
6. Seneca Struts and Frets	Rosemary Bancroft 49
7. The Modern Greek Language Problem	Robert D. Nutt 54
8. Book Review	Martin Coppen 57

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

1900

JIM FITTON

1933 - 1969

I have been asked by Pegasus to write an appreciation of my late friend Jim Fitton. I am honoured by the invitation; but I wish there were no cause for it.

Jim was not a conventional person, and a conventional obituary would be out of place. Those who knew him need no reminding of what he was like; those who did not will not be interested. I am therefore attempting the daunting task of trying to sketch for future generations what manner of man he was; for the day will come when people will want to know, and memories will have faded. This is a high ambition, and I shall fail. But I will do what I can.

There are two kinds of appreciation, the formal and the informal. Both can be disastrous. The former encourages the de mortuis nil nisi bonum approach, which all too often produces de bonis nil nisi mortuum. Besides, it is a dishonest maxim, and I prefer the truth. But in the case of Jim the two coincide: to search for a harsh word against him is to search in vain. The informal approach, on the other hand, tends to slip into sentimentality, or at least into Hilda Tabletry. The risk must be taken.

What I have done is to begin with a biography - and I must thank Mrs. Molly Fitton and Mr. John Griffith for their help in providing and verifying information for this section - and then to attempt a series of portraits: a kind of verbal photograph album. The order is not chronological, perhaps not even logical. But that is how memories come, and I hope that by jumbling the snapshots I may give some impression of the many-sidedness of Jim's nature.

James William Fitton was born in Aldridge, Staffordshire, on April 16th, 1933. He was educated at Queen Mary's Grammar School, Walsall (where, I am told, he often exchanged glances with another pupil, Molly Rogers), and at Jesus College, Oxford. He had, in fact, sat for an Open Scholarship in Classics at Oriel, but was rejected on the grounds of a Greek unseen. As is the custom, his papers were handed to a second college, Jesus, for consideration; and it was precisely the same paper that secured him his scholarship. "The man who wrote that unseen must be either an idiot or a genius", the examiner said; "we'll risk it". The risk was, of course, amply justified.

Jim was a Scholar at Jesus from 1950 to 1954. In "Mods", the linguistic and literary examination which forms the first part of the Oxford Classics course, he achieved a first class degree in 1952; in "Greats", the historical and philosophical examination, a second class in 1954, to the disappointment of his tutors, who had confidently predicted another first. Six years later, someone else did just the same - and I remember our reciprocal sheepishness as we confessed to each other. In his life's work, Jim brought together all these aspects of the ancient world - and particularly the Greek world - language, literature, history and philosophy, and much else besides; but more of that later. From 1954 to 1956 he was a research student, working for the degree of B.Phil. in Greek and Latin language by thesis and examination. That is quite common nowadays, but Jim was the very first person to attempt it, although the course had been on the statutes for some years. His thesis was on The Antecedents of Menander, and his supervisor was E.R. Dodds, then Regius

Professor of Greek, and (I should add for the sake of non-classicists) one of the finest living British Hellenists. The result was a triumph.

From 1956 to 1958 Jim went through his compulsory National Service, and shortly after he was, as they say, let out, he married. His bride was Molly Rogers, whom he had met again years after those first glances, and the marriage took place in Aldridge, the small town where they were both born. Jim returned to Oxford for the academic year 1958-9 as a tutor at Magdalen and St. Catherine's Colleges, and it was in Oxford that their first child, Amanda, was born in August 1959. From 1959 to 1961 Jim taught at Bedford College, London, and in January 1961 their second daughter, Belinda, was born. Friends began to speculate whether they intended to work through the whole alphabet.

Belinda was born on the same day that Jim was appointed to a position in the Classics department of the University of Exeter. At first it puzzled me that a scholar of Jim's calibre, with three years' teaching experience, and with a major article in a leading journal to his credit, should have been appointed to an assistant lectureship; but then I remembered that those were the days when an article cooked up by a leading Exeter administrator and published in the Guardian proudly divulged that ours was the most cheaply-run University in the country. Jim and Molly bought a lovely old cottage in the village of Sowton - the walks down the lane to Sowton are amongst the most pleasant of my memories of my first year at Exeter - and in 1962 Jim was made full lecturer. In February 1963 their youngest child, Jonathan, was born at Crediton. (I remember visiting the nursing-home, no doubt looking somewhat bedraggled. "Visiting hours are strictly over now", said the nurse, "but after all, since you're the father ...")

In 1964, finding that the advantages of the seclusion of a Devon village were outweighed by the disadvantages, they moved to 59 Marlborough Road, a spacious and elegant early Victorian house. In mid-February 1969, Jim heard that he had been appointed to an international research Fellowship at the Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington D.C. "A fine compliment to Exeter", an American friend wrote to me. Within two weeks Jim was dead.

Jim died on February 24th, 1969. The first reaction of everyone who knew him was of stunned incredulity. The routine business of changing timetables took one's mind off what had happened. And then incredulity gave place to grief. Jim's pupils were downcast and silent, some on the point of tears. Then the news spread outside Exeter. So strong was his personality that even those who had met him only once were shaken: "I was horrified to hear the news", wrote one such person, expressing concern for the family as well. We are all concerned for Molly and the children; time heals, but it heals slowly.

During Jim's first year at Exeter he shared a small teaching room with Ann Ridgwell, and during his second year with myself. He was, in fact, working in a space half the size of that laid down as the legal minimum for typists. Speaking from the experience of four years' work in such conditions, there can be no doubt that the infuriating inconveniences and frustrations that they entailed were made tolerable only by my good luck in having congenial companions; Jim had strong feelings on the subject too. One of our major problems was how I could avoid Jim's feet, which projected some way under my desk (we sat facing each other) and which were not particularly petite.

"Jim Fitton", wrote a friend at the time, "sounds as though he's just stepped out of a novel by Kingsley Amis. If you put him back into it I suppose you could have the room to yourself." But there were plenty of compensations. There was, for example, the day that Jim set the plastic waste-paper basket on fire with a cigarette stub and we both tried to extinguish the blaze with the tea-pot; but for our heroic efforts the Queen's Building might not be standing today. Then there was his conversation - but I will come to that in a moment. And he was always doing little odd jobs - introducing me to my wife, for example.

Jim was an enormous man, physically. Not plump, but heavily built, tall - well over six foot - and as strong as a navvy. He lifted wardrobes the way other people lift matchboxes. His way of walking, like his way of speaking, was slow and deliberate; "I would have taken him for a farmer rather than an academic" is a comment I have often heard. Big Jim, we called him; and to see his huge figure lumbering down the corridor in conversation with Professor Clayton was to realize what a marvellous double act the comic stage had lost. He had the physique of a bully - but I have never known anyone more gentle. Children loved him. His voice was never raised in anger. Like everything about Jim, that voice was unusual. Not that it was odd, but it had an indefinable character. "Husky, with a faint trace of a lisp", someone has suggested; but the truth is that our language is too imprecise to describe it. No one who has heard it will forget it.

The gentle voice and the gentle manner were true signs of the kindest of hearts. Jim would take the utmost pains over the weakest of students - and the best as well. Innumerable acts of kindness spring to mind, but they were performed so quietly and unostentatiously that hardly anyone other than those whom he helped knew of them. I can only speak of my own experience. During many months of illness, Jim was one of my few regular visitors, and his visits were more effective than any medicine. Not long ago he drove me to Oxford and back - that alone is remarkable enough, as the visit was far more to my advantage than his - and I had unexpected difficulty in finding lodgings for the night. Instead of leaving me to search, as most people would have done, Jim drove me from door to door until I found a spare room. Everyone must have such memories - just as often an accumulation of friendly acts, small in themselves, but none the less an impressive testimony to his unfailing consideration and kindness.

Jim's father was Branch Manager of a Co-op in the Walsall area; so I suppose his political views were to some extent inherited. But to a much greater extent it was his sympathy for the weak and the underdog, and his hatred of stuffiness and the "fuddy-duddies", which led him naturally to left wing views. In the University of Exeter, he counted among the "stuffed shirts" and "fuddy-duddies" such people as - well, let's have a lacuna here: de semimortuis nil nisi bonum. Exeter, he would say, was the first place in which he had lived in which you actually had to apologize for being a socialist.

"His keen eye sees the bent kings
Ploughing the rough furrows
And the lost peoples walking erect
From ancestral burrows",

he wrote in one of his earlier poems. It is not hard to guess who the visionary is.

Yes, his poems. Perhaps it will come as a surprise to many people to learn that he was a poet. That was one of the things about Jim; he kept whole areas of himself hidden from the world. The real Jim - but there was no

one real Jim: like all of us, he was a continuous succession of shifting personae across a firm screen of abiding characteristics; and who am I to sort them out? The "moon-faced clown" (another phrase from his poems) were many disguises; but were they all disguises? Jim the ordinary chap who had no patience with scholarship was certainly a smoke-screen. Jim the giver of wild parties, Jim the anima naturaliter Aristophanica, Jim the shrewd judge of character - these were just three of the best-known facets of his nature. But some obvious aspects of Jim hid other, less obvious aspects. Under Jim the ingenious punster lay a deep lode of melancholy. Under Jim the absent-minded ("Sorry I'm late") lay a methodical scholar who always kept his work in faultlessly systematic order. Underneath Jim the lover of old cars - and unlike so many ostentatious veterans, that magnificent great Ford V8 really was extraordinarily comfortable to ride in; large, deceptively slow, and easy going, it was an extension of its owner's personality if ever anything was - lay Jim the scholar; indeed, one might say that under that great Ford V8 itself lay, quite literally, Jim the scholar; for as he tinkered with it he would be ruminating on the most knotty problems of Greek lyric. And so, underneath or within all these personae lay Jim the poet. I have not read any of his poems for a long time, and I am no judge of their quality; but lines have stuck in my head for six years, which is certainly some sort of test. There are a great number, some so personal that now is not the time to go through them. They vary in quality. "Sammy" (Pegasus III.13) reads as though Vachel Lindsay had written it to get a phrase of e.e. cummings out of his head; but perhaps the pastiche is intentional, and it is certainly entertaining. "Arethusa, nymph and fountain", on the other hand, is most impressive. Jim asked me to set it to music; but the music is there already in the words. Written, scrapped, re-written, polished, they must be sifted and printed one day. One will appear in a forthcoming issue of Stand. Plans are in the air for the publication of an illustrated book of children's verses.

It was the farewell party for third-year students, and one student had said hardly a word the whole afternoon. He had never met Mrs. Fitton before. After a lengthy pause he remarked to me: "Nice bird, Mrs. Fitton"; and with those memorable words he left the University of Exeter. There was more in what he said than he meant. Jim chose his wife well, he was a devoted father, and his family life was a very happy one. "We had some marvellous years together", said Molly, "and now I shall start a new life". I know that I speak for all readers of Pegasus, and many others besides, in wishing her well in her new life, and in saying that we are delighted that she has decided to stay with us in Exeter. Is it too facile to call it a marriage of opposites? Molly's temperament is very different from Jim's, but there was a fundamental core of shared values, and like so many "marriages of opposites", it worked; the children were brought up in an atmosphere of joy, love and care - which include squeaking and shrieking and toys and cats and chaos now and then, thank heaven. Several generations of students have lodged with the Fittons; they know better than anyone what a happy household it was - and still is - and how good Molly and Jim were to them all.

Jim could talk about anything. Sometimes it would be religion; sometimes it would be old cars; sometimes it would be psychology; sometimes - though not often - it would be gossip; sometimes it would be anthropology. The list is random and incomplete. Jim was fascinated by religion; he was not a Christian, but deeply interested in everything that religions of all times and places have meant to man. Anthropology would be seen from a variety of

angles (he was no follower of the Jackson Knight light). And all this would not be amateurish fumbling, but informed and penetrating comment. After his death, several members of the common room were upset - "marvellous fellow, Jim Fitton", some of them said, "but which department was he in?" Jim could hardly have wished for a higher compliment to the range of his interests - and an unintentional one at that. Jim had a way of talking at some length until sometimes his listener would wonder what it was all about, and almost lose interest, until suddenly there was a swerve, an illumination, and all fell into place. The slow and deliberate manner of speech to which I have alluded concealed exact and sharp-edged thought. I can think of no one else who could be called "quietly outspoken".

Another side to Jim's conversation was his firm grasp of practical matters, useful pieces of information that somehow one had never come across before. For example, on long journies, he would look out for transport cafés with plenty of lorries parked outside. He knew that lorry-drivers would not choose a poor place, and that what they wanted was plenty of food at reasonable prices, served pleasantly. It is obvious, once stated; yet not many of us would have thought of it.

But it was, above all, his sense of humour that endeared him to colleagues and pupils alike. Sometimes it would creep into serious discourse, sometimes it would keep going in a seemingly endless give-and-take of hilarity, where parodies of Sophocles would get jumbled with old music-hall jokes. Sometimes I felt relieved that we had no custard pies in the house. In 1962 we wrote a Christmas pantomime together. We enjoyed doing it, but unfortunately it developed into a tradition and we got more and more stuck for plots each time. Jim's contributions in conversation were superb; the trouble was that he characteristically withdrew some of the best lines for fear of hurting some individual. I would like to call much of Jim's sense of fun "impish"; but have you ever seen an imp over six foot high?

The Classical Quarterly is to publish Jim's last article. The evidence is from Aristoxenus, the fragments of Aristotle, etc. etc. The title is from a music-hall joke. The juxtaposition is typical.

Only a student can say what Jim was like as a tutor. But I feel sure that anyone who was taught by him remembers him as thoughtful and stimulating. My own impression is that he commanded universal affection and admiration. Certainly one former pupil has told me that he remembers him above all for his readiness to help at any time with problems either academic or personal; he would take a real interest in them, regardless of his own time. I have had dozens of letters from former pupils, ending more or less as follows: "Please give my best wishes to the department, and especially to the Fittons". Let his pupils speak for themselves; I shall be very surprised if the next issue of Pegasus is not heavily laden with letters from those who have written to add their voices to mine. "Teaching by Redbrick staff", a recent survey concluded, "is characterless, and because of that unstimulating" (reported in the Guardian, March 22nd, 1969). Jim was a living disproof of such a foolish generalization.

Those who took Greek Lyric Poetry as their Special Subject, and his research pupils, were obviously the students closest to him. Thinking of those concerned, it is clear that Jim was no indoctrinator, no overwhelming master; he allowed each individual to develop in his own way. A review of a work by a pupil of the retiring Camden Professor ended: "The book is written throughout in Professor Syme's imitable style". Nothing of the sort

could ever be said of what Jim's pupils wrote. Yet they have all inherited one thing from him: a genuine interest and a genuine enthusiasm for their subjects. It is easier to indoctrinate than to inspire.

Jim published only two articles during his lifetime; another will appear shortly. For bibliographical purposes, the details are:

1. "The Suppliant Women and the Herakleidai of Euripides", Hermes lxxxviii (1961), 430-61.
2. "Barrett's 'Hippolytos' - a review", Pegasus viii (1967), 17-43.
3. "That was no lady, that was ...", Classical Quarterly, forthcoming. (This is on the sex-life of Socrates, in case you are wondering.)

The argument developed in the first article may or may not be right, but it is a challenging work, full of fascinating detail, which has been unjustly neglected. The review of Barrett has been declared superior to that by Professor Lloyd-Jones which appeared in the Journal of Hellenic Studies. It took him two years to write.

Jim was a fine scholar, gifted and sensitive, with a sharp eye for detail, and a ranging eye for the general. It even came out jokingly. On hearing "Homo sum; nil femininum a me alienum puto", he commented: "I'll remember that one - only shouldn't it be femineum? Isn't femininum generally the grammatical gender?" All this with that look in his eyes that was never the cliché-writer's twinkle, but somewhere between a twinkle and a glint. He was right, of course. Similarly, a flippant example, hitherto unpublished, will illustrate his skill as a textual critic: "K.R. Popper, 'The Open Society and its Enemies. Vol. I: The Swell of Plato'. A neat and obvious emendation.

As far as prose-style goes, one only has to re-read the review of Barrett to realise how well Jim wrote. He knew when to be down-to-earth, and when to use the telling phrase: the poet's feeling for language, in fact. One of his highest terms of praise was "a nice punchy style", and it is just the word for his article, a pungent distillation of discursive thought. If Jim thought something ludicrous, fatuous or silly, he would say so, though scholars usually prefer the oblique or the Housmanic form of condemnation. He even tried to bring that superbly expressive word "soppy" down from the nursery into academic discourse.

At this point, I would like to take a wider view of Jim's work - to assess the quality of his scholarship, to give some idea of its character and vitality, its fusion of fearless but firmly-based speculation, leading to far-reaching conclusions, with an impressive grasp of the traditional literary and linguistic minutiae of our discipline. But I am not qualified to do so. His research will eventually be published (some provisional details are mentioned towards the end of this article), so it will be far better for the reader to turn to what Jim wrote, and judge for himself. Instead, then, I will touch on one aspect of his scholarship only, taking as my text a remark once made about Jim by a well-known classicist: "You have a splendidly open eye for what matters beyond the tram-lines of modern 'don't-be-irrelevant' approaches to antiquity".

Here is Jim, way beyond the tram-lines and out into some very interesting country (tram-lines are not noted for the fascination of their routes). It is his scheme of work on the personality of Socrates, one of four topics on which he hoped to work in Washington.

1. (a) The sources. The problem of anecdotal tradition. Aristophanes. Higher scepticism (Chroust) as a response.
(b) The major clash between laudatory accounts and Aristoxenos. The reconciliation of the evidence as an alternative to rejecting inconvenient versions.
(c) The assumptions of psychological probability in modern accounts. The failure to see that there is something to be explained in Socrates' strange behaviour.
2. The oddity of Socrates.
 - (a) Appearance and physique.
 - (b) Auditory hallucinations.
 - (c) Trance-states.
 - (d) Unusual imperturbability. Ineptness.
 - (e) Search for what words mean. Literalism.
3. Special problems.
 - (a) Parents and upbringing. Attachment to the mother. Difficult childhood.
 - (b) Sculpture.
 - (c) Social position - his alleged poverty.
 - (d) Mystical initiation (Charites, Corybantes).
 - (e) Politics: authoritarian opinions.
4. A psychological estimate: the meaning of melancholikos and stasimos.
 - (a) Schizophrenic tendencies?
 - (b) Autistic tendencies. Modern studies of autistic children.
5. Personality and philosophy. The differentiation of Socrates from the schizoid Plato. (Basic ideas: (a) techne (b) logos (c) the quest for sameness. Style of utterance: (a) question and answer. (b) mythical exposition. The 'blessings of madness'. erōs. ideai.) An attempt will be made to show that the philosophical contribution of Socrates can only be understood after a psychological study".

This fresh and exciting project was never realised, of course. Perhaps its publication will stimulate someone else to work along the same lines. But isn't it splendid to see Jim bashing down traditional and unnecessary walls between disciplines and preparing to throw light on to an old problem from a new angle?

What Jim published during his life-time is only the tip of the ice-berg. Why did he publish so little? There are all sorts of reasons. It took him years to think over his ideas, to collect the primary sources, and to evaluate the secondary; the notes would accumulate, the files would swell. He was both diffident about his abilities and a fierce critic of his own work. The inadequacy of the Exeter library is a notorious scandal. He spent hours on his pupils' work rather than on his own. He was subject to fits of black despair, in which he would declare that hardly anyone at Exeter had the least interest in what he was working on. (He was probably right) The American Fellowship would have been a godsend. "At last", he said to me, "I'll be able to get out all my little old scribbles and fit them together". Then he added, characteristically: "Of course, perhaps they will turn out to be just little old scribbles that won't fit. Then I'd know".

Jim's unpublished work, as I have already hinted, was considerable, and in perfect order. It was generally agreed that we should publish as much of it as possible; but the credit for suggesting that it should appear in book form, rather than as a series of articles, goes to John Glucker. I am delighted that Mr. John Griffith, who was Jim's tutor, has agreed to be editor. "I would gladly do anything in my power to help in the preservation of what I am sure includes much that should not be allowed to vanish", he has written, with characteristic generosity. Plans at this stage are naturally fluid - we do not even know yet whether we have one volume or two on our hands - and the choice of publisher has still to be made. It is no easy task to go through twelve years' research, but as things stand we believe that we can certainly publish (in addition to reprinting the three articles listed above) at least a lecture on Greek Dance, on which John Cowell is working, a brief article on Euripides' Aeolus, on which Celia James will be working, a longer article on Aeschylus and Sicily, which should keep me occupied for some time, an article on the pyrrhic dance, another on the ritual of hair-clipping, and possibly certain portions of Jim's thesis. John Cowell recently made the important discovery that a number of files on the Hippolytus, which had been taken as preliminary notes towards the Pegasus review, in fact contain a very large quantity of later work on the play. There is much that is not yet known: what was the extensive collection of notes on ritual intended to lead to? It looks as if they cannot be brought into publishable shape, and will have to be filed for reference. Will it be possible to reconstruct Jim's views on lyric metre, which I understand were revolutionary, and to which he devoted so much of his life? I hope so, but fear not. It will be slow work, and in places difficult; but Jim has got a distinguished and enthusiastic editor, and a conscientious group of sub-editors.

No one can accuse me of breaking my promises. I said that this appreciation would be inadequate, and so it is. If anyone would like to remedy any of its deficiencies, I am sure that the editors of Pegasus would be glad to publish their contributions. I see, for example, that I have not even mentioned his rose-red jacket, twice as old as time. There must be many more such omissions.

That thing about "Whom the gods love" is of course an insult to a fuddy-duddy, not an epitaph on a young man. Even if it were an epitaph, it would be a singularly inept one for this senseless mors acerba. There is little consolation, except that his life was happy and his death neither protracted nor painful. We must do what we can: his papers must be published, his family cared for. But there will never be another Jim. Perhaps the most fitting epitaph is the last two lines of the Hippolytus, adopting Jim's own emendation:

τῶν γὰρ μεγάλων ἄξια πένθη
φημαῖ μᾶλλον κατέχουσιν.

"Great characters get their due mourning; it is their reputations that have the greater hold".

DAVID HARVEY

"WHETHER 'TIS NOBLER "

Some thoughts on the fate of Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Heracles, with special reference to the question of suicide.

The plots of Sophocles' Ajax and Euripides' Heracles Furens have several points in common. They both concern a hero, renowned for his physical prowess, who is driven mad by a god and in his madness commits acts of violence which place him in an intolerable position on regaining his sanity. He contemplates suicide; his friends attempt to dissuade him. But the ways in which Sophocles and Euripides tackle this situation are radically and significantly different.

Sophocles starts with his hero already degraded by madness and his play concerns Ajax' and others' reaction to the ruin of his honour as a hero, and his reinstatement after his death. The Athenians who watched the play worshipped him as a hero. There is a feeling of inevitability about Ajax' progress towards death, with his character as Sophocles portrays it; the idea of Ajax deciding to live seems in the context of this play dramatically intolerable; the only 'surprise' is the attitude of Odysseus, for which we are carefully prepared in the prologue. This indeed is Sophocles' usual way of working, as opposed to Euripides who likes to surprise his audience with unexpected events. Sophocles has a feeling for the magnificence of the old-fashioned hero that Euripides does not; "men as they should be" in fact, as opposed to "men as they are". Ajax is harsh, vengeful and displays that $\psi\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon$ which angered Athena and caused his destruction. But he has real stature; and one need only read the Iliad to see that modesty was not usually a Greek virtue, least of all in the heroic world to which Ajax originally belonged.

The parallels between Sophocles' Ajax and Hector have already been observed: Sophocles touches it explicitly when he refers to the fatal exchange of gifts, Hector's sword kills Ajax and Ajax's belt helps to kill Hector. The scene¹ on the walls of Troy between Hector, Andromache and Astyanax yields to the same emotion as does Ajax - honour is more important than life or dependants, however dear. Ajax desires death, but he also believes that it will go some way to retrieving his honour.

Yet this Homeric character cannot fit into Sophocles' world; the increasing fear of $\psi\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon$ and the $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ² of the gods, the development of city life and what Adkins³ calls the "quiet virtues" as opposed to military prowess, made Ajax a kind of dinosaur in 14th century terms. Odysseus' recommendation of moderation and caution for weak man in the face of the divine, is put forward as the attitude proper to contemporary man.

Heracles' madness and its sequel occupy less than half of Euripides' play. Heracles comes to save his dependants from the clutches of the wicked tyrant after a build-up culminating in the description $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \acute{\upsilon}\mu\iota\nu \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\prime \omicron\delta' \acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$. He appears in his full might; although he boasts - he claims not to care if the whole city saw him, but admits he had the sense to enter secretly (595-6), he is indeed capable of superhuman effort: the Chorus have just given an account of his labours, and he goes on to kill Lycus. It is not his character that brings about his ruin, though his natural violence may contribute to it; Hera's malice is caused by his very existence.

Ajax exhibits no real change of character; he moves from lyric despair to resolve, from which he is not shaken; the speech 640-91 reveals perhaps what he ought to do, but what he as Ajax could never do. Heracles

however at the end of the play bears little resemblance to the confident superman who appeared to save his family in the nick of time. But he learns to accept his fate in the way in which Ajax could not. It is the final reaction of the protagonists to their intolerable position which is of the greatest interest in showing the contrast of the dramatists' ideas.

The parts played by the gods in the two plays are typical of their authors' attitudes to the Olympian religion. In 'Ajax' the gods are accepted and respected; Athene may provide an unpleasant picture to modern sensibilities as she teases Ajax to entertain and instruct her favourite Odysseus; but mercy was never a characteristic of Greek gods, and her attitude is simply that of offended divinity. Man is not expected to have the same feelings about the case as god; there is too strong an implication of "my turn next?" For god to be proud and man to be humble is the order of things, but it is an order; Ajax is being punished for his conceited rejection of Athene's offer of help, for behaving as if he were more than man. Humanity - κοῦφην σκιάν (126) is weak and ignorant and must submit obediently to divine will. In the uncertainties of human life the safest path is that of σωφροσύνη (11.118-133).

The gods of the Heracles Furens embody some of Euripides' most explicit condemnation of the Olympian religion. The divine blow upon Heracles differs from that upon Ajax in that he has done no wrong: it is his very birth that Hera objects to (1263-4):

Zeûς δ' - ὅστις ὁ Zeûς - πολέμιόν μεγαίνατο
Ἡρᾷ.

The attitude of Iris leaves the divine motives in no doubt; her cruelty revolts even Lyssa, who as "Νυκτός κελαινῆς καρθένα" might be expected to have a merciless attitude. No moral can be drawn from Hera's behaviour; Heracles has done no wrong, committed no act of ὕβρις he is εὐεργέτης βροτοῖσι καὶ μέγας φίλος "(1252) and their mighty friend". It is rare in tragedy for the tragic hero to contribute so little to his own fate; Oedipus⁶ of Oedipus Rex is the nearest parallel, and he is helpless before the working of an impersonal fate and not a malicious goddess.

Heracles is less responsible than Ajax for the atrocities committed in a state of madness; Ajax intended murder and was led to vent his rage on beasts instead of men; Heracles was innocently sacrificing after killing a real foe, the brutal Lycus (and no one, certainly no Greek, could doubt the rightness of this act) when he was struck with madness; only after he loses his reason does he become violent. Whether in a state of sanity he would have liked to kill Eurystheus' children remains problematical; one cannot convict him on such slender evidence.

It is perhaps the attitude to suicide in these plays that provides the most interesting contrast. Most of the 'Ajax' revolves around his death. Suspense is built up as the Chorus and Tecmessa attempt to dissuade him, and he deceives them, presumably to be alone when he dies. But no one can tell him that death will not provide a solution to his state of dishonour, their pleas are all personal; he is asked to live for the sake of his dependants, not for himself. One may compare 'Hippolytus' 305-9, where the Nurse warns Phaedra of the fate of her children if she dies, rather than speaking of her act as wrong in itself. Indeed the Chorus are resigned to his death (635)

κρείσσων γὰρ Ἀιδῶ κεύθων ὁ νοσῶν μάταν
640 ὅς ἐκ πατρώας ἥκων γενεᾶς ἄριστος...
ἀλλ' ἐκτὸς ὀμιλεῖ.

It is better that he should die, because he has behaved in a way unsuited to his noble breeding; they are agreeing with Ajax' own feelings on the matter. He must, he says (429) "ἀλλ' ἢ καλῶς ζῆν ἢ καλῶς τεθνηκέναι". He must do something to show his father that he is not ἄσπλαγχος (471) "gutless". The first thing that occurs to him is death against enormous odds; to go and fight single handed against the Trojans. The Spartan Aristodemus at Plataea attempted to regain his honour by this method; he had escaped alone from Thermopylae, and tried to rid himself of the disgrace this had incurred by fighting and dying with reckless courage (Herodotus IX,71). Aristodemus, and Herodotus himself, clearly considered that this was a fair atonement; but curiously enough the Spartans, whether this was their usual practise or whether they were exceptionally angry with the unfortunate Aristodemus not only refused to honour him as the best fighter, because he had deliberately courted death, but gave him no special honour at all. This objection is nothing to Ajax; he must decide against dying in battle because this would aid his enemies, the Atreidae, and eventually decides to die alone on his own sword; this must be as καλός a death as he can find. In life he can only find hatred and scorn from his fellow beings; it is αἰσχρόν he says, to desire life which only means misery. To this the Chorus' reaction is basically agreement; his speech is not ὑποβλητόν, but true to himself, the self which is noble and which he left in his madness (635-40).

Indeed the preservation of honour is a common motive for suicide. One may compare Phaedra, Hipp. 329

ὀλεῖ· τὸ μέντοι πρόγμ' ἐμοὶ τιμὴν φέρει

and

207 ἐγὼ δὲ τ' ἀμὰ θήσομαι καλῶς

717 ὥστ' εὐκλεᾶ μὲν πλοῖ προσθεῖναι βλοῦ

Elsewhere the method of death is important; Helen 841

πῶς οὖν θανούμεθ' ὥστε καὶ δόξαν λαβεῖν;

That this was something of a cliché is shown by Aristophanes' 'Knights' produced some years earlier than Euripides' 'Helen'. The two slaves discuss suicide, ll. 80 ff.

"ἀλλὰ σκόπει

ὅπως ἂν ἀποθανώμεν ἀνδρικώτατα" and decide drinking bull's blood, as Themistocles was said to have done, would be the best method. It is interesting that the scholiast says that line 83 is adapted from Sophocles' 'Helen' and quotes

fr. 663 ἐμοὶ δὲ λυστον αἶμα ταυρεῖον πιεῖν

καὶ μὴ γε πλείους τῶν δ' ἔχειν δυσφημίας

The idea of winning glory by the very act of suicide appears in Euripides' 'Suppliants' in the words of Evadne. Certainly she is driven mad by grief for her husband Capaneus, but she is only carrying to excess the ideas already referred to above. She claims to be καλλίνικος and surpass πάσας γυναῖκας. (1061) not in the womanly virtues of house-craft or good sense, which her father mentions,⁵ but in ἀρετῇ, i.e. in the physical courage suited to a man, not a woman⁶, and which her husband possessed. She will cast herself on to his pyre and die beside him, so that (1067) πάντα Ἀργείους μαθεῖν. The Chorus' reaction is that it is a δεινὸν ἔργον, and that her father has suffered σχέτλια and is τάλαις, but there is no reproach levelled at Evadne herself because of the nature of her deed.

Thus during the fifth century suicide incurs no moral reproach and may well be κάλος. I cannot find such an example of suicide to save the reputation or enhance it in Homer, suicide is in any case rarely mentioned, and then usually as a sudden wish in a moment of violent stress; when

Achilles hears of the death of Patroclus, Antilochus holds his hands lest he should harm himself in his agony (Iliad XVIII, 32ff) and Odysseus when his comrades loose the winds which were tied up in a bag and cause a terrible storm contemplates jumping into the sea, but decides to stick it out (Odyssey X 49 ff). Ajax' death is mentioned in Od. XI; the manner of death is not given, but it was due to the award of arms, so that suicide because of slighted honour is a probable assumption.

Ajax dies because life no longer has any value for him; but in his final speech he takes the opportunity of cursing the Atreidae, calling upon the Erinyes; he hopes to harm his enemies in death if not in life. This recalls the death of Epicaste in Odyssey XI τῷδ' (Oedipus) ἄλγεα κάλλιπ' ὀπίσσω πολλὰ μάλ' ὅσσα τε μητρὸς Ἐρινύες ἐκτελέουσιν." "She left a great many sorrows behind for him, such as the Erinyes of a mother bring to pass" and Eurydice in 'Antigone' who dies cursing her husband. So it seems that a method of naming your enemies is to die with a curse; the death, because they have driven you to this extreme, will make the curse more effective⁷. The dead can invoke the grim powers of the underworld, the horrific Erinyes of the 'Eumenides'⁸.

In 'Heracles' however, the enemies of Heracles are not mortals but gods, and he cannot harm them by suicide and a curse. This must be what Theseus is thinking of:

1241 Her. τοιγὰρ παρεσκεύασμεθ' ὥστε κατθανεῖν.

Thes. δοκεῖς ἀπειλῶν ὧν μέλειν τι δαίμοσιν;

Jevons⁹ and Westermarck¹⁰ suggest that there may have been a general fear of the ghosts of suicides in Greece. Aeschines In Ctesiphonta, 244 remarks that the bodies of suicides in Athens had the "hand that did the deed" cut off and buried apart. It is suggested that this was done to render the ghost harmless, to make it incapable of taking vengeance on those who drove it to die. Jevans compares old superstitions and customs in England and Germany, included the cutting off of the head or hand from a body to prevent it from becoming a vampire, and suggests that the same motive holds good of classical Greece.

Of vampires in the exact sense I can find no trace in classical Greece. The ghosts of the dead are feeble creatures in Homer, and such they seem to remain generally. It is not ghosts that people fear, but their agents the Erinyes, and these are indeed vampires; Aeschylus' 'Eumenides' 183ff and 264 ff present them drinking blood from their victim and draining all his strength. Clytemnestra does not haunt Orestes herself; she merely urges on her avengers with angry words. Rohde¹¹ holds that the Erinyes were originally in fact angry ghosts, but this has been disputed; their function is not restricted to avenging the dead, though it is in this context that they most commonly appear¹². The keres¹³ appear in the 'Shield of Heracles', which if not Hesiodic is presumably fairly early, as drinking the blood of those who fall in battle; they are under the control of the Moirai, and in the Theogony are children of Night, as the Erinyes are in Aeschylus. Various bogies or underworld spirits, such as Mormo, were supposed to bear off children; in Aristophanes' Frogs Dionysus (and Xanthias) express great terror when they think they encounter Empusa, a monster who constantly changes shape. When Odysseus visits Hades (Odyssey 11) he finds the gibbering ghosts 'creepy' but his serious fear is that a monster may appear (634-5) μή μοι Γοργεῖνν κεφαλὴν δεινόιο πελώρου ἐξ Ἀΐδεω πέμψειεν ἄγανη Περσεφόνηα". But are these crea-

tures ghosts of the dead? The only one for which I can find evidence is Gello, mentioned in Sappho, - Zenobius says that she died young and takes other children with her. If this is so, it is an example of a "ghost" proper, but it is a special case.

Ghosts were certainly abroad during the third day of the Anthesteria, and cathartic measures were taken such as smearing door posts with pitch, but we do not know precisely what was feared. The only classical example I can find of a ghost doing its own avenging is in Plato Laws 865 D-E. "It is said that he who dies by violence is angry with the killer when he is newly dead, and troubles the killer as he has been troubled by him". A penalty of a year's exile for involuntary homicide is prescribed. This implies a local visitation¹⁴; if a ξενος is killed, the killer must keep away from his homeland for a year. The Erinyes are not local; they pursue Orestes to Delphi and Athens in the Eumenides. This strongly suggests that the ghost of the dead man is meant. Electra and Orestes cummon Agammemnon to aid them in their vengeance, and beg earth to 'send him up to watch the battle (487)': his aid is required in person. In the same day Orestes describing his reasons for vengeance speaks of the threats he received in the event of his not avenging his father; horrible diseases would be sent out of the earth as well as the Erinyes: the ghost is powerful. But a most interesting point concerning the question of the mutilation of a corpse is the fact that Agamemnon's body has been mutilated (438-42); Rohde discusses this practise of μαρμαλισμός of victims¹⁵ by murder so suggests that it was to prevent the ghost from taking vengeance.

It seems not improbable that this was the primary cause of the mutilation of corpses, though by classical times it has been largely forgotten or buried. The dishonour suffered by the dead is the cause for complaint in the 'Choephoroe': had Agamemnon died a dignified death at Troy and received honourable burial he would be a ruler among the dead (344 ff.) implying that now he has no honour in Hades. One must not forget that the dead were believed to continue to bear in Hades the wounds which the body had suffered, and mutilation was also a method of making the after life unpleasant. Aeschylus anyway does not suggest that Agamemnon's powers of vengeance are (or are hoped to be) curtailed; they exist in Orestes (and the Erinyes). Similarly the severing of a suicide's hand might originally have been a protection against ghosts, and later have been given another, more moralistic explanation.

Aeschines in the passage referred to above is thinking not of ghosts but of exile. By honouring Demosthenes, he says, you leave yourselves and those who died in battle for you unavenged. But you punish by exile pieces of wood, stone and iron which have killed someone, "καὶ ἐὰν τις αὐτὸν διαχρησθῇ, τὴν χεῖρα τὴν τοῦτο πράξασαν χρωρὶς τοῦ σώματος θάπτομεν ... " we bury the hand apart from the body, "exile" it in fact, as though it were an independent being that has attacked the rest of the body. That this idea did exist seems likely from the 'trials' of inanimate objects for homicide.

There is little explicit evidence of a general religious horror of suicide. The Chorus on first hearing of Ajax' intentions say (362-3)

εὐφημα φώνει· μὴ κακὸν κακῷ διδοῦς

ἄκος πλεον τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης τίθει.

"Hush! do not add ill to ill and make the pain of your ruin worse by its cure εὐφημα φώνει is a religious expression, requesting someone to

refrain" from impious and ill omened words. But there is no more in the same vein. It seems that Phaedra's suicide excites the same feeling in 'Hippolytus':

814 Chorus βιαίως θανοῦσ'·
 ἀνοσίῳ τε συμφορᾷ, σᾶς χερὸς
 πάλαισμα μελέας

"Having died violently and by an unholy mischance, the struggle of your own hand".

here seems to refer to her act of suicide. But again no one enlarges on this aspect. Lines 1212-13 in Heracles Furens are comparable to the 'Ajax' verses.

Amph. δρόμον ἐπὶ φόνιον ἀνόσιον ἐξάγει
 κακὰ θέλων κακοῖς συνάψει, τέκνον
suicide here is clearly condemned as ἀνόσιον. But Theseus uses ethical not religious grounds to persuade Heracles to live.

Really explicit condemnation from a religious viewpoint appears in Plato, Phaedo 61-62, where it is attributed to the Pythagorean Philolaus. The idea is that the gods are our masters and we should not try to escape from our "post" (or "prison", φρουρά) on earth. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐν ἀπορρήτοις λεγομένοις περὶ αὐτῶν λόγος, ὡς ἐν τινι φρουρᾷ ἔσμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ οὐ δεῖ δὴ ἑαυτὸν ἐκ ταύτης λύειν οὐδ' ἀποδιδράσκειν".

"They have a saying among their secret doctrines, that we humans are in a sort of garrison post, and must not release ourselves from it not run away".

That this much was genuine Pythagorean doctrine is confirmed by Clearchus on Euxitheus the Pythagorean in Athenaeus IV 157c and Cicero also mentions the idea. Whether Pythagorean beliefs were seeping into the thought of fifth century Athens, whether this belief was in fact based on a popular feeling that suicide was ἀνόσιον or whether the two things are completely independent, I cannot say. Perhaps the bodies of suicides incurred pollution¹⁶; at Thebes they were deprived of funeral rites, and in Cyprus left unburied, but this might, as the old Christian ban on burial in consecrated ground, be a case of the community rejecting one who rejected it. But there is no sign of the horror which attended murder of kin, even if Plato (Laws, 873) puts his laws on suicide immediately after his laws on the slaying of kinfolk as a murder of "τὸν δὲ δὴ πάντων οἰκεότατον καὶ λεγόμενον φίλτατον". It might be significant that "αὐτοχειρ" can mean 'murder of kin', or 'murder of self' (or even 'murder with one's own hand') when the messenger in 'Antigone' says (1175)

Mess. Αἴμων ὄλωλεν· αὐτόχειρ δ' αἰμάρσεται,

The chorus ask πότρεα πατρώας ἢ πρὸς οἰκείας χερὸς; There is no special word for suicide; to make the meaning explicit one must say (1177) "αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτόν.". This speaks of the importance of the family as a unit, as opposed to the individual; one's kin are "αὐτός". But one must not push this line of argument too far; self-murder may be unnatural but it does not incur such penalties as killing of kin.

The only way that the suicide could be punished (excluding deterrent measures taken on the dead body by disapproving human beings) is in Hades. Life in the Homeric underworld is certainly depressing; it is better, says the ghost of Achilles, to be the serf of a poor man on earth than a ruler among the dead, and this is no en-

couragement to anyone to leave life. But actual punishment is only meted out to notorious characters such as Sisyphus and Tityos. It might be remarked here that Virgil gives suicides in Hades a gloomy life such as Homeric ghosts lead, and feelings about it like those of Achilles; (VI 436-7) "quam vellent aethere in albo nunc et pauperiam et duros perferre labores". This is a strong warning against suicide, but no actual punishment is given to them. They are not sent to Tartarus or Elysium. In Plato Republic 615c great penalties are allotted to those guilty of dishonouring gods or parents or αὐτοχειρὸς φόνου, but this vague term, as I have explained earlier, may only mean "murder with one's own hand".

Adherents to various mystery religions, such as Orphism, had different views about the after life, expressed by the Orphics as σῶμα = σῆμα; the body is a tomb. If the soul is only really happy on quitting the body, why should you not release it at once? This question clearly occurred to the Pythagoreans, and their answer is given above in the passage from Plato's 'Phaedo'. One does not hear of fanatical adherents to mystery religions killing themselves¹⁷ when life became unpleasant, and it seems reasonable to suppose that a ban for some such reason was generally accepted among them. Socrates in 'Phaedo' extends this idea to 'philosophers' in general¹⁸. Suicide was in Pythagorean belief actually punished in the after life - the man who "releases" himself receives πλεῖστοι καὶ μέγιστοι τότε λύμαις.

Neither Ajax nor Heracles think of the after life when they contemplate suicide; the after life that they will find must be assumed by the spectators to be of the Homeric kind.

In Plato Laws 873 C-D, suicide has become a moral rather than a religious problem, though he instructs relatives to take advice on correct rituals. The ban is not absolute, as religious bans tend to be; it depends on circumstances whoever kills himself neither under orders from the state, nor compelled by some intolerable misfortune, nor falling into some disgrace that is unbearable and beyond remedy, but from ὀργῆς δὲ καὶ ἀνανδρίας δειλῆς, is to be buried in a solitary unnamed tomb in a lonely place. "Orders from the state" probably means state execution; the prisoners had to drink the hemlock themselves. The other reasons are more interesting and would give difficulty in practice; ἀσχυρὴ is especially interesting as a reason and would excuse a large number of legendary suicides, presumably including Ajax. If these excuses do not apply, the suicide is guilty of "laziness and unmanly cowardice". As far as it is possible to ascertain, this idea first makes its appearance in Euripides' Heracles. Theseus sets in opposition to Heracles' despairing desire for death no religious objection, but (1248) "εἰρηκας ἐπιτυχόντος ἀνθρώπου λόγους", a contrast to the Chorus in Ajax, who find his speech in favour of suicide suitable to his noble birth. Of course, Theseus throughout uses Heracles' heroic status as a means of persuading him to live, for this is his most important characteristic, and the reminder of Heracles' former stature has a dramatic effect. But when everything is taken into account, it remains remarkable that Theseus can stigmatize suicide as cowardly and vulgar, and Heracles accept this, (1348) μὴ δειλὸν ὄφλω τιν' ἐκλιπὼν φάος. Theseus is a "good" character: a faithful friend, a sensitive man and the bringer of the solution of the drama, a sort of homo ex machina. His statement that pollution cannot pass from friend to friend and that gods cannot be polluted might be ideas which Euripides personally wished to introduce into the drama. Theseus' dramatic

function is somewhat similar to that of Odysseus in the Ajax, a σωφρων who proposes a non-violent solution from a deeper understanding of the human position.

Concerning the gods he advises refraining from bold words (1244), since this only causes trouble, and cites their example of continuing to live unashamed in spite of their crimes. (Like the Nurse in 'Hippolytus', this test is scarcely edifying and looks like a sophistic common place. Heracles expressly rejects it as an excuse. (1340 ff)). But Theseus appeals mainly to the opinion of men (1252-4).

Theseus: εὐεργέτης βροτοῖσι καὶ μέγας φίλος;

Heracles: ὅςδ' οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦσ' μ', ἀλλ' Ἥρα κρατεῖ.

Theseus: οὐκ ἂν σ' ἀνᾶσχοιθ' Ἑλλάς ἀμαθὴ θανεῖν.

(Thes. The benefactor of mortals and their mighty friend?

Heracles. They cannot help me at all, but Hera rules.

Thes. Hellas would not allow you to die in a stupid way.)

Theseus ignores the mention of Hera and concentrates on human opinion, and this is what persuades Heracles. His suicide cannot affect his enemy Hera nor his supposed ally Zeus (as Ajax hopes his, by his curses, may affect the Atreidae); men would think it ἀμαθία, a word which often refers to the ignorance of the common people, like ἄγροικος. So in fr. 1070N² whoever advises suicide as an escape from sorrows οὐκ εὔ σοφοῦσιν ἐστίν.¹⁹

But if suicide is unheroic, what is the alternative? There is no spectacular way for Heracles to regain status. All his labours will now be useless for this and he will be accursed in Greece where he was once acclaimed (1300). Great deeds are useless merely if one does not continue them, says Odysseus in Euripides' 'Philoctetes'.

789N² ὅκνων δὲ μόχθων τῶν πρὶν ἐκχεῖαι χάριν
καὶ τοὺς πάρους οὐκ ἀπωθοῦμαι πόνους.

and both Ajax and Heracles have, they believe, lost the reputation gained by their πόνος by the deeds committed in their madness.

The only alternative offered to Heracles is that of quiet endurance, of inactive retirement. His isolation is overcome, as Ajax' is not, by Theseus' generous offer of a home, and with the mental anguish remaining he decides it is braver to live. The endurance of suffering remains one of the later Stoic doctrines; the Stoic attitude to suicide was ambiguous. It might be the bravest way out of an insurmountable difficulty, or aid country or friends (Diog. VIII 130, Muson. in Stolb. Floril.) - here one might think of cases of self-sacrifice in Euripides - and Seneca thinks it best if old age is affecting one's mental capacities. But sometimes endurance is right and suicide is cowardly, e.g. Plutarch, Cleomenes 314 - 6. Cleomenes and his friends only kill themselves when there is no hope left. Epicurus in Cicero de Finibus I, 15,49, and Seneca Epistoles 12,10, recommends suicide when life is miserable, but in Epistoles 24,22 Epicurus is quoted as attacking those who seek hastily to end their lives as much as those who seek to prolong them, and when Diodorus committed suicide (Sen.Vit.B.19.1) doubt was expressed as to whether Epicurean doctrine allowed it. Thus in later times interest in the moral question of suicide grows; and among the Romans, particularly those of the empire, it was of course much more common.

Life can hold no happiness for Heracles; and Ajax rejects this kind of endurance as ἀλσχροδόν (473-80) 'to lengthen out life when it brings no change from ills'. But Heracles is willing to live thus to show his courage.

This story of Heracles' madness and end seems peculiar to Euripides. The more usual story gives the labours as penance for the murders, and Heracles usually dies on the pyre and is translated as a god. Sophocles does not give the deification in Trachiniae, but he gives the pyre and endows it with a mind of religious significance; when Heracles knows how his joke has come about he becomes calm and gives these strange instructions. One cannot really say that Sophocles explicitly rejects the deification after the burning; he leaves it out of his play so that we see Heracles as a suffering mortal at the end. The shirt of Nessus may have been the cause of death in the original story, not the pyre. In the Νεκύια Heracles is already deified, and even if the passage is an addition it still points to an early date. The Athenians preserved a strong tradition that they were the first to worship Heracles as a god. It is presumably to shrines of Heracles that Euripides refers in 1329-30. "Mortals shall call these τεμένη after you in the future". But here Heracles will be treated as a hero εὔτ' ἂν εἰς Αἴδου μόλῃς; Theseus thinks of him as dying (not that at this stage he could know of any deification) and the existence of the shrines is accounted for without implying the deification. But one cannot say that Euripides brings Heracles into retirement in Attica merely to account for the presence of certain shrines there; he could probably have done this without settling Heracles there for the rest of his life. Eurystheus at the end of the 'Heracleidae' becomes friendly to the Athenians although they cannot save him from death; their pious attitude is sufficient.

The question of φιλία 'friendship' is important in both the plays. Odysseus bases his argument for the burial of Ajax partly on the instability of φιλία, one's friend may become one's enemy, and vice versa. So it is better to treat everyone fairly in anticipation of receiving fair treatment oneself. (1359-61) Theseus on the contrary holds to the importance of φιλία. Heracles has helped him, and he will help Heracles. (One might remember that φιλία does not mean a purely emotional relationship, but implies the exchange of benefits, an "alliance" between people or between states)

For Sophocles, human friendship is something uncertain and not to be relied on. False friends certainly appear in Euripides - Menelaus in 'Orestes' for example, but in the conclusion to the 'Heracles' human friendship is the only thing that can be relied on. It is here contrasted with divine 'friendship'. Amphitryon addresses Zeus:

341 σὺ δ' ἦσθ' ἄρ' ἥσσον ἢ ὁδκεῖς εἶναι φίλος.
ἀρετῇ σε νικῶ θνητός ἂν θεὸν μέγαν.
παῖδας γὰρ οὐ προὔδωκα τοὺς Ἡρακλέους.

"You are less of a friend than you are supposed to be. I defeat you in virtue, though I am a mortal and you a great god; I have not abandoned Heracles' sons".

Gods are not to be trusted. Admittedly Ajax mistakenly trusts Athena when she addresses him in his madness, but there is a reason for her malignancy, whereas Hera's only reason is jealousy. In Euripides only mortals have a moral sense, and he censures the gods for their cruelty.

It is in the nature of gods to be harsh and unforgiving, and Sophocles, unlike Euripides, tends to accept this. Athena knows no mercy because she is a goddess; Odysseus the mortal sees his own condition reflected in that of Ajax. But the herdsman in 'Hippolytus' vainly advises Aphrodite to be merciful:

χρὴ δὲ συγγνώμην ἔχειν,
εἰ τίς σ' ὕφ' ἱερῆς σπλάγχχνον ἔντονον φέρων
μᾶταλα βᾶξει.

and Agave protests at her doom: Bacchae 1357 -

Dionysus καὶ γὰρ πρὸς ὑμῶν θεὸς γεγὼς ὑβριζόμεν.
Agave ὀργὰς πρέπει θεοῦς οὐχ ὁμοιοῦσθαι βροτοῖς.

To show pity or change one's mind is a sign of human weakness; gods have little feeling for mortals. The same obduracy is detectable in Sophocles' heroes. Oedipus at Colonus, soon to become a 'hero', is a good example; his wrath against his sons is not excessive because he is moving towards a semi-divine position. But human protagonists in Sophocles are exceptionally stubborn; Antigone, Ajax and Philoctetes all suffer in different ways because of their obduracy, but it is partly this that gives them their stature. Heracles in the 'Trachiniae' does not forgive Deianeira, nor pity Hyllus' feelings; Electra's love of her father will not let her give in to Clytemnestra. Sophocles sees the dangers of this sort of stubbornness, and Odysseus, the perfect mortal, is an example of sensible changing of attitude.

Euripides does not portray this sort of hero. Electra's hatred has made her brutal, Orestes is a neurotic, Hippolytus a fanatic. Pentheus' persistent denial of the Dionysian religion merely serves to make him ridiculous. Medea is human when she debates with herself on her horrible plan; when she has carried it out she appears in the sun's chariot almost like a goddess - but a vicious Euripidean goddess. "Divine" qualities do not make gods better than men, they make them worse.

Protagonists in Euripides' plays may change their minds. The best example is Ion, who after praising the quiet life he leads at Delphi runs to become a king in Athens, and Heracles here changes his mind and yields to Theseus. The Heracles in Euripides' play is nearest to the conventional type of hero at the beginning; he has great strength, has done great deeds, he is confident and determined. But he is not godlike, and the word is no compliment in Euripides. He sets a 'hero' before our eyes only to degrade him into a shaking creature that can hardly rise to his feet (1395). The heroic and obvious course seems to be death. But it is not; and Heracles gains a new quality by changing his mind. The courage he must show is a specially human courage; the voluntary endurance of sorrow. The hero becomes a human being, dependent upon others for his life. Euripides, I think, prefers humanity to a barren display of old fashioned 'heroic' qualities.

NOTES.

1. Iliad XI.
2. See Dodds, 'The Greeks and the Irrational'.
3. See Adkins, 'Merit and Responsibility'.
4. Oedipus' position of helpless dependence on others at the end of the play in contrast to the independence he had shown throughout is also comparable to Heracles' state of weakness.
5. Iphis' remarks are exceptionally obtuse, but I think that line 1062, is intended to show the "unwomanliness" of Evadne's act. Iphis' conventionality. (1066 "his bourgeois reaction" J.W. Fitton, 'The Suppliant Women'.)
6. Adkins (see above) devotes some space to this (p. 36). Evadne's courage is 'unconventional'. See also Comford, C.Q. 1912, p.252.
7. In some Eastern countries suicide, so that the ghost could take vengeance, was a recognised form of revenge.
8. The point of the threatened suicide of the Danaids in Aeschylus' Suppliants (455-67) is not the curse of their ghosts but the pollution incurred by their hanging themselves on the statues of the gods.
9. F.B. Jevons, C.R. 1895, p. 247-50.
10. E. Westermarck, The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas, ch. XXXV - on Aeschines evidence, p. 248.
11. E. Rohde, Psyche, Ch. V, p. 128 - 9.
12. H.J. Rose sums up in O.C.D. They prevent offences against the course of nature.
13. The keres are usually bringers of death (see W.K.C. Guthrie, OCD). Whether κῆρες can mean 'souls of the dead' is questioned by Pickard-Cambridge in his chapter on the Anthesteria (The Dramatic Festivals of Athens², p. 14) They seem to be malignant underworld spirits similar to the Erinyes.
14. Similarly heroes were powerful only in the neighbourhood of their graves. Oedipus will be helpful to the Athenians when he is buried at Colonus. (Oedipus at Colonus, 582, 621f) and Cleisthenes (Herodotus V 67) "brings in" Melanippus to Sicyon in order to make the Argive hero Adrastus "leave the country of his own accord". The Lacedaimonians (id. I 67-8) are advised to remove the bones of Orestes from Tegea to Sparta in order to succeed in battle over the former.
15. Psyche, Appendix II.
16. Plato in Laws IX 813 C.D., speaks of the cathartic rites which relatives should perform on the body.
17. Cicero, Tusc. I, 34, 83-4 gives the story of Hegesias the Cyrenaic philosopher, who was stopped from lecturing by Ptolemy because many of his listeners committed suicide!
18. The word 'philosopher' however, had a special significance for the Pythagoreans, who were said to have invented it. The question is discussed by R. Joly (among others) in 'Le thème Philosophique des Gens de Vie dans l'Antiquité, pp. 21-52.
19. Similarly, Agathon, fr. 7.

φαῦλοι βροτῶν γὰρ τοῦ πονεῖν ἡσσώμενοι
θανεῖν ἐρώσιν.

PROFESSOR KEY AND DOCTOR WAGNER

An Episode in the History of Victorian Scholarship

(The central parts of this essay were read as a paper to the Classical Association, South-West Branch, in Exeter, on January 31 1969)

The nineteenth century was an age of revolution in the history of Classical scholarship, and, although this revolution had its forerunners in England in the persons of Bentley, Porson and some of their pupils, it took place mainly in Germany and in countries which, like Denmark and Holland, came under the influence of German learning. The main features of this revolution are well known, but we may recall again two of them, thoroughness and the perfection of method. With typical thoroughness, the German 'Gelehrter' set out to collect and codify every scrap of information related to the ancient world, and their collections of texts and fragments - as well as their handbooks - revised from generation to generation and containing exhaustive bibliographies, are still the essential tools of the Classical student everywhere. In the realm of method, the German scholars attempted, with no mean success, to establish the various Classical disciplines as proper 'Wissenschaften', establishing rules for the treatment of new materials and the reassessment of the old. In many cases, the game of establishing new methods was overplayed, at the expense of common-sense - as in the case of 'Quellenkunde', the study of sources, which had taught some people the principle that no Classical author could have thought out for himself what had been said by another, and that, if both Aristotle and Seneca have avowed that bread is nourishing for man, the former cannot but be the latter's source for this astonishing discovery. Housman's many strictures against this blind and excessive preoccupation with method are well known and, within their limits, when they refer to methods which developed into manias well deserved.

But in two of the Classical disciplines, both connected with the texts of the Classical writers and their linguistic interpretation, the German century has truly effected a revolution. These are textual criticism, and the application to Greek and Latin of the principles of comparative and historical linguistics. In the realm of textual criticism, the labours of Zumpt, Madvig, Bekker, Bernays and Lachmann - with whose name this method is particularly associated - have established the procedure of recension of a text based on a historical study of its manuscript tradition which, although it has become much more complicated and somewhat improved since, is still essentially the method which we all use. The discovery by Sir William Jones of the relations between Sanskrit and some of the older European languages led to the establishment in Germany, by Bopp, Schleicher and their contemporaries and successors, of the comparative study of the Indo-European languages. Applied to Greek and Latin as two members of that family of languages, the new science has completely revolutionized our approach to Greek and Latin grammar and etymology.

England was slow to react to these changes. One remembers what Houseman(1) said about the year 1825, 'when our great age of scholarship, begun in 1691 by Bentley's *Epistola ad Millium*, was ended by the successive strokes of doom which consigned Dobree and Elmsley to the grave and Blomfield to the bishopric of Chester. England disappeared from the fellowship of nations for the next forty years' etc. In the English universities - and they were fewer then than now, and fewer than those which existed then in Germany or France - tutors, whose knowledge was sometimes not much in advance of that of Porson's 'Doctor Paginibus', continued to teach Greek and Latin verse composition to well-bred boys intent on making a career in the Church or in politics. George Eliot's

Reverend Edward Casaubon, who discovers after a lifetime of study that the book he will never live to write is of no value, since it has taken no account of the immense advancements effected by German learning, is no rare figure in early Victorian England, and to compare, for example, the achievement of an average British scholar like John Stuart Blackie (1809-1895) with that of a typical German scholar like Moritz Haupt, who was a year older than Blackie and died a good twenty-one years before him, is to invite black despair. In the second half of the century, British scholars had to serve a long apprenticeship at the hands of their German colleagues before Classical scholarship could establish itself again in this country and find here its long-lost home. Such British scholars as were the first to look to Germany for guidance - men like Munro in Cambridge, Pattison, Henry Nettleship, Robinson Ellis and Bywater in Oxford, and Donaldson in London, felt, for a long time, isolated in their own schools and universities, and the career of Mark Pattison in Oxford is a powerful illustration of this state of affairs.

Plautus is one of those authors who benefitted beyond measure from the establishment of the new Classical disciplines, and the two main stages of what can justly be called a revolution in Plautine studies are connected with the names of Friedrich Ritschl in Germany and Wallace Martin Lindsay in England and Scotland. Ritschl, who spent most of his life as professor in the Universities of Bonn and Leipzig, was the first to apply the new methods of textual criticism to the study of Plautus. Recognizing the value of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, he not only restored the author's true name (which was previously known as M. Accius Plautus, and had been identified earlier with that of Accius the tragedian), but completely rearranged the stemma of the MSS, relegating all the later ones to one family derived from one archetype. Plautus became his lifelong study, and his various editions, 'prolegomena', 'parerga' and other publications added yearly to the fund of knowledge of the text of that author. Not content with this, Ritschl made a special study of the forms of early Latin, as they appear in the non-literary sources, and applied all the information amassed in this manner to the interpretation of the language of Plautus. Being a great teacher - and a German professor - Ritschl also busied himself in producing and organizing a younger generation to carry on his labours. Goetz and Scheell, Fleckeisen and Brix - to name but a few of the names which still appear in any honours list of Plautine studies - were his pupils, and the direction to their life-long activities was given at his hands. The metrical work of C. F. W. Müller, the first to discover the law of 'brevis brevians', could not have taken place without him.

Ritschl was too old and too involved in his established field to absorb and use the growing new discipline of Indo-European linguistics, and the role of applying it to the study of early Latin was left to a younger generation of scholars. The foremost representative of this new generation was Lindsay, whose first published book, the famous - and still popular - school edition of the *Captivi*, was published in 1887, eleven years after Ritschl's death. In the next fifty years, until his premature death in a car accident at the age of 79, Lindsay devoted his immense energy to what may be the most thorough study yet undertaken by one man of the Latin language in its context within the Indo-European family. Without relinquishing his occupation as a Latinist to become a student of Indo-European linguistics as such, he applied all the information and methods which could be obtained from the new discipline to the establishment, on a scientific basis, of the language, syntax, prosody, metre, spelling and every other linguistic aspect of early Latin, and especially its poetry. If nowadays we have a text of Plautus which looks more like proper Latin, and where points of text and language can be rationally discussed and not just left to mere conjecture and intuition, it is to Ritschl and to Lindsay, and the generations of scholars they stand for, that we should turn in gratitude.

Lindsay's career symbolizes, in a way, the migration of Classical scholarship from its German centre towards the English-speaking countries. As a young man, Lindsay went to Germany to sit at the feet of the great German scholars,

especially the pioneer in the field of the linguistic study of Latin, Franz Skutsch. When Lindsay died, Britain was already a centre of Classical studies in its own right, and the 'successive strokes of doom' - of a much more real and fearful nature - were falling over Germany. The last generation of German scholars were dying out, and those who survived the accession of Hitler were either driven out or left of their own free will. To this day, German scholarship has not yet completely recovered. Otto Skutsch, the son of Lindsay's friend and mentor, has been with us for many years as Professor of Latin in University College, London. Paul Maas, Eduard Fraenkel and Rudolf Pfeiffer are only three of the distinguished German scholars who left Germany in the 1930's to settle down in this country. When they arrived, they found the methods established by their German predecessors widely known and used in the universities of Great Britain.

The heroes of my present tale fall between the two stages symbolized by Ritschl and Lindsay. They were all contemporaries of Ritschl, and one of them was his pupil. They were all concerned in their different ways with the study of Plautus, Terence and early Latin in general, and two of them are of some importance in the history of the linguistic study of Greek and Latin in this country. The protagonist in this drama, a pupil of Ritschl and a man who achieved surprisingly much in a very brief span of life, was a German who tried to come to England and settle down here when the going was still not good.

In 1866, there was published in Cambridge, by Deighton Bell & Co., a new edition of Plautus' *Aulularia*, 'with notes critical and exegetical and an introduction on Plautine prosody, by Wilhelm Wagner, Ph.D.'. The volume is dedicated 'to T. Hewitt Key, M.A., Professor of Comparative Grammar in University College, London... as a tribute of the sincere regard of the editor'. The preface was written in 'Rusholme, near Manchester, May 1866'. In it, the editor asks for the 'forbearance and kindness of his readers, who will, I hope, not be very strict in the case of a foreigner whose acquaintance with the English language is of no very long standing'. (Needless to say, forbearance and kindness are not among the chief virtues of most writers of reviews, and as late as 1872, an anonymous writer in *The Saturday Review* (2) still takes the opportunity of making a few rather complacent witticisms at the expense of the German gentleman and his ignorance of some of the most idiomatic of English idioms). The editor concludes his preface with the following words: 'Thus I dismiss my book, though I feel that it stands in need of much indulgence and forbearance - I venture to say that it could be better if I could have written it at a place more favourable to philological studies than Manchester'.

The commentary is full of references to a Latin Grammar by T. H. Key, the man to whom the book is dedicated, which is used as a standard reference work on points of grammar and syntax. But both in the introduction and in the commentary, the author shows himself unable to accept Key's system of pronouncing Latin verses, which he calls 'contractive'. An example can be taken from Note 1 of pp. XV-XVI: 'Prof. Key tells us to read poëta cūprim am adscribend appulit ... there being no metrical reason at all why we should not admit a dactyl (prim ani) instead of the spondee (prim am). I am afraid that a general application of this system would reduce Plautian lines to a monotony which would entirely spoil the charm of conversational liveliness which we find in the comic writers'. Elsewhere (3), the editor makes a similar remark about the Professor's suggestion to read τῶ ποτε in Sophocles, Phil. 740, as one dissyllabic word τῶποτε: 'This would indeed be the same as the beginning of an English iambic This is my own; we may only be allowed to ask for the arguments which entitle us to transfer the laws of English poetry to Greek and Latin metres; and these I cannot find in Prof. Key's paper'.

These are only two specimens of what cannot but appear to be a strange procedure. Wagner is obviously dissatisfied with the Professor's method of analysing Latin prosody and metre, and gives expression to his feelings on this

subject again and again. He only just stops short of calling the whole system unscholarly and unscientific. And yet, the book is dedicated to Professor Key, 'as a tribute of the sincere regard of the editor'.

One's curiosity is further aroused as one turns to the 'second edition, re-written', published by the same Deighton Bell & Co. in 1876. Here there is no dedication - to Professor Key or to anyone else. Key had died in 1875, a year before the second edition was published, and a dedication to his memory of this new and revised edition would be the best testimony to 'the sincere regard of the editor' - if this sincere regard still existed. Instead, we find that some of the footnotes to the introduction which deal with Key's metrical theories are largely expanded, to include criticisms of some of the Professor's more recent publications (4). To savour only one short passage from one of these notes (Note 2, pp. 36-7): 'It is the pervading tendency of Mr. Key's theories on Latin versification to reduce Latin dissyllables and trisyllables to monosyllables. Such a proceeding is indeed very much in the style of that language which has succeeded in contracting the noble ἑλεμίσυνη into a convenient monosyllabic alms, but it may be doubted whether these violent contractions suit the genius of the Latin language'. Those who enjoy the subtle art of invective can look to the introduction for more.

When this second edition was published, Wagner was - as the title page discloses - Professor at the Johanneum, Hamburg'. In the preface, dated 'Hamburg, Easter 1876', he says, among other things: 'If the second edition proves to be superior to the first, this should be mainly attributed to the greater facility I enjoy at my present place of residence for procuring more philological works, indispensable to an author like this, than were within my reach at Cottonopolis'.

Most people nowadays, if they have ever heard of Wilhelm Wagner, may remember him as co-editor, with Henry Nettleship, of the second half of 'Virgil, Conington, abridged'. Some may have come across his name in connection with works like Mediaeval Greek Text and Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi - books still quoted in the standard histories of Modern Greek, both language and literature. A glance at the British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books will reveal more than three columns (5) dedicated to the publications of Wilhelm Wagner, Ph.D. They include editions with commentaries of Plautus, Terence, some Platonic dialogues, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and a number of French and German classics in the Pitt Press series - this apart from editions with introductions and notes of Bentley's Phalaris and Dobree's Adversaria, and a number of collections of mediaeval Greek poetic texts. This is only a list of books - Wagner published many notes and articles as well. Most of them - books and articles - are written in English. They represent a surprising, almost unbelievable, amount of work for a man who died at 37.

For this, I am afraid, is almost all the information one can obtain out of the four lines dedicated to Wagner in Sandys' History of Classical Scholarship (6): 'Among the scholars inspired by the new interest in Plautine studies was Wilhelm Wagner of Hamburg (1843-1880), who edited the Aulularia, Trinummus and Menaechmi, as well as the whole of Terence, with English notes'. No biographical or bibliographical reference; no explanation of any of the strange facts of the case. Why did a German scholar write most of his books in English? What made him live for some time in the uncongenial environment of mid-Victorian Manchester? Why, on his return to Germany, did he have to become a schoolmaster? The Hamburg Johanneum is one of the most distinguished secondary schools in Germany, and its high academic standards are of very long standing - but it is a school and not a university). And, to anticipate, what happened between him and Professor Key?

We fare no better when we try the Dictionary of National Biography, or the old Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie (the new one has only reached the letter Fic, and the Neue Deutsche Biographie has advanced as far as Har!). They contain no mention of Wilhelm Wagner, Ph.D. It is only when we turn towards that most useful book of its kind, Pökel's Philologisches Schriftsteller-Lexicon, that we find a proper article on Wagner, with real bibliographical and biographical

references. The fullest, and only, biographical sketch of Wagner was published in 1881, in the Schulprogramm of the Hamburg Johanneum, where Wagner spent the last ten years of his life. It was written by Lic.Theol. Adolf Metz, a colleague and friend, who used both personal recollections and the Wagner archives at the school library, to write what is a clear, perspicacious and sympathetic essay - but still more of a long obituary than a biography. Before we proceed with some of our enquiries, I shall sum up the biographical information supplied by Metz, with a few additions from other sources.

Wilhelm Wagner was born in Steinau on May 11, 1843. His father was a poor country doctor. But his maternal grandfather, Heyl by name, was a protestant clergyman, an inspector of schools, and a man of wide literary interests, whose house was full of French and Italian books. It is this grandfather, and a local clergyman, who discovered the child's unusual talent for languages, and persuaded his father to send him to a good Classical school. The Headmaster of the Frankfurt Gymnasium, where the boy was sent in 1855, was Johannes Classen, the famous commentator on Thucydides. He encouraged the young scholar to develop his linguistic talents and aim at a career in Classical philology. When still in school Wagner published a verse translation into German of the *Trinummus*, an article in a local weekly on survivals of ancient mythology in Modern Greek superstitions, and wrote for private circulation, in Modern Greek, which he had taught himself, a Dialogue on Greek Pronunciation, in which he argues that, whatever our reconstruction of the pronunciation of Ancient Greek, it has to account for the manner in which the modern pronunciation has devolved from the old one.

On finishing school with the highest distinctions, Wagner spent the year 1861-2 in the University of Berlin, attending lectures by Boeckh, Haupt and Trendelenburg. The impersonal atmosphere of a vast university in a vast metropolis repelled him, and Ritschl's growing reputation both as scholar and teacher attracted him to Bonn, where he spent the next two years as one of the Master's most promising pupils. Among the many distinctions he won was a first prize, shared with another promising young scholar, Dziatzko, for his doctoral dissertation (*De Plauti Aulularia*, published in 1864). He received his Ph.D. 'eximia cum laude', and now had to look for a living. The career of an overworked schoolmaster repelled him, and he had no private means to serve a long apprenticeship as the peculiarly German 'Privatdozent'. Some friends suggested that a man with such linguistic talents would benefit by a short sojourn abroad. Wagner agreed, hoping that he could make use of his French, Italian and Modern Greek to extend his knowledge of countries and literatures. The opening came from an unexpected direction. A German family in Manchester wanted a private tutor for their children. Wagner accepted, and arrived in the new country in Easter 1864. His duties here included seven hours' teaching a day, in exchange for free board, salary, and a few weeks' vacation.

Wagner arrived in England with hardly any knowledge of the English language. But at the end of two years' residence in Manchester, which had included trips to London, Paris and York in search of manuscripts, he had already become fluent enough in the language to prepare for publication in it an edition of the *Aulularia*. On a visit to London in 1865, he made the acquaintance of Professor Key, and his Vice-Headmaster in University College School, E. R. Horton. He also met H. A. J. Munro in Manchester - we are not told how. Key, a Cambridge graduate, advised him to publish his book, and it may not be an accident that the *Aulularia*, like most of Wagner's English books, was published by the Cambridge firm of Deighton Bell. In the next few years, more books saw the light of day in Cambridge: an edition of the whole of Terence, dedicated to Munro, in the 'Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts' series, 1869; in the same year, an edition with commentary of Plato's *Apology* and *Crito*, followed, in 1870, by a similar edition of the *Phaedo*. In a meeting in London on February 16th, 1866,

Wagner was elected a member of the Philological Society, of which he remained a member all his life. He served on its council during the years 1866-9 and again in 1876-7. In 1867 alone, he commuted from Manchester to London and read seven papers at various meetings of the Society (7). Professor Key, who was then engaged on the Latin Dictionary he never lived to finish, invited Wagner to collaborate with him. Wagner agreed, and we shall soon return to the subject of this collaboration. In brief, the foreigner, who, two or three years earlier hardly knew a word of English, was already establishing himself as an important member of the society of British scholars.

As early as 1866, two years after his arrival in England, Wagner had made up his mind to settle down in this country, and tried to obtain the headmastership of a public school - we are not told which. He received glowing testimonials from various English and German academics. Munro spoke of 'his critical sagacity, and the extent and accuracy of his knowledge' as well as of the 'originality and independence of his mind... his apparent force combined with great modesty of character, and (what is not unworthy of notice, since he is a German)... the remarkable mastery of English idiom and the excellence of his pronunciation'. But Key, in his testimonial, added to words of praise the phrase 'but he is a foreigner', as if any English public school needed to be reminded of that.

Failing in this, Wagner stayed on in Manchester until the end of 1867. In the meantime, he became engaged to Hannah, daughter of a Mr. J. Trowsdale, Esq., (as the German biographer has it), of Whitby, Yorkshire, and their marriage took place in January 1868. Both Wagner's research interests and Mrs. Wagner's desire to leave the provinces pointed to London, and in March 1868 they took a house at 8, Christchurch Road, Hampstead N.W., where they continued to live until they left England, and where, next year, their first son was born. A proper post was still out of reach, and Wagner supported himself by private tuition, the writing of school texts, lectures on Shakespeare and the Elizabethans (on whom he had by now become an expert) in the local grammar school and various women's institutes - and, in the midst of all this, with a certain amount of social life and entertaining thrown in, he devoted his spare time (God only knows where he got it), to reading and writing. When his father visited him in London and saw the way he lived and worked, he warned him that he would not live to be forty.

In the meantime, an examinership in Classics fell vacant in London University, and Wagner applied for it, in another attempt to stabilize his position in his country of adoption. He now produced testimonials from Key, Munro, Conington, Robinson Ellis, Ritschl and Fleckeisen, all - except Key's to which we shall presently return - praising him in no ambiguous terms. The post went to someone else. Money was running short in London, the family was growing, and at last, towards the end of 1869, Wagner accepted the invitation of Classen to return to Germany. Classen had become by now Headmaster of the Hamburg Johanneum, and had tried a few times to obtain the services of his old pupil. Now that all hopes on this side of the channel seemed to be shattered, Wagner accepted a post in Hamburg, and in 1870 he moved there with his family. From now until his death ten years later, he had to suffer the drudgery of a schoolmaster's life, teaching mainly English to uninterested schoolboys. It took him some time to find his feet and talk to his pupils as teacher to student rather than as one scholar to another. Calamity followed upon calamity. A second son, born in 1871, died in the following year. Wagner himself became ill, and a rest cure seemed to help - but the years of drudgery were taking their toll. In 1874 he was elevated to the rank of Professor (roughly equivalent to a Senior Master in an English school). But money was still short, and many of the books he published during these years were obviously written as pot-boilers. To this category belong all his school editions of French and German classics, with English notes and introductions, written for the Pitt Press Series. They are admirable little productions in their own way - his edition of Hermann und Dorothea of 1875 is still a model of what a school commentary can be turned into in the hands of a learned and sensitive editor - but for the scholar, interested in his own research, this was a mere waste of time. His chances of a chair in Germany were minimal, not only because

of his long absence in England, but mainly because of a review of vol. II of Ritschl's *Opuscula* which he had published in the Transactions of the Philological Society in London (3). In this review, Wagner not only had the audacity to differ from the Master, and agree with some of his 'renegade' pupils, on some points in Plautine scholarship - he also dared to remonstrate with Ritschl for his haughtiness and his contempt for some of his pupils and followers. 'A little more tolerance', he had written, 'would not disgrace even a Ritschl'. He forgot that, in the civilized world we live in, only children are punished for telling lies, adults are penalized for telling the truth - as we have seen, this is a mistake which our hero made repeatedly and therein, for those interested in the problems of practical ethics, may lie the moral of our tale. Ritschl had, in the meantime, become a 'Geheimrath', and no academic appointment in the Classics in any German university could pass without his consent. And he never forgave Wagner the offence of speaking up - and in English - in 1867. When, in 1875, Wagner applied for chairs in Marburg and Graz, the door was closed - and Ritschl's vengeance continued even beyond the grave. In 1876, Wagner applied for the Chair of Latin in Leipzig, now vacant after the death of Ritschl himself. This was his last abortive attempt to escape the fate of an English master in a secondary school.

In the midst of all this, his scholarly activities continued unabated. In 1872, he published an edition, with English notes, of the *Trinummus*. In 1876, his revised *Aulularia* came out. Here, the section on the MSS and the critical apparatus were skipped, and the editor promised to make up for this with a critical edition of the whole of Plautus, which he never lived to finish. His *Trinummus* received an enthusiastic welcome in a review by Henry Nettleship (9). Other works of his in the same field were received with open arms and became standard commentaries in schools and universities all over England. The second, 1876, edition of the *Aulularia*, was still in demand when, seven years after his death, it was reprinted. The *Apology and Crito* of 1869, revised in 1874, was again revised and reprinted in 1876, and then reprinted in 1886. The picture is the same when we turn to any of his Classical books. They were all in continuous demand for the best part of thirty years, and a whole generation of English students was brought up on them, as representatives of the latest results of German scholarship in a clear and distinct English style. Even German reviewers complained of the lack of commentaries of a similar nature for the use of German students.

At the same time, Wagner made use of his expertise in the field of Elizabethan poetry. His editions with English notes include Marlowe's *Edward III* (1871) and *Doctor Faustus* (1877), and the whole of Shakespeare (1879). For the German reader he published editions of *Macbeth* (1872) and *Henry V* (1873), and a book (1874), called '*Shakespeare und die neueste Kritik*'. This is not the complete list.

While in London, in 1869, Wagner was tutor to a son of the rich Greek family of Cassaveti, and in their house, he met the Greek scholar, writer and statesman Dimitrios Vikelas, who became his lifelong friend. Vikelas encouraged Wagner to return to his Modern Greek studies, and already in 1869, the first fruits of this new impetus saw the light in his *Mediaeval Greek Texts*, for which he had collected materials in MSS in London and Paris, and which was published in London in 1870. In the following years, Wagner made this new field his specialty, and published first editions of a number of *Mediaeval Greek texts*, mainly poetic. They include the *Romance of Imberios and Margarona*, published in Paris, with French notes, in 1874; the *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi* - still one of the most important books in the field, published in the same year in Leipzig; and the *Alphabet of Love*, published with a German translation, and dedicated to Vikelas, in 1879. This apart from 'light entertainment' in the form of translations of Vikelas' book on the Greeks in the Middle Ages, and a translation into German, completed a few months before his death, of his friend's famous novel, *Loukis Laras* - a novel which is still one of the minor classics of Modern Greek literature, and has just been reprinted in Athens as a paperback. Here, in the

field of Mediaeval Greek, was a new area of research and discovery, where Wagner soon established himself as a pioneer - and in October 1879, after years of sheer drudgery, he obtained a leave of absence from his school in order to go to MS libraries in Italy and prepare a new collection of hitherto unpublished Greek poems. He made his way from library to library, working with his usual speed and accuracy, and enjoying Italy in a way that only a man who is both a Classical scholar and a modern linguist can. But the years of subhuman living conditions had done their work, and when he caught a common cold in Naples, it soon developed into typhoid fever, which killed him on April 15th, 1880, when he was not yet 37 years old.

I propose to postpone for a later part of this essay the discussion of Wagner's place in the history of Victorian scholarship. The problem which should interest us more than any other, and which dictated my choice of the title, is, what went wrong with Wagner's attempt to establish himself in the scholarly world of Great Britain. Here the information given by his German biographer is scanty and somewhat elusive. A Wagner archive still exists in the Johanneum in Hamburg, and I am very grateful to its present Headmaster, Dr. Walter Blume, for his kindness in sending me a very detailed description of its contents. It seems to contain, apart from Wagner's library and copies and fair copies of all his publications, a fairly substantial amount of his personal documents and private correspondence, on which Metz drew in his biographical essay. I have not been able to consult these archives, and the only documents I have obtained in microfilm, through the kindness of Dr. Blume, are the testimonials used by Wagner in 1868. They are printed, and most probably by some private printer in London.

But all the clues lead to Professor Thomas Hewitt Key, M.A.(Cantab.), F.R.S., Professor Comparative Grammar in University College, London and Headmaster of University College School. And it is to this powerful personage that we should now turn our attention.

We have already seen that it was Key who encouraged the new arrival on the English scene to publish his *Aulularia*, and thus gave him the first introduction to the British publishing world. But we have also seen that the relations between Key and Wagner became somewhat strained in the following years, and probably deteriorated even more as time went on. No respect for persons could stop Wagner from expressing his opinions, in the most candid and honest (two epithets constantly used of him by his contemporaries) manner, on points of scholarship. In the same edition of the *Aulularia*, published at Key's instigation and dedicated to him, Wagner made, as we have seen, no secret of his true opinions about Key's theories of early Latin scansion and pronunciation. It may not be an accident that it was Key who, in 1866, emphasized in his testimonial for Wagner the fact that 'he is a foreigner', while others, like Munro, laid their emphasis on the fact that his command of English was perfect. It is only in his testimonial of 1869 that Key admits that 'in his knowledge alike of English literature and the English language there are few Englishmen who can surpass him, and he speaks with all the fluency and accuracy of a well-educated native Englishman'. But even this testimonial is not free of ambiguities. Key talks of receiving from Wagner 'a valuable stream of information' on any subject they discussed. I do not know - and we are not told - whether Wagner was talkative, but this is certainly the impression one receives from Key's phrasing. Key continues: 'I have limited my direct testimony to his Latin scholarship, and this for two reasons; first, because my own means of forming an opinion on other sides have been but small, and secondly because anything I could have said would necessarily have been without weight' (10). This, I believe, is plain prevarication. Key had not limited his testimony to Latin - for has he not just spoken of the 'valuable stream of information' he obtained from Wagner on 'any one' of 'the subjects for discussion that arose between us',

which 'were very numerous'? As for the weight of his opinions on any subject except Latin, this is surely an extreme form of modesty, coming from a man who, for the last seventeen years, had been the only Professor of Comparative Grammar in Great Britain, Headmaster of a distinguished school, a founding member, and often president, of the Philological Society, a Fellow of the Royal Society since 1860, a doctor of medicine by training (though he never practised it), an ex-professor of Mathematics in the University of Virginia, and who professes to base his testimony on good personal acquaintance. We shall soon have reasons to believe that extreme modesty of this kind was alien to the character of Professor Key. As a well-known and influential man in the University of London and in University College School, such limitation of his testimonial (for an examinership in Classics!) to Latin only could not but imply that the writer had no great faith in the other qualifications of the particular candidate. And it may be significant that all the prestige and influence which Key had in London University could not, in the end, secure a post there for his protégé. Could not or would not?

One asks inevitably, what happened to the collaboration between Key and Wagner on the Latin Dictionary? His biographer's words are very interesting: 'Key was then (during Wagner's visit to London in 1865 - J.G.) working on the preparation of his great Latin Lexicon, and asked the 25-year-old Wagner to collaborate with him. Since this undertaking involved not only reputation, but a yearly salary of £120, apart from future royalties, Wagner accepted, defining firmly in the contract his independence as an equal collaborator (the title page should bear the name of both authors, and each item should carry the initials of its compiler). Already by March of the following year (1868), the collaboration developed into a friendship, and Wagner gave up his independence as an equal collaborator; for Mr. Key - as he says in a letter - 'was or assumed to be not so much my partner as my superintendent'. Here it seems clear to me that Metz has not quite understood the English undertones in Wagner's letter - and I would have liked to see the complete text of this letter, if it is still preserved. The words 'was or assumed to be not so much my partner as my superintendent' sound to me like the expression of wounded pride rather than satisfied friendship (11).

Key's own side of this collaboration is preserved in a somewhat cryptic sentence in a Memoir of the Professor, printed for private circulation by his friend and pupil John Power Hicks, of which a copy exists in the British Museum (12): 'He made at least two attempts', says Hicks (pp.12-13), 'to avail himself of the work of assistants in this much larger undertaking (the reference is to the Latin Dictionary, which was originally conceived by Key as a mere supplement to Andrewes - J.G.), but these attempts were found unpromising and he fell back upon his own exertions'. I see no reason to doubt that Wagner was one of those two assistants, who, as Key probably told Hicks privately, were found to be unpromising.

One remembers that, when Wagner first met Key, it was before the publication of his *Aulularia*. It was then, as his biographer tells us, that he was invited by Key to collaborate with him on the Dictionary. When the *Aulularia* appeared in 1866, Key must have been shocked at the editor's audacity in criticizing his benefactor's views of Latin prosody and pronunciation. That Key could be, and was at times, vindictive, we shall soon see. But Key was also a gentleman, and he had given the strange foreigner his promise of support and had asked him to help with the Dictionary. On these promises he could not go back. But his support, I believe, was henceforth given with reluctance and in no unambiguous terms. As for the Dictionary, the work continued, but Key did his best to put Wagner in his place and to become 'the onlie begetter' and sole author, making the impudent émigré feel that he was now only an assistant.

But there were, I think, other and weightier reasons. We have already had a glimpse of Key's unscientific approach to the prosody and metres of early Latin. But Key's philological eccentricities were by no means restricted to this field. His prowess in the field of Latin etymology was no less notorious. When his Latin Dictionary, in an incomplete form and, of course, with no acknowledgement to

Wagner or anyone else, was posthumously printed by the Cambridge Press in 1888, it was reviewed in The Academy by that knowledgeable and sensible scholar, A. S. Wilkins (13). Wilkins is always worth listening to, but here one needs no excuse for quoting his posthumous judgement of Key's approach to etymology:

'But it is a much more serious objection to the issue of the work in its present form that it teems with etymologies of the type so lamentably frequent in Professor Key's publications. In the present state of philological science, it is a matter which calls for plain speaking ... Professor Key's etymologies are throughout based on two or three assumptions. The first is that there are no sound laws characteristic of particular languages... Now, if these assumptions are legitimate, it necessarily follows that hundreds of graduates trained in the last few years by the Cambridge lecturers have been rewarded by university distinctions for their faith in cunningly devised fables. But if the teaching sanctioned by the University is anything more than a delusion, then the issue of this dictionary can only be compared to the issue of a treatise on the Ptolemaic system in the generation following the appearance of Newton's principia'.

The eccentricity of Key's etymologies was not unknown during the Professor's lifetime. John William Donaldson, in his epoch-making book, The New Cratylus, has some relevant remarks (14). He tells us in a footnote (p.238) of Key's attempts to derive the Latin eia from audin. 'Of course', he adds, 'he never heard of the Greek εία, and he is prepared, we presume, to find a new parentage for eiulare'. In another note (p.465), he reminds us of another of Key's etymologies: 'The Professor of Comparative Grammar, to whose ludicrous performances we have occasionally averted, has put together a tissue of absurdities in his attempt to trace the Greek, Latin and English synonyms for good, better, best and well to a common origin. For instance, optimus is o-pet-unus = o-bet-unus = bet-est = best; the initial vowel being here merely to furnish the astonished reader with the necessary exclamation. Some cruel wag will suggest that the author of such derivations ought to be promoted at once to the professorship of superlative philology'. These are only two examples brought by Donaldson (15). Wilkins, in the review just quoted, supplies us with other specimens: 'Uxor is ocus-or, and so implies a lost verb, ocus-o - Gk. οπου (i.e. οπουω), marry; the -or of uxor, dim. of affection, like -or of sor-or'. 'Lucus perh. for solucus, a lost adj., of which sol is the root, analogous to Eng. hallow, Germ. selig'. Almost like the traditional 'lucus a non lucendo'.

Wagner was no Sanskrit scholar - we do not know that he ever studied that language. But one can have no two opinions about his likely reaction to such an approach to etymology, and there is little need to guess whether or not he kept his mouth shut, and what may have been the result.

Key's biographer in the DNB presents us with a rosy picture of his scholarly attainments. He quotes words of praise from Robinson Ellis for the Latin Grammar, and then adds: 'In January 1831, in reviewing Zumpt's Latin Grammar (Quarterly Journal of Education), Key made the first proposal in print to apply the methods of the Sanskrit grammarians to the study and teaching of Latin and Greek, but previously to 1831 the crude-form system had been expounded in his classical lectures'. The candid reader of the DNB, who only knows that, in 1842, after nine years in the Chair of Latin in University College, London, Key resigned his post for the Chair of Comparative Grammar, 'discharging the duties of the latter chair without salary until his death', can only assume that here was a man with a good knowledge of the new science, a master of Sanskrit, who, like Sir William Jones before him, hit upon an important discovery concerning the relations between Sanskrit grammar and that of Greek and Latin, and was the first to put it on paper, since he was the first to discover it. The words are, indeed, those of Key himself (16): 'The first proposal in print to apply the principle (of crude-form - J.G.) to the analysis of the Classical languages was made by the present writer in a review of Zumpt's Latin Grammar ... The system had been previously expounded (but note that Key does not say 'expounded by me' - J.G.) in the classical lecture room of the University of London (now University College)'.

It is probably true that the term 'crude-form system', meaning the analysis of nouns and verbs according to stem rather than an accidental first form like the nominative singular, was first applied to Latin in print by Key. But in the article mentioned, nothing is said by Key about the fact that this is the method of the Sanskrit grammarians. In fact, he calls it (17) 'the more philosophical division of the conjugations adopted in all Greek grammars and now expounded in the small Latin grammar of the Charterhouse'. To claim, after this avowal, that Key was the first to suggest that this system should be applied 'to the study and teaching of Latin and Greek' is to introduce strange standards into what should be a reference book based on careful historical scholarship.

But there is more light forthcoming - again from the candid pen of John Power Hicks (pp.10-11): 'Here he made the first proposal in print to apply the method of the Sanskrit grammarians to the study and teaching of Latin and Greek, and near the end of the paper occurs the earliest published use of the name 'crude-form' suggested by Rosen, for what is called 'stem' in the public school Latin Grammar'. On Key's own knowledge of Sanskrit, this is what Hicks (p.10) has to say: 'In 1829 Professor Key attended the lectures of his colleague, Dr. Rosen, on Sanskrit, but he never had leisure to acquire more than the elements of this language'. This fact is acknowledged by Key himself in his Philological Essays, 1868, p.249.

So the secret is out, at last. It was Friedrich August Rosen (1805-1837), Professor of Oriental Languages, and later of Sanskrit, in University College, London, who first suggested the un-English name of 'crude-form', with a hyphen, for what used to be called stem. Key may have been the first to put into print this suggestion, which he picked up in one of Rosen's lectures. It is significant that he himself uses the cautious phrasing about being the first to suggest this system in print, and that, when he talks of this system being previously expounded in the University of London, he carefully omits the names of any agents. There is no doubt that this is what is lurking behind Donaldson's remarks about Rosen in The New Cratylus (18): '... we must not forget that we really owe to him indirectly the first application of comparative philology to the public teaching of the classical languages, a merit which has been too eagerly claimed for and too readily conceded to the Greek and Latin Professors, who merely transmitted to their pupils the ideas and information which they had derived from their German colleague, and who, in the long period, more than a quarter of a century, which has since then elapsed, have not proved themselves capable of building on the foundations which he had laid'. If there is any doubt as to the true meaning of this passage, one only has to turn to a footnote to the corresponding passage in the second edition of 1850 (pp.45-6), which was omitted in the third: 'The author considers it incumbent on him to make these remarks, because, in the former edition of this work, he was led by a youthful feeling of regard for one of his tutors to admit the extravagant claims set up for the first Professors of Greek and Latin at University College. He has since become aware that these gentlemen were entirely indebted to Dr. Rosen for their first acquaintance with the principles of comparative philology, and that they filtered into their class-rooms the knowledge which they had picked up at the ill-attended lectures or in the instructive society of the editor of the Rig-Veda. At the time no doubt the Classical professors did not attempt to conceal their obligations to Dr. Rosen; but in the eagerness, which they have since shown, to gain a character for originality, they have made no mention of the fact that comparative philology was first taught at the London University because Dr. Rosen was there.' One need only add that the first professors of Greek and Latin in University College London were George Long and Thomas Hewitt Key.

Key's championship of the methods of Sanskrit grammar, which he plagiarized from Rosen and carefully masqueraded as his own invention, did not long outlast his futile attempts to learn that noble tongue - or the lifetime of his German instructor and source. Already in 1844, in one of his answers to Donaldson in the course of the Varronianus controversy (of which later), he makes the following statement (19): 'Thus called upon to make a confession of my faith in Bopp, I

beg, with all due humility, to speak as follows: Though I have deemed it my duty to read the *Vergleichende Grammatik* with care ... yet as regards theories I believe the book to be of very mixed value; to contain, on the one hand, much that is deserving of praise, and, on the other hand, much that is wholly erroneous'. This is all that the Professor of Comparative Grammar, occupying the only chair of its kind in Great Britain, has to say about the man whose work inaugurated the new era of Indo-European linguistics, and whose name is still the first to appear, after that of Sir William Jones, in any historical account of the pioneers in this department of knowledge. Later on, Key published a long article (20), under the title 'Quaeritur. The Sanskrit Language as the Basis of Linguistic Science; and the Labours of the German School in that Field - are they not over-valued?'. In it he argues, as already suggested by the title, that one should not - as he claims that the Sanskrit scholars do - use Sanskrit as the basis for the study of Indo-European languages in general, and Greek and Latin in particular. This, for a man who, to the end of his life, claimed for himself the credit for having made the first suggestion in print to apply Sanskrit methods to the study of Greek and Latin, is instructive. What is more instructive is the assumption made by a Professor of comparative grammar, that what the new Sanskrit scholarship aims at is to make Sanskrit the basis of the whole of Indo-European philology. This is tantamount to admitting that he did not even begin to understand what the word 'comparative' meant in this context.

But an understanding of this - in fact, the main principle of the new science - was hardly to be expected from its official exponent in Great Britain, and his rejection of it enabled Key to carry on with his pre-scientific theories in the fields of early Latin pronunciation, prosody and etymology, ignoring the criticisms of knowledgeable colleagues like Donaldson and Goldstuecker, and denouncing, from his official chair of the new science, the real achievements of those who made it a real discipline. This pantomime was allowed to continue, on one of the most elevated academic stages in Europe, for more than thirty years, and in the interludes the protagonist, assisted by a small chorus of supporters, kept claiming, by careful concealment and innuendo, that he was the first to apply to Greek and Latin the methods of the very Sanskrit grammarians whom he denounced elsewhere. If the ghost of Dr. Rosen did nothing during all these years (and it is significant that it was only in 1842, five years after Rosen's death, that Key had the courage to take up the Chair of Comparative Grammar), the Erinyes must certainly have turned into Eumenides.

We have seen enough to realize that, as a comparative linguist, Key was a fraud and an impostor. A plausible fraud, no doubt: he knew enough Latin to lecture on it and make some minor contributions to its lexicography which, where they were not concerned with his fantastic metres and etymologies, were sometimes quite valuable in their minor way. That he was an impostor, and a conscious one, is clear from the manner in which he so carefully worded the ascription to himself of a theory first suggested by Rosen. This brings us to the next virtues in Key's ἀρετολογία: his petty-mindedness and vindictiveness. Both were manifested in the famous controversy with Donaldson about the latter's *Varronianus*. When Donaldson published this book in 1844, Key printed a pamphlet, blaming the author for appropriating, without acknowledgement, materials first printed by Key in anonymous articles in *The Penny Cyclopaedia*. A battle of pamphlets ensued, and these were later collected and reissued by Key (21). The long and short of it is that Donaldson did use a number of philological tables and examples, of which the anonymous Key of the *Penny Cyclopaedia* was the first compiler. Strictly speaking, one could say that Donaldson should have acknowledged his debt. But his excuse for not doing so is reasonable and just (22): 'In regard to original results, general principles, emendations of corrupt passages, every thing, in fact, which amounts to discovery, it is held that the most scrupulous references ought to be made to the source from which the information is derived. But with regard to the mere raw materials of scholarship - quotations, illustrations, lexicography, tabular comparisons etc. it is held that every scholar is entitled to consider them as an advantage with which he was born - his τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ...' To this, Key has no reply, and

he emerges from the controversy as a mean and jealous man, who would fight tenaciously to win recognition for small services to scholarship which he should have been glad to see turned into common use by a greater and better man.

But Key's attitude is explained when we examine his remarks on pp. 4-5 of his original 'Remarks on the Varronianus'. Donaldson had quoted in his book a whole array of foreign names: Niebuhr, Grimm, Bopp, Lobeck and others, and included even - God forbid! - some Italian names. But the name of that great meteor of philological science in Great Britain, Thomas Hewitt Key, appeared only once and in a casual remark. Donaldson, if not a man of great original mind, was a competent linguist who could judge rightly the importance of other people's achievements. Compared with the great pioneers of linguistic science on the continent, Key was a complete nonentity who later developed into a dangerous enemy of the science he professed to represent, and a mention of his name beside those of Grimm and Bopp would amount to turning a Thersites into the peer of Agamemnon and Achilles. This, however, was not Key's own picture of himself, and his resentment at being put in his place by a competent man resulted in this distant and full controversy (23).

With this picture of Key in mind, we can now guess what passed between him and Wagner. At the beginning of their acquaintance, Key probably believed that, by giving his support to the struggling new arrival, he could win to his own side a learned German, and a pupil of one of the greatest Latinists of his age. But he was soon to discover that, kind and obliging as Wagner was in his personal relations, he would stand no nonsense as far as scholarship was concerned. He saw through Key's metrical theories soon enough, and one assumes that it did not take him long to see through his absurd methods of etymology. Such a man was dangerous, and while Key pretended to help him in his most gentlemanly manner, he probably did his best, by default if nothing else, to help in shipping him back to Germany. It is significant that in his last two years in England Wagner dedicated two of his books to University College people. His *Apology* and *Crito* of 1869 is dedicated to W. A. Case, Fellow of University College, London. His *Phaedo* of 1870 is 'dedicated to my very dear friend E. R. Horton', who was Key's Vice-Headmaster in University College School. One cannot doubt Wagner's sincere friendship with these two people. Horton was certainly one of his closest friends, and the dedications to both reappear in all subsequent editions. But these dedications may also be an expression, in a way, of the author's feelings of belonging to University College, where he certainly hoped to make his career. I do not know how influential W. A. Case was in his College. Horton, one assumes, was completely in the grip of his powerful Headmaster (Key, I believe, would not stand any interference with his own authority: this may explain why Henry Malden, who started off as joint Headmaster with him, relinquished his post in University College School in 1842, although this involved no change in his position in the College itself). I think we can now understand why, in the revised edition of the *Aulularia*, which appeared in the year following Key's death, the dedication of the work to the late Professor of Comparative Grammar was omitted.

What sort of scholar did England lose when Wilhelm Wagner was constrained to leave the country of his adoption? Before one attempts to answer this question, there are a few facts which should be borne in mind. The first one is a fair warning given us by Adolf Metz at the beginning of his biographical sketch. Wagner died at an age when many a great scholar would still be at the beginning of his career. Had Bentley died at the age of 37, he would now be known in the history of scholarship only for his *Epistola ad Millium* and his *Phalaris*: no mean achievement, that, but only a small part of Bentley's real contribution to scholarship. Housman, whose material hardships in the years following on his graduation can be compared with those of Wagner, published his first *Manilius* when he was 44. Had he died at 37, his only claim to fame would be his early articles, which, at his death, he did not deem worthy of republication. Scaliger's *De Emendatione Temporum*, Casaubon's *Athenaeus*, Sir William Jones' essay which announced his dis-

covery of the Indo-European nature of Sanskrit, Porson's Euripides - these are only some examples of works which would never have been written had their authors died at 37. But one should also remember that the authors of most of these works enjoyed much better facilities for study and research than did an impoverished house-tutor in Manchester, an overworked teacher, lecturer and writer of school texts in London, or an English master in a secondary school in Hamburg.

Of Wagner's linguistic talents there is no doubt. When he left school, he was already fluent in French, Italian and Modern Greek, apart from the Classical languages, and two years in England made him an expert on the Elizabethan period in English literature, all written in a language he had to learn from scratch. But he was no comparative philologist. He knew no Sanskrit or any other of the older members of the Indo-European group, except Greek and Latin, and his writings show no inclination towards the new discipline. His whole approach to language was that of the more traditional 'grammaticus', and the direction to it was probably given at the hands of Ritschl.

Nor was he a great textual critic. Of all the emendations he offered to the text he knew best, Plautus' Aulularia, only six have lived to be mentioned in Lindsay's Oxford Text (ll.262, 268, 377, 449, 559, 811), and of these, only the last two are admitted into the text itself. His emendations are usually of the 'indifferent' type. In Phaedo 95b6, he offers us *τον λόγον τον μέλλοντα ὁηθήσεσθαι* for the MSS readings *ἔσεσθαι* (accepted by most editors after Bekker) and *λέγεσθαι* (which most editors agree is a gloss). This - his only emendation to the text of this dialogue - is not an impossibility. But unless one can see what is wrong with a simple and slightly vague Attic colloquialism like *ἔσεσθαι* there is no need to emend.

His ideas about the establishment of a text out of the MSS are sometimes strangely reactionary for a man brought up in Germany, by the former teacher of Bernays, more than ten years after Lachmann's Lucretius. His text of the Apology and Crito is, as he says in the preface, 'almost throughout in strict conformity with the Bodleian MS, deviations from which are admitted only in those places, where other reasons seemed to render them absolutely necessary'. But one has to remember that 'Lachmann's Method', although it seems obvious to most of us, took some years to penetrate into the consciousness of editors. As far as Plato's text is concerned, it was almost twenty-five years after Lachmann's Lucretius that Cobet (24) could still pronounce his famous dictum about burning all the MSS but one, and almost half a century after Lachmann, in an edition of Plato's Republic published by the Cambridge Press in 1899, James Adam still allowed himself to follow Parisinus A as the 'best manuscript'.

The truth is that Wagner was more of a polymath than a scholar. He had a genuine desire and enthusiasm for linguistic and literary knowledge, an intelligent and sensitive mind, naturally adapted to the careful and sympathetic reading of a great variety of poetic texts, and sensible judgement of the contributions made to the various fields of his interest by people of a more original turn of mind. He was no great discoverer, innovator or herald of new methods and systems, and, being an extremely modest man, never made any such claims for himself. But he was an ideal editor of poetic texts, and, from his collation of the hitherto unutilized MS J of Plautus for his first edition of the Aulularia, to his later editions of mediaeval Greek poetry, he showed how a man of intelligent and careful habits, even though he has no great originality, can widen the horizons of his subject. As a commentator, he was eminently suitable - to quote Henry Nettleship (25) - 'to put the questions at issue in a clear light, and to illustrate them with candid and sensible discussion'. In this manner, he became the educator, in some departments of the Classics and modern languages, of a whole generation of British students.

Had he lived longer, one can guess that he would have turned himself into one of the major exponents of the results of Latin scholarship in Germany. He would certainly have become a leading expert in the field of mediaeval and early modern Greek Verse - a subject which still stands in need of much more work than has been done in it so far. His pioneering efforts in this field, where the careful

collation and emendation of a limited sort of texts was a work most suitable to his abilities and temperament, were fully recognized and rewarded by scholars in Greece. He was elected in his lifetime a Member of the Greek Order of the Redeemer (1875), and of the Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος of Constantinople (1874) and the Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Παρνασσός in Athens (1874). After his death, an obituary was published by that prince of Greek mediaevalists Spiridon Lambros (26). Lambros makes no secret of the fact that, at the beginnings of his activity in this field, the language of mediaeval Greek poetry still held some secrets from him - a fact which should hardly astonish us if we remember that, on his death at the age of 37, this eminent expert on mediaeval Greek had as yet had no opportunity of visiting Greece itself. But Lambros counts Wagner, along with Legrand himself, as one of the two pioneers of the systematic study of mediaeval Greek texts, and calls him the first to apply to these texts the critical methods developed by his German masters in the Classical field. Ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ κινήσει ἥτις κατὰ τὰ τελευταῖα ἔτη παρατηρεῖται περὶ τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἡμῶν ποίησιν δυνάμεθα θαρρούντως νὰ εἰπώμεν ὅτι προσεστέται ὁ Βάγνερ.

The Greeks have not forgotten Wagner, and his name still appears in the latest issue (1927) of Elefterodaki's Encyclopedic Lexicon, and of the Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια (1957). This, as we have seen, is more than anything done to cherish his memory in the two countries where he lived. Germany may excuse itself. It is there that he studied and, later, taught in a school (and that school, at least, has kept his archives and published his only biography so far). But it was in England that he matured as a scholar, it is here that his first books appeared, and, even after his return to Germany, he continued to publish most of his books - and not only the pot-boilers - in the English language. The Dictionary of National Biography devotes three columns to Key, and in the Encyclopedia Britannica, as long as it was published in this country, there was a short item on Key as well. In vain does one look for Wagner's name there. The four lines which I quoted earlier on from Sandys' History of Classical Scholarship are, to my knowledge, the only monument to the memory of Wagner in English letters. They made no mention of his multifarious contributions to scholarship England - apart from three of his English works - or of his long sojourn in this country. In a history of scholarship written 'sub aeternitatis specie', Wagner may not deserve more than three lines. But in a History which gives Key thrice the space devoted to Wagner, one begins to wonder what has happened (27). Sandys was a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, where Key had been a brilliant undergraduate.

As I have said before, Wagner's library and archives are still in existence in the Johanneum in Hamburg. They were used by Metz for his biographical sketch. But we have seen how many questions, especially those connected with Wagner's life in England, remain unanswered, while the materials have been available for almost a century. England did not treat Wagner as he deserved. Even when he died, some of the obituary notices in British papers were laughable. An example is the notice in The Academy, May 8, 1880, p.341: 'The death is announced of Prof. Wilhelm Wagner, of the Johanneum, Hamburg, best known for his publications of mediaeval Greek texts.' - And Mr. Handel was best known for some operas in the Italian style. So much for Wagner's many contributions to scholarship in Great Britain (28). Britain owes Wagner some reparations, and the present essay is only a modest effort in this direction. Whether he will ever enter the Sanctum of the Dictionary of National Biography and enjoy there the company of eminent scholars like Thomas Hewitt Key I know not, although I believe that his activities in this country and his contributions to the development of British scholarship would justify this, even though he was not born and did not die in Great Britain. But some British scholar with the suitable background and an interest in the history of Classical scholarship may find a worse occupation for his leisure than a few months spent in the archives at the Johanneum on the preparation of a full-length biography, based on the first-hand materials. Apart from the mere human interest afforded by Wagner's life, short as it was, he had a number of great men who were his friends and correspondents. They include Ritschl and Fleckeisen in Germany, Munro, Gommington, Nettleship and Robinson Ellis in

England, and Vikelas and Lambros in Greece - to name but a few. A full biography of Wagner in English will throw light on the incidents of his life in this country in a period of great importance for British scholarship, refuting or confirming, as the case might be, the conjectures made in the present essay. It may explain the reasons for his failure to establish himself here in greater detail. It will constitute a belated act of atonement for the sufferings he had to undergo at the hands of the first Professor of Comparative Grammar in Great Britain.

I cannot conclude without returning for a short while to Cottonopolis, the place where lack of adequate research facilities made Wagner suffer so much for four of the best years of his life. Owens College, founded in 1851, was, when Wagner reached Manchester, a rather negligible affair. It has developed very fast since, and is now, as the University of Manchester, one of the greatest centres of learning in the country. Its library is today - and has been for a considerable time - one of the best provincial university libraries in England, and, since 1900, there has also been the magnificent John Rylands Library. A number of competent Classical scholars have lived in Manchester since Wagner left it, and have produced some useful works of scholarship. Perhaps the greatest of them is Augustus Samuel Wilkins, who, in 1868, was appointed Lecturer in Latin, and in the next year was made Professor of Latin and Lecturer in Comparative Philology at Owens College. Wilkins came to Manchester as a last resort: he was debarred from a fellowship in his own University, Cambridge, for committing the double crime of being a nonconformist and getting married. His first years in Manchester were probably as difficult as Wagner's, and for the same reasons. But from the 1870's onwards, his publications began to come forth and to establish his name as one of the leading Latinists in the country. His Oxford Text of the Rhetorical works of Cicero is still a sensible and useful one, in spite of more recent, and fuller, critical texts by Reis and Malcovati. His commentary on the Epodes is still one of the best of its scope in English, and his great commentary on the De Oratore, recently reprinted in Germany, is a work of Latin scholarship which still rightly familiar to all students of the subject. With his friend and colleague E. B. England, Wilkins translated into English two books by Georg Curtius, which made the young generation of English students familiar with some of the new methods of Greek linguistics on the continent. All this work could be done - was done - in Manchester, and one can venture a guess that, had Wagner arrived there twenty years later, he would have found conditions there more favourable to philological studies than they were in 1866. He would certainly have found the company of genuine scholars like Wilkins and England more congenial and refreshing than that of one, at least, of his colleagues in London.

One of Wilkins' first and most promising students in Owens College was a young Yorkshire lad called George Gissing, who, at the age of 15, in 1874, was already a distinguished Classical student, with a promise of a brilliant Classical career before him. As he did again and again in later life, Gissing wrecked his career at its most promising point, this time by contracting a hasty and unsuitable marriage. In the next twenty years, he worked as a teacher and a literary drudge in Boston and London, but established himself as one of the most famous English novelists of his day. In 1891, Gissing settled down in Exeter, and here he wrote, among other things, his famous novel *Born in Exile*. Like many of his novels, it is partly autobiographical. It is no business of mine to sum up the plot: a copy of the novel is mercifully available in Exeter University Library. What interests us is that the hero, Godwin Peak, a former student of Owens College (thinly disguised as Whitelaw College, Kingsmill), after years of drudgery in London, moves to Exeter, and here he falls in love with a local girl called Sidwell, who lives in a Victorian mansion at the north end of Old Tiverton Road - one of those beautiful houses which can still be seen there today. The novel is usually taken to be the first of its kind in English, written against the background of a redbrick university. This is an exaggeration. Only part of the first of its five parts is connected with Owens College, and only its first chapter actually takes place within the College itself. The few descriptions of Manchester are rather vague. But it is for its lovely descriptions of Exeter that one turns to this novel.

Exeter exercised a constant fascination on Gissing. His letters of the period (29) have some beautiful descriptions of Exeter and the happiness he found in this lovely and peaceful city. His last - perhaps his best - book, *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft* (1903), returns to this topic. After years of drudgery in London, the weary old veteran of letters at last settles down in a cottage near Exeter. This, for him, is a haven of rest after the exasperating years in the capital, and the beauty and peacefulness of the Devon countryside are superbly described.

Beautiful, quiet and peaceful Exeter still is - though perhaps not as much as it was seventy years ago. But our concern is with the history of Classical scholarship. When I read, a few years ago and in Exeter, Wagner's bitter remarks about lack of research facilities in the Manchester of his age, they struck a very familiar note. Exeter has had a University College for nearly fifty years, and full University status for the last twelve; it has had a Department of Classics for something like thirty years, with a full professor at its head for the last twenty. It still offers no adequate facilities for studying the Classics for those who wish to pursue it on research level. If Wagner had to live in Exeter today, one can image what his reaction would be. But why talk in conditionals and imperfects? There are now in Exeter a number of people, paid to be Classical scholars, interested in research in their subject, who feel continually frustrated for lack of proper research conditions. The present essay is a good specimen. It is not a proper contribution to Classical scholarship, but rather marginal to it. Its author can only consider it as a parergon - though he has found his preoccupation with its subject, with all its detective problem, a rather fascinating thing. The point is that even an essay like this, where almost all the materials come from English publications of the last hundred years or so, could never have been written in Exeter conditions. Even inter-library loans and the London Library were not enough, and a good few days in the British Museum were an absolute necessity even for the composition of an essay like this. The comparison with Manchester, where, a century after Wagner left it, it is possible for a scholar like Gunther Zuntz to enrich our knowledge of Classical, Hellenistic and Byzantine Greek year after year, without having to take the train to London whenever he has to finish the smallest article or note, is striking. After twenty years of existence, Manchester was already capable of providing Wilkins with the proper means of writing Classical books of a high standard. After more than half a century, Exeter still has not provided us with anything comparable to it. A future student of the history of Classical scholarship in this country, if he ever finds it of any interest to turn his gaze on the Exeter of the 1960's (and the Spartans answered: 'If'), may find it useful to have before him a clear statement of this fact. Perhaps by his time, if he lives a hundred years or so hence, the words of the hero of *Born in Exile* (30) may have become a reality:

'I shall stay first of all in Exeter', Godwin replied with deliberation; 'one can get hold of books there'.

J. GLUCKER

NOTES

1. Introduction to *Manilius I*, p.xlii.
2. July 13, 1872, pp.62-3: a review of Wagner's *Trinummus*.
3. Commentary, pp.100-101.
4. For example, note 2 pp.10-11; note 1 p.21 - which is completely new; note 1 p.33 - again, new to this edition; and note 2 pp.36-7.
5. British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books, vol. 251, pp.489-492.

6. vol. 3, p.143.
7. For details, see lists of members and tables of contents in the Transactions of the Philological Society 1866-1880.
8. Trans.Phil.Soc. 1867, pp.399-422.
9. The Academy, August 1, 1872, pp.298-9. See also review of his Terence, Athenaeum 2189, Oct. 9, 1869, pp. 460-1.
10. I take these quotations from a photocopy on microfilm of a testimonial of March 13, 1869, kindly sent by Dr. Blume.
11. Metz, pp. X-XI, in my English translation. I assume that the reference to 1868 as 'the following year' must mean 'the year following the contract', not 'the year following the first suggestion of such a collaboration'. For, in p.X, Metz tells us about the acquaintance struck up between Key and Wagner during Wagner's visit to London in 1865, and then says that it was then ('damals') that Key was working on his dictionary and invited Wagner to collaborate. It was probably in 1867, when Wagner had come to realize that Key's relations to himself had become somewhat ambiguous, that he demanded the contract. Key, I assume, needed a harmless drudge to do the donkey work for him, and the contract was signed. Wagner needed the money, and, even as Key became more and more tyrannical, he carried on with the work as long as he could. How he was finally sacked we are not told. In any case, what Metz says and quotes certainly gives me the impression that documentary evidence was available to him - and is most probably still available at the Johanneum - which would settle this problem.
12. T. Hewitt Key, A Short Memoir, by John Power Hicks...printed for private circulation, London 1893.
13. The Academy 33, May 5, 1888, pp.309-310.
14. I quote from the posthumous fourth edition, London 1868, which is identical with the third edition, the last to appear in Donaldson's lifetime and to be revised by him.
15. For others see pp. 248, 340, 436, 474 and 587.
16. Latin Grammar, 1862 edition, p.423.
17. Quarterly Journal of Education 1, 1831, p.98.
18. The New Cratylus, fourth edition p.55.
19. A Rejoinder to the Reply etc.. (see note 21), London 1844, p.24.
20. Reprinted in his Philological Essays, 1868, p.248ff.
21. The Controversy about the Varronianus... printed for private circulation, London 1845.
22. A Reply to the Calumnies and Misrepresentations etc...(see note 21). Cambridge 1844, pp.2-4.
23. On the whole question of Donaldson's attitude to the claims put forward by Key and Long, see Appendix.
24. Mnemosyne 1875, p.197.
25. In the review quoted earlier. See note 9.
26. Παρνασσός A, δ, 1880, σελ.331-4. Reprinted in the author's Πικτάι Σελίδες, σελ.772-6.
27. Vol.3, pp.429-430.
28. For longer and slightly more balanced obituaries, see The Times, April 26, 1880, p.8; Athenaeum No.2740, May 11, 1880, p.567.

29. Letters of George Gissing to members of his family, collected and arranged by Algernon and Ellen Gissing, London 1927, pp.312ff.
30. Born in Exile, new edition, London 1894, p.201.

A P P E N D I X

LONG, KEY AND THE NEW CRATYLUS

The first edition (1839) of *The New Cratylus* is dedicated 'To George Long, Esq., formerly Professor of Greek in the University of London, as a slight memorial of regard and esteem from his sometime pupil, the author'. In it, p.30, appear the following words: 'The establishment of an English school of philology is to be referred to the opening of the London University in 1828... and may be truly ascribed to the mode of teaching adopted by the first Greek Professor at that institution. It would be impertinent to speak here of the various labours of this scholar, but it is right to mention that to him and to his colleague in the Latin chair we owe the first application of comparative philology to the public teaching of the classical languages'. All that Donaldson has to say in this edition about Rosen is (p.35): 'We have indeed lost much by the recent death of Dr. Rosen, who, though a German, was by his residence in England, as Professor of Sanscrit in the University of London, almost naturalized among us, and had at all events consecrated his learning and abilities to the service of philology'. Not a word here about the fact, so clearly stated in later editions, that it is to him that we owe the real beginnings of the teaching of philology in London. This, in fact, has just been ascribed to the first Greek and Latin Professors, Key and Long. But it is significant that, even in this early edition, the author does not give the names of Long and Key in his historical chapter, and never mentions them, even by their titles, on pp.35-6, among those scholars in Britain whose printed work has contributed to the advance of comparative philology.

The second edition of *The New Cratylus* appeared in 1850, six years after the Varronianus controversy. We have just seen how Key behaved in this controversy, of which he was the prime mover. Key and Donaldson, throughout this controversy, appealed to George Long as an independent judge. After a long silence on his side, while both Key and Donaldson remained very active, Long sent a letter to Key - the last document to appear in the 'collected papers' of this controversy. In his letter, Long expressed, in very careful terms, his general wish to be left out of the controversy. But he did not abstain from castigating Donaldson for the sharpness of some of his replies. A modern reader cannot help feeling that Long understood the point at issue and that, although he was an old friend of Key's (he had sponsored, as early as 1828, Key's appointment to the chair of Latin in London), he could not bring himself down to taking Donaldson's 'plagiarisms' as seriously as Key wished him to take them. But, because he was a friend of Key - and only an old and helpful tutor to Donaldson - he did take the step of addressing the final letter to Key, and he did blame Donaldson for his hard language, without even a hint of blame for Key, whose idiocy was the first cause of the whole ridiculous episode. Moreover, Long implies in his letter that, in a private conversation with Donaldson, he had admitted the justice of the latter's point of view - but then he proceeds to say that it was ungentlemanly of Donaldson to publish the contents of a private conversation!

For such 'gentlemanly' behaviour, Long had now forfeited any claim to the 'regard and esteem from his sometime pupil', and it is not surprising that the second edition of *The New Cratylus* is dedicated, not to George Long, but to Trinity College, Cambridge. Here, the statement about Key and Long is, of course,

omitted where it appeared in the first edition (p.39 = p.30 of the first ed.), and, instead, we now have the statement about Dr. Rosen in its new and extended form, and the footnote on pp.45-6 added, in which the claims of Key and Long for any originality in the field of comparative philology are exploded. I have already quoted a long extract from this footnote, and one can only add that Donaldson's phrase concerning 'a youthful feeling of regard to one of his former tutors' refer, of course, to George Long, who had 'discovered' Donaldson when he was a student in London in 1830-31, and was then instrumental in sending him to Cambridge. 'Reverence and esteem' are, after all, the terms used in the dedication to Long of the 1839 edition.

As we have seen, what angered Key more than anything else in the Varronianus was the fact that here, in the Latin counterpart of The New Cratylus, he was no longer mentioned as one of those who first introduced philology into London, and his name only appeared once, and in a minor context. This was seven years after the death of Dr. Rosen, two years after Key had assumed the chair of Comparative Grammar in London. I believe (though lack of books in Exeter does not allow me to examine the evidence at present) that, by this time, Key had already made public his later, unscientific view about Latin pronunciation and etymology, and that Donaldson had, by that time, found out the truth about the real source of the new and revolutionary teaching of philology in London - which, in 1830-1, he himself had received at the hands of Key and Long, and for which, even as late as 1839, he still held them responsible. I think it not unlikely that Donaldson, who had many friends in London and its University, made no secret of this newly acquired information in his conversation, and that when his Varronianus came out, Key had good reasons to understand why he was so casually being treated in it. If this is the case, one may have here the ἀληθεσιότης πρόφασις of the Varronianus controversy. This can explain Donaldson's violent exposure of Long and Key in the 1850 edition of The New Cratylus. Here, he not only stated Rosen's claims and exploded those of Long and Key. It is also here that some of the footnotes containing those sarcastic remarks about Key's etymologies made their first appearance, and one of them (pp.222-3) is very much longer than its counterpart in later editions (p.248 of the fourth). In the third edition (1859, of which the fourth, printed after the author's death, is a mere reproduction), this note was shortened and others, but fairly short ones, were added. The long note about the claims of Long and Key on pp.45-6 of the second edition was here omitted, though part of it was added to the main text, in a slightly modified form. It looks as though, once he had explained at some length in his second edition the mistake he had made in the first about Key and Long, he was satisfied with inserting in the later editions a shorter statement of the facts. This may be because, even now, he still felt some respect towards Long, and did not wish, in the final version of the book, to harp on Long's part in the Rosen affair at great length. It is certainly significant that in the index to the later edition, Key's name appears, and one is referred to all the footnotes about Key, although in none of them is he mentioned by name. The only reference to Key, - anonymous like the rest, but unmistakable - which is not mentioned in the index, is to the passage about Rosen on p.55, where Long is mentioned in the same unsavoury context. Long's name never appears in the index. Long was a man to whom Donaldson owed some gratitude. Moreover, although one has no reason to disbelieve Donaldson's testimony that Long, along with Key, claimed after the death of Dr. Rosen praise which was due to Rosen himself, one can at least say in his defence that he never claimed to make any contributions in print, after 1830, to the advancement of philological studies. Long's publications after that date consist wholly of editions, with notes, of some Latin texts, translations from Greek and Latin (his Marcus Aurelius is still a classic in the field of translations of the Classical authors), and popular books on ancient and modern history. To all intents and purposes, the nineteenth century ceased to exist for George Long after 1830, and he made no claim to be one of the great philologists of that century. But it is interesting to see that, between 1828 and 1830, the first years of the University of London - and of Rosen's

activities in it, Long published a number of items concerned with the comparative philology of Greek and Latin. In 1830, Rosen left University College to live on private tutoring (until his return as Professor of Sanskrit in 1836), and Long returned to the eighteenth century.

But Key was a different man. As we have seen, he did not forsake his philological efforts when his former mentor and source died. Instead, he preferred to return to pre-Rosen and pre-Sanskrit methods (see *The Spectator*, May 5, 1888, pp.634-5), but remain officially a philologist and, while publicly becoming an enemy of the new science, still claim for himself a discovery of Rosen's for which he had merely acted as public relations officer. To Donaldson, who had spent most of his life trying to acquaint the British public with the results of comparative philology, this must have been even a more painful spectacle than it can ever be to a modern reader. Key's pompous and petty claims to fame, presented in such an unpleasant manner in the Varronianus affair, must have been the last straw. I believe that, in 1839, only two years after Rosen's death, and three years before Key took the chair of Comparative Grammar, Donaldson was quite candid and sincere in attributing to Key and Long the first introduction of comparative philology to the teaching of Greek and Latin in London. It is true that he says (footnote, p.46 of the second edition): 'at the time no doubt the Classical Professors did not attempt to conceal their debt to Dr. Rosen', and one remembers that, 'at the time' means the years soon after 1823, when Donaldson himself was for a while one of their pupils in London. But in 1831, and even as late as 1839, Donaldson may still have thought that what Key and Long owed Rosen was only a small part of their achievement, and that the main fact of introducing comparative philology into the Classical lecture room of London University was their own idea: after all, were they not a party to the appointment of Rosen himself? As long as Rosen was about, Long and Key were probably under his spell, and it took them some years after his death to recover. Long returned to the harmless pleasures of an eighteenth century don, and Key to the harmful theories of 'lucus a non lucendo'. A close friend like John Power Hicks knew, years after Key's death, and most probably from private conversation, that the suggestion to apply the 'crude-form' method to Latin was really made for the first time by Rosen. But when it was published in 1831, and even eight years later, Donaldson may still have thought that this was Key's own idea. It was only when, long after Rosen's death, Key turned himself into the official exponent in Britain of the new philology, and at the same time began to show himself in his true colours, that the truth of the matter must have dawned on Donaldson at last. One is tempted to speculate on the possibility that, some time between 1839 and 1844, someone 'in the know' told Donaldson the true source of Key's great discovery. Be that as it may, I see no reason to suspect the truth of Donaldson's statement in the second edition (note on p.46) that 'he has since then become aware' etc.. I therefore have no doubts about Donaldson's complete honesty in this matter. But for the Varronianus affair, he might have toned down the language of his footnote about Long and Key in the second edition - or he might even have been satisfied with a mere omission of the sentence confirming their claims. That he would in no case have retained this sentence, I have no doubt.

SOME ALLUSIONS IN GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE TO THE CENTER FOR
HELLENIC STUDIES, WASHINGTON D.C., AND ITS DIRECTOR.

[The contribution to scholarship which follows first appeared in Festschrift B.M.W. Knox MCMLXVII, and I am grateful to the honorand for permission to republish it. A few points need explaining. The Director is Professor Bernard Knox; Hector is the name of his huge and, to the author at least, terrifying dog. Mrs. Marie Beale bequeathed the land on which the Center stands, and Mr. Paul Mellon is its chief benefactor.

F.D.H.]

A number of allusions to the Center for Hellenic Studies and to its Director in Greek and Roman literature appear to have escaped the notice of scholars. It is my purpose in this brief note to call attention to the most remarkable of them.

The Center is briefly described by Plutarch [1]: ἡ δὲ περὶ τὰς ψῆδας καὶ τὰ μέλη παιδευσις οὐχ ἦν τὸν ἐσκουδάζετο τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις εὐζηλίας καὶ καθαριότητος ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μέλη κέντρον εἶχεν ἐγερτικὸν θυμοῦ καὶ παραστατικὸν ὁρμῆς ἐνθουσιῶδους καὶ πραγματικῆς : "Education in poetry and Hellenic studies was cultivated there no less than friendly rivalry in purity of diction; indeed it [Washington] had a Center for Hellenic Studies [2] to stimulate the spirit and to provoke enthusiastic and effective efforts." Similarly, in the Masps [3], Bdelycleon exclaims:
ἔχουσι γὰρ καὶ Κέντρον...
ὀξύτατον, ᾧ κεντοῦσι, καὶ κεκραγότες
πηδῶσι καὶ βάλλουσιν ὥσπερ φέφαλοι.

"For they have a most sharp-witted Center, where they make stinging remarks, and yell and leap about and knock people, like bright sparks." Pindar [4] refers both to the Fellows and to the founders:

... Κένταυρον ...
ἐκ δ' ἐγένοντο στρατὸς
θαυμαστός, ἀμφοτέροις
ὅμοιοι τοκεῦσι, τὰ μα-
τρὸθεν μὲν κάτω, τὰ δ' ὑπερθε πατρός.

"The Center ... which produced an amazing band of scholars, resembling both parents, like their mother [Mrs. Beale] in the lower parts, but like their father [Mr. Mellon] in the upper."

Like Plato's Academy, the Center attracted much abuse in antiquity. Echoes of this are preserved in Hesychius, where Κένταυροι [5] is explained as λησταί, "plagiarists", and Κενταυρικῶς as ἀγροικῶς. Similarly, Hesychius gives us νοῦς οὐ παρὰ Κενταύροις· παροιμιῶδες ... ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων ταπτόμενον : "'There's no intelligence in Centers': proverbially applied to incompetent scholars." An alarming picture of conditions in the Center is drawn by Seneca [6]: descriptus est carcer infernus et perpetuo Knocte oppressa regio, in qua

ingens ianitor Orci
ossa super recubans antro semesa cruento
aeternum latrans exsanguis terreat umbras.

"It is described as an infernal prison, and as an area oppressed by the continual presence of Knox, where 'the huge hound of Hell [Hector], lying in his bloody kennel on top of half-gnawed bones, terrifies the pale shades [the Fellows [7]] with his perpetual barking'". Thus too in the Aeneid [] the sleepless Dido is unable even to dream of the Director of the Center and his dog:

at non infelix animi Phoenissa neque umquam
solvitur in somnos oculisque aut Hectore Knoctem
accipit.

"But Dido is distraught and cannot get to sleep or even have (sc. the image of) Knox with Hector before her eyes". Finally, we have a very valuable piece of evidence which is preserved in Cicero [9]: a list of names, "all of whom they say were Knox's Junior Fellows". These are clearly the nicknames by which various Junior Fellows were known; it is beyond the scope of this article to attempt to identify the scholars in question. The passage runs as follows: "Amor, Dolus, Morbus, Labor, Invidentia, Fatum, Senectus, Mors, Tenebrae, Miseria, Querella, Cratia, Fraus, Pertinacia, Parcae, Hesperides, Somnia; quos omnis ... Knocte natos ferunt".

F.D. HARVEY

The Center for Hellenic
Studies, Washington

Notes:

- [1] Plut. Lycurg. 21.1. It will be seen that the spelling of the Greek word for the Center varies between Κέντρον and Κέντραρος; this reflects the difference between the English spelling "Centre" and the American "Center".
- [2] μέλη accusative of respect.
- [3] Aristoph. Wasps 225-7
- [4] Pind. Pyth. 2.44-8
- [5] The plural here and in the third citation from Hesychius must mean "the Center for Hellenic Studies and Dumbarton Oaks".
- [6] Sen. Epp. 82.16. perpetuo Knocte: perpetua nocte codd., absurde.
- [7] For the paleness of scholars, cf. e.g. Aristoph. Clouds 103.
- [8] Verg. Aen. 4.529-31. Hectore Knoctem: pectore noctem codd., perabsurde.
- [9] Cic. de Nat. Deor. 3.(17).44. Knocte: nocte codd. et edd., stultissime.

HYLAS AND HERACLES

The earliest extant presentations of the story that connects Hylas and Heracles are in Apollonius Rhodius¹ and Theocritus². They tell how Heracles snatched Hylas away from his parents while still a child, how he looked after him and took him on the Argonaut expedition so as not to be separated, and how he searched when the nymphs had lured Hylas to his death down a well. Hylas belongs to the mythology of the inhabitants of Cios and Prusias on the southern shore of the Propontis³. He is traditionally interpreted as a fertility god who died and was reborn annually⁴, and H.J. Rose⁵ compares him to Linus, Lityerses, Osiris, Bormus, and Maneros. The most appropriate of these parallels is Bormus who, like Hylas, went in search of water and disappeared⁶. Of Hylas Rose only says that he revived 'no doubt in springtime'. The time of year when this type of deity revived is difficult to determine since it was the death that was usually celebrated. In Hylas' case the season at which this occurred can be worked out from Theocritus.

He says that the Argonaut expedition set out when the Pleiads were rising and spring was just turning to summer⁷. In this part of the year the Pleiads rose at the end of April and the beginning of May. Three days after the expedition started it reached the Hellespont⁸. Gow notes that elsewhere in Theocritus the adventure of the Argonauts which in Apollonius immediately follows Hylas' death took place when the meadows were bright with flowers which bloom *ἔσπερος λήγοντος*⁹. Hylas died at the beginning of summer. He is not a fertility deity of the Adonis type who died at midsummer and whose death represents the final 'death' of the corn when it is stored in underground silos after winnowing. He represents the 'death' of the corn when it is reaped at the beginning of summer¹⁰. The season of his death is important because it links up with the festival of Cretan Zeus who is, like Hylas, a dying and reviving fertility deity and who is connected with Hylas in another way that will become evident¹¹. But in Apollonius and Theocritus there is little trace of Hylas the fertility deity.

Indeed in Apollonius he is no more than Heracles' servant though the account includes certain interesting details. It is Theocritus who reveals the way in which the Greeks looked at the story.

According to Theocritus¹² Heracles took Hylas while still a boy so that he could teach him all his own skills and make him into a true man. The motif is derived from rites of initiation. A boy is taken away from his parents in order to learn the skills that he will need in adult life. Achilles' life followed the same pattern. His parents first entrusted him to Chiron who gave him special foods to make him strong¹³, and when he was nine Thetis, wanting to stop him going to Troy where it was fated for him to die, dressed him in female clothes and put him in Lycomedes' care among the Scyrians¹⁴. A.E. Crawley, noting that Odysseus took him straight from Scyros to fight at Troy, suggested that his stay with the Scyrians marked his period of initiation immediately before becoming fully adult¹⁵. Frazer rightly protested against this on the grounds that there was no parallel for the start of the final period of initiation at so early an age¹⁶, and Cretan evidence shows that a period of special association with women and removal from the parental home occurred before a boy had become an ephebe. It was

after his period as an ephebe that a youth was considered fully adult. Cretan παῖδες¹⁷ were called σκορφοί because they spent much of their time in the women's part of the house¹⁸ and they spent two months out in the wilds with a lover¹⁹. When they became ephebes they were physically but not socially adult, and this is the stage at which Achilles would be when he left the Scyrians. Like Hylas he received instruction in manly things before reaching puberty. Heracles was still performing the task when he took Hylas on the Argonaut expedition. The expedition's departure coincided with a change in Hylas' status for, according to Apollonius²⁰, he had then reached his πρῶτῃβη. Theseus had reached the same stage when he arrived in Athens from Trozen according to Bacchylides who pictured him in other respects as an Athenian ephebe²¹. Πρῶτῃβη was marked by the first appearance of the beard - a feature that the Greeks especially admired - and generally occurred at about the age of sixteen. At this stage a youth became, in Athenian terms, an ephebe²². The organisation of youths into bands of ephebes was a widespread, though declining, institution in Hellenistic times so that a poet could be sure the ideas associated with ephebes were well known. When Hylas went with the Argonauts he had reached the age at which a youth became an ephebe.

Pierre Vidal-Naquet has investigated in an important article the ideas associated with the Athenian ephebeia²³. His general thesis, which I believe he has successfully demonstrated, is that it was a period when youths, besides learning the skills that they needed when adult, also behaved in a manner completely opposite to the way they would act when full members of society. Three of these ideas are present in the story of Hylas.

The first concerns the method of waging war. Ephebes, though they received training in hoplite tactics fought as light armed troops. In Greece, at any rate until the fourth century and with a few exceptions, this was an inferior way of fighting. The adult man had failed if he was not able to hold his place in the hoplite ranks. Though Vidal-Naquet does not discuss it, the bow was also an inferior weapon from Homeric times onwards. A poem in the Palatine anthology shows that youths when about to become adult dedicated their arrows to Hermes because they had no more use for them²⁴, and Artemis the goddess of immature youth carried a bow²⁵. It was one of Hylas' special duties to care for Heracles' bow and arrows²⁶.

The second idea concerns the place of habitation. Ephebes were sent to guard the wild frontier regions and even when being trained lived on the outskirts of the city²⁷. So when Heracles snatched Hylas as a boy he took him away from his home²⁸. Again when he went with the Argonauts, from the Greek point of view he was travelling to the wilds though from his own point of view he was going home.

The third concerns the time of Hylas' death. Vidal-Naquet draws a distinction between hunting by day and by night²⁹. Generally adults went hunting by day and youths by night. It was after nightfall that Hylas went hunting for water since Apollonius says that the Argonauts began preparing the feast for which Hylas was to bring the water after they had sacrificed to Apollo Ecbasius at nightfall³⁰.

Bearing in mind the principle of reversal that can be applied to an ephebe's life, it follows that during the time in the wilds he had to abstain from contact with the opposite sex and remain unmarried. For example, in Crete it was not until a young man had left the *agelai*, that is, ceased to be an ephebe³¹, that he was allowed to marry³². Vidal-Naquet does not state the principle in so many words but it is implicit in his discussion of Melanion and Atalanta^{32a}. Melanion has a name (the Black Man) that links him with Melanthus, one of the aetiological heroes of the Apaturia who was so named because ephebes wore black cloaks³³. Melanion is an ephebe who nevertheless married Atalanta. The marriage is ill-starred since after making love illegally in a temple of Zeus or Cybele they are transformed into lions or wolves³⁴. It is no surprise to learn that Hylas died when he succumbed to the charms of a nymph out in the wilds for he had broken one of the cardinal rules of his status. His crime was the very opposite of that committed by Euripides' Phaethon who, though he was an adult³⁵, refused to marry and accept an adult's responsibilities³⁶.

Theocritus' version of Hylas' story provides a starting point which allows us to connect him with an initiation pattern and some of its associated ideas. Between the pattern, which is known mainly from Athens, and the Hylas episode there is one difference. Hylas reached his *πρωθήβη* and went away like an ephebe at the end of spring whereas Athenian youths made a hair offering to mark the beginning of their period as ephebes at the Apaturia which fell in October³⁷. But the date of the ceremony for which the Cretan Hymn of the Curetes was written shows that the season when youths were initiated was not the same everywhere.

M.L. West³⁸ has most recently investigated the significance of this hymn concentrating on the Curetes' fertility aspect and not even mentioning Jane Harrison's researches³⁹. She showed that the Curetes were a group of young initiates and that the myth of Zeus' birth and his protection by the Curetes from his father Cronus reflects a pattern of initiation. It is a common way of thinking attested by evidence from many primitive societies that initiation into a new status is equivalent to death and rebirth⁴⁰. Zeus is born and received into the band of Curetes. The hymn invokes 'The Greatest Couros, son of Cronus' who must be Cretan Zeus. According to Hesychius⁴¹ the Cretans called Zeus *Φελχάνος* and there is evidence for his worship under this title in classical times at Cnossus, Lyttus, and Gortyn⁴². His festival in Lyttus took place on the Kalends of May⁴³, that is, at the very time when Hylas departed with the Argonauts. Theocritus, it should be noted, called him a *κοῦρος*⁴⁴.

But, strong as the Curetes' connection with initiation is, they are also involved with the cycle of fertility as West most clearly shows. The same is true of Hylas. The inhabitants of his homeland celebrated a festival during which they went out into the wilds to search for him⁴⁵. The occasion of the festival, which is not stated, was presumably when he disappeared in spring since lamentation played a prominent part. There is no indication that it was an initiation festival in Cios and Prusias. This aspect appears to be a literary addition to the story. It is manifest in Theocritus and lies behind Apollonius' account⁴⁶. As the former's poem seems dependent on the Argonautics, and not vice versa⁴⁷, Apollonius was writing with a version of the story in mind that

already included initiation motifs. They became part of the story when Hylas was made Heracles' lover. As evidence for this association earlier than the trio of poets Callimachus, Apollonius and Theocritus, is all open to dispute⁴⁸, I believe that it was Callimachus who associated them⁴⁹ and in so doing introduced initiation motifs which in extant accounts are clearest in Theocritus' poem. From it we see how a story's significance could be changed by the cultural milieu to which it was transferred.

J.H. Cowell

NOTES.

1. Argonautica 1, 1207 ff.
2. Idyll 13.
3. See Strabo 12, 4, 3.
4. See for example L.R. Farnell, Greek Hero-Cults and Ideas of Immortality, p.23.
5. A Handbook of Greek Mythology⁶, p.200.
6. Nymphis 432 F 5b Jacoby ap. Athenaeus 14, 619F - 620A. In another version he dies, like Adonis, while out hunting (Scholiast to Aesch., Persians, 940; Pollux 4, 53).
7. Lines 25-6.
8. Line 29.
9. Theocritus, II p.237. He refers to Idyll 22,43.
10. Bormus also died during the reaping season. He went to fetch water for the reapers (Nymphis, loc. cit.) and so died during the θέρους (Schol. Aesch. loc. cit.; Pollux loc. cit.).
11. See below, p. 46
12. Lines 8 ff. Theocritus says that Heracles snatched Hylas while still a παῖς (line 6) and Apollonius while still νεανίας (1, 1212).
13. Apollodorus, Bibl., 3, 13, 6.
14. Apollodorus, 3, 13, 8.
15. Achilles at Scyros, Class. Rev. 7, 1893, pp. 243 - 5.
16. The Youth of Achilles, Class. Rev. 7, 1893, pp. 292 - 4.
17. The term covers youngsters in their early teens before they became ephebes (R.F. Willetts, Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete, p. 14).
18. Scholiast to Euripides, Alcestis, 989.
19. Strabo 10, 4, 21. See Willetts loc. cit., and G. Thomson, Aeschylus and Athens, p. 106.
20. Argonautica 1, 132.
21. Poem 18 Snell. Theseus' dress shows this. He wore the χλαμύς (lines 53-4) which formed part of the ephebes' dress (Antidotus comicus fr. 2 K, line 3; cf. Philemon fr. 34 K) and he was πρόσηβος (line 57).
22. It should be noted that a youth did not officially become an ephebe until he was eighteen, but J. Labarbe has demonstrated the existence, alongside the official ephebeia, of a more archaic ceremony concerned with admission of youths to the phratries which took place at the age of sixteen. See J. Labarbe, L'âge correspondant au sacrifice du κοῦρεῖον et les données historiques du sixième discours d'Isée, Bull. Acad. Roy. Belg. Cl. Lettres 39, 1953, pp. 358 - 94.
23. The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian Ephebeia, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. n.s. 14, 1968, pp. 49 - 64.

24. Anth. Pal. 6, 282 = Gow and Page, Hellenistic Epigrams, lines 3590 ff.
25. For Artemis mistress of arrows see Eur., Hipp., 167 - 8. In the same way Apollo was an archer and κουροτρόφος.
26. Why Heracles (and certain other heroes) whom we think of as especially manly carried a bow and arrows is a question too large to discuss in detail here. I will only say that after his death Heracles married Hebe (the earliest reference is Odyssey 11, 602 - 3) and ἦβη was reached when a youth became physically mature. In Diodorus (4, 39, 2 - 3) Heracles before marrying Hebe is passed by Hera through her clothes so that he should appear to be born a second time. The Hesychian gloss δευτερότοκος shows that this was connected with initiation (or rather re-initiation).
27. According to Aristotle (Ath. Pol., 42, 3) they were stationed in the Piraeus and at Munychia and Akte.
28. Apollonius 1, 1212.
29. op. cit., p. 55 (on the Spartan Crypteia) and 60 - 61.
30. Argonautica 1, 1185 - 6. Theocritus calls the nymphs who seduced Hylas ἀκοίμητοι (line 44).
31. See Hesychius ἀγελάους· τοὺς ἐφῆβους Κρήτες (Latte's text).
32. Strabo 10, 4, 20. Willetts, op. cit., p. 8.
- 32a. op. cit., pp. 62 - 3.
33. Vidal-Naquet, p. 54.
34. Apollodorus, 3, 9, 2; Ovid, Met., 10, 560 - 680. For other authorities see Frazer's Loeb Apollodorus, I p. 401, n. 2.
35. Oxy. Pap. 2455, fr. 14, line 209.
36. He rejects the bride Merops has secured for him (A.W. Pickard-Cambridge, New Chapters in Greek Literature, third series, p. 143) and spends all his time hunting and in the gymnasia (this is the implication of Clymene's statement, fr. 785 N², that she hates the bow and wishes gymnasia did not exist).
37. The offering was made on the third day of the festival, Κουρεῶτις (see Suidas and Hesychius s.v.).
38. The Dictaeon Hymn to the Kouros, Jour. Hell. St. 85, 1965, pp. 149 - 59.
39. Embodied in her book Themis. A Study in the Social Origins of Greek Religion.
40. A van Gennep, The Rites of Passage, Eng. tr., pp. 91 ff, and the authorities quoted by Harrison, Themis, p. 19, n. 1.
41. s.v. Γ(=F) ελχάνος· ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Κρήσιν.
42. A.B. Cook, Zeus, II 2, p. 948.
43. ibid.
44. Lines 46 and 53. κοῦρος can indicate a baby as well as a youth (see LS9), but for the Achaeans the κοῦροι were the ephebes (Justinus ad Odyssey, p. 1788, 57).
45. Strabo 12, 4, 3; Apollonius 1, 1344 ff; cf. Antoninus Liberalis, Transformationes, 26.
46. Most explicit is the reference to Hylas' πρωθήβη (line 132).
47. Gow, Theocritus, II pp. 231 - 2. See more fully Class. Quart. 32, 1938, pp. 10 - 13.
48. Gow, Theocritus, II p. 231.
49. There is only ^{one} piece of evidence that Callimachus treated the theme (fr. 596 Pf.) but it does show that he included Heracles in his version.

SENECA STRUTS AND FRETS

"Say no more, Seneca; I'm your man. There's no better stage manager in the business, or my name isn't Dominus Gregis. You won't have any cause for complaint in the performance; all my lads are trained to a T and there isn't an unfreed slave amongst them! Mind you, this isn't the sort of thing they've been used to acting just lately, but they'll learn, they'll learn.

"Before we get down to brass tacks, Seneca, do you mind satisfying my curiosity as to why you've suddenly decided to go in for this lark? Recitation parties too limited in scope, or what? Not that I'm against a bit of artistic branching-out, far from it! But I didn't know you were what one might call a theatre-going man, and I must say your proposition has taken me by surprise. Feeling a bit of Imperial pressure, I suppose? That's an infirmity we all have to yield to from time to time. Me too - those guards used to get my goat, standing around freezing the audience with their stiff faces. I wouldn't have minded so much if they'd had any artistic appreciation. Still, at least that curse has been removed, and Nero doesn't seem to care a damn what anybody says about him, bless his august little fiddle!

"One small point, Seneca, which you might not think is worth your attention, but which matters a lot to me in my profession. Is your tragedy - ahem - are you sure this Phaedra is going to go down well with your new public? I mean, don't forget that these people are used to wild-beast shows, gladiatorial combats, pantomimes and the like. They're not all as perceptive as your literary friends. Aren't they going to get, well, bored? Oh, you've taken that into account? There's no problem then, if as you say you've put in plenty of spectacle and gore, and made the philosophy nice and easy to appeal to the man on the street. You don't mean to say that you've always written your tragedies with a view to a future stage production? Great, great. Perhaps we won't have to chop and change too much after all, though - what, no adaptations? Is that a clause in our contract?

"Well, in that case I suggest that we go into this more thoroughly before I commit myself. I don't want to risk having my costumes ruined by too many old tomatoes, haw haw! I suggest you read me your tragedy right here and now, just like you recited it at your last Literary Club meeting or whatever you call it, and after that we'll go through the script together and I'll get my Smarmio over here to take notes of props, costumes and stage directions. Very quick with his stylus, he is - a Greek well worth his salt for a change. O.K.? Off you go then.

(Some considerable time later)

"Thanks a lot, Seneca. Great, just great. I see what you mean about public appeal - I kept noticing things all the way through. - Smarmio, come over here and bring your writing block. I want you to take down some notes while I go through a new playscript we're going to put on shortly. - Right, Seneca, just one more time through the script if you're ready - we don't want any slip-up on the night, do we, haw haw! That reminds me, a bit of sawdust for that last scene might be in order. - Sawdust, little Greek. Stop grinning at the sky and write. -

"Curtain down and we start with a rousing spectacle to make the yobs sit up and stop scratching. Scene, early morning, Theseus's front yard at Athens. Enter Hippolytus with at least 20 huntsmen, I should say, plus 4 pairs of hounds, breed respectively non-barking, Molossian, Cretan and Spartan. Props for hunters, as follows; heavy wide-meshed

nets, smooth-wrought snares, one line with crimson feathers at least 1 each dart, 1 heavy oak shaft with iron head, and 1 curved hunting knife. Oh, and a statue of Diana. Hippolytus to gesticulate in 7 different directions, huntsmen to adjust leashes of dogs according to script, similar for nets - look here, Seneca, the huntsmen are going to walk off with buckled knees under all that lot if Hippolytus stands praying all that time. Of course, the huntsmen start moving off from line 54, isn't that right? Line 81, barking hounds heard off-stage, hasty amen from Hippolytus and exit in same direction. Dramatic pause.

"Enter Phaedra from Palace talking to Crete. Oh sorry, it's the Nurse you say? Oh yes, line 129 - you had me fooled there, Seneca - she must come in with Phaedra. I get it, Phaedra uses Nurse as a thinking-post. Very bright, very bright. And Nurse not being so very bright, thinks Phaedra's been talking to her, and obliges with a bit of good advice, nice and eloquent to appeal to the men in the audience who remember their school-days, swotting away at rhetoric. I bet they'll be ever so glad you reminded them that the Getae, the inhospitable Taurians and the scattered Scythians, at any rate, don't commit incest! Sorry, Seneca. Anyway Phaedra stops looking through Nurse and looks at her sometime during all this fine speaking, and makes a reasonable enough answer; Nurse adopts a philosophic tone for the benefit of those lovely grandmothers out there; you've got 'em spellbound, Seneca. This goes on for a bit, speeches shorten, tension mounts, every word counts - tension snaps as Nurse bares breast 1.246; will Phaedra yield? She resolves on death not dishonour, 1.259 looks round for a weapon, 1.261 begins a slow dash into the palace to continue her search, followed by tottering and remonstrating Nurse, who presumably carries on pleading within the Palace while the Chorus sing their first Ode.

"Problems here, Seneca. How does the Chorus get on stage, and when, and who the Hades are they supposed to be? You hadn't thought. What about sympathetic Athenian citizens, since they obviously know all about Phaedra's little problem? What! You don't mean it. That's not possible. Now look, you can't have the chorus on stage at the same time as all those dogs and huntsmen. Either you have one lot on, or the other. You won't sacrifice the huntsmen? - O.K. Smarmy, take this down. Exeunt huntsmen 1.53 as we said; chorus enter 1.84 from the other side so as not to get mixed up with the hounds, and anyway they'd be coming from the town direction, not the country. - Fine, except that Phaedra's very rude not to acknowledge their presence - mind you, she is in a bit of a brown study when she enters, as I remarked before.

"Enter Nurse 1.358 to be met with anxious enquiry from chorus as to Phaedra's progress, which wasn't a very good idea as Nurse has obviously come out for a bit of a breather from her patient - well, why else should she have come out? She describes at full length exactly how Phaedra is behaving, but might as well have saved her trouble because 1.384 the Palace doors are slid back and we view for ourselves the beautiful tableau as follows; Phaedra is flopped on golden couch in her underwear, hair all over the place, tearful mask; handmaids proffer robes bedecked with purple and gold, Syrian scarlet, Chinese silk, jewellery too - but no, she rejects them all. Finally she stands up in a revolting baggy shift with a string girdle, quiver in left hand, Thessalian spear in right - er, do you really want a crescent shield there too, or is that poetic licence? Oh, a simile. - No shield, Smarmy. -

"You haven't indicated where you want the doors shut, Seneca. What about straight after Phaedra's dressing scene, seeing that Hippolytus is due to arrive back soon, if I remember correctly? Fine - Phaedra is tucked

back into Palace and Nurse is left alone with the Chorus, who tell her rather sharply to shut up groaning and pray to Diana. I must say it's hardly surprising that the prayer does no good. Pretty tactless of Nurse to insult the goddess with references to a past folly of hers, but I suppose you know best, Seneca, you're the poet!

"Then what do you know - here comes Hippolytus back home already, out of luck it's obvious, or he wouldn't have deserted his fellow hunters. Nurse has a quick mumble, blaming Phaedra for what she's about to do, and around 1.430 begins wending aged steps towards Hippolytus. - Smarmy, note description of Nurse's mask. - The aged steps stop in front of Hippolytus during 40-odd lines of beautiful Stoicism you might say - haw haw! Seneca old man, seriously now, take a pat on the back for Hippolytus's reply. It really does you credit. It's got nothing original anywhere in the thought to cloud their appreciation of that sparkling wit of yours. - Hey, Smarmy, get that "worried gold" bit - never heard anything like it, have you? - Nurse drinks it all in with bated breath, all 88 lines of it; then we get the pace hotting up a bit, but not enough for Phaedra who's been listening at the keyhole and at 1.583 flings herself out of the palace. Overcome by Hipp's proximity, she does a belly-flop on the stage, and is re-erected by Hippolytus himself. Great stuff. Nurse describes all this as well, just in case the audience are looking elsewhere at the time. Back on her pins, Phaedra evades Hippolytus's questions by a short communion with her soul, then asks him for a private interview; after looking round vaguely, Hippolytus assures her that there are no retainers lurking in the corners, overlooking Nurse and the sympathetic Athenians. Seneca, how does ne know they're sympathetic?

"Now we have a nice little dialogue interspersed by a couple more floor flops executed by Phaedra near Hippolytus's feet, at lines 667 and 703. Stung by the second threatened assault on his knees, followed by an even nastier attack on his upper torso, Hippolytus grabs his stepmother by the hair with his left hand and poises his sword over her neck with his right, while telling the audience what he's doing in case they get the wrong idea, and gradually edging over to the statue of Diana at the same time. - Incidentally, Smarmy, the statue has an altar; and Hippolytus is wearing a sword. O.K.? - Phaedra's little speech is uttered with her neck bent back and pressed lightly by sword - Smarmy, we'd better put Bullio into this part, don't you think? He's the strongest - and finally Hippolytus casts her and sword to the floor and rushes off shouting wildly.

"Now if you don't mind a criticism, Seneca, this next bit is very hazy from my point of view and I need your help. Nurse stands wringing her hands over Phaedra's insensible body and works out another little plot, out loud for the audience's benefit, while the Chorus look on in mute sympathy. Correct? Then who exactly is Nurse yelling to in 1.725? Does she mean the indoor slaves? That must be it - she knows she can rely on the Chorus not to let her down, and the slaves wouldn't expect Athenian citizens to do anything helpful at a time of crisis. So out come these slaves and carry Phaedra back into the house while Nurse trots alongside talking cheerfully and carrying the sword, thus clearing the stage nicely for the Chorus to speak in safety. But can you beat the hypocrisy of these people? They've kept quiet all the time Hippolytus was being so grossly slandered by that Nurse, out of sympathy with Phaedra you told me, and now they turn round and tell us how sorry they are for the poor young man and what a stinker they think Phaedra is! - Smarmy, that twitch of yours is coming back, I see. Do you want a rest for five minutes? No? Right, press on then. -

"Line 829 enter Theseus plus regal dignity, pale-cheeked high-held head and stiff dirty hair, all carefully described by Chorus in case the stage manager can't imagine what a man coming back from Hell would look like; and in case we haven't realised by now that it's Theseus, he stands talking about his nasty experiences in the underworld and how he escaped until he's quite sure everyone in the audience must have got the message, at which point he is interrupted by wails off. Nurse comes at his shout to give him the gen, accompanied by at least 2 slaves, used first in 1.863 to open up the Palace doors so that Phaedra and Theseus can exchange a few remarks across the threshold, then later to threaten the Nurse with chains, at which point Phaedra capitulates and tells her fib. - Getting on well now, eh Smarmy? I'm ready for my dinner, aren't you? - Seneca, you haven't told us what happens to Nurse after that. I know she's got to be the Messenger in the next scene, but you ought to have finished her off better. Presumably you mean her to run away into the Palace after being threatened by the slaves - she must be feeling pretty weary anyway, long day for an old lady! - Smarmy, take note of description of Hippolytus's sword which Phaedra has been waving about since the doors were opened - ivory hilt embossed with figures, that's right. - Who does Phaedra point at when she says "these", 1.901? The chorus, or the 2 slaves? Oh, all right, minor point, but I've got to put this show on the stage, remember. And what does Phaedra do while Theseus is cursing his son? Do you want her back in the palace before then, or before the Choral Ode? Seneca, old son, it's unhappily obvious to an old stager like me that you're a greenhorn at this business. Next time, do try to make these things a little clearer!

"I take it that Theseus is supposed to hang round through the Ode until the weeping messenger comes in at 1.989 to bring the news that Neptune has fulfilled his fatal promise; and he has to hang round for quite a bit longer until the messenger has got through the gory details. Ye mortal gods, but that's a good bit, almost as good as the circus. You suffer in sympathy with every verbal rip. The sadists will be writhing in their seats - glorious! What's that you say? An idea you've got? You want the huntsmen to arrive in procession? - Hey, listen to this, Smarmy, the man's got something. - Imagine a solemn line of huntsmen, beginning about 1.1110, entering one by one, each man with a piece of Hippolytus in his arms and depositing it on the growing pile on the ground, then moving round to stand with the others in silent grief at the back! What vision! Masterly, masterly. - Smarmy, do try to control your twitch for a little longer. It makes me quite nervous, watching your shoulders jerk. -

"A nice non-committal ode by the Chorus, and then comes the Grand Slam. Wailing off; enter Phaedra with that sword again - do I detect a note of boredom in Theseus's question 1.1056? She makes her confession after addressing in succession Neptune, Theseus, Hippolytus's remains - is that offering of hair torn out or cut off by the sword? Pity, I like the sword, personally - herself, death, Athens, Theseus again, Hippolytus again, Theseus again, and finally shuts herself up by thrusting the sword into her wicked heart and falling dead beside the heap of Hippolytus. Correct, Seneca? - Trick sword, Smarmy. -

"And there stands Theseus, alone, upright beside his fallen wife and his mangled son, and laments in our friend's so beautifully-turned language, until the Chorus thinks it's about time Hippolytus was buried, and the two servants bring the bits - there must be a bier there somewhere, Smarmy - a bit closer so that Theseus can do the jigsaw puzzle. Here's where the sawdust comes in. I say, Seneca, I've got a great idea for the remains. What about the bits left over from the previous day's circus? Ideal, don't you think? Of course it means depriving the lions which might be a bit difficult. But think of the effect when Theseus picks up a few choice morsels, dripping with gore, and hugs them to his breast! What a treat the people are getting, boy oh boy.

"Let's just gallop through to the end now and then work out what we need. Theseus fiddles around for a while putting things in order; picks up a bit and looks at it doubtfully all round, then puts it in a vacant space - did you speak, Smarmy? - ; gazes into the face; takes off the jewellery he wore in Hell, and puts it on the bier; gives orders to the onlookers to open the doors, wail, build a pyre, chase runaway bits of Hippolytus in the fields, and bury nasty Phaedra nice and deep; stands wondering what to do himself and finally decides to go into the Palace - to deal with Nursey, Seneca? Right, that's it. That just leaves the question of props. - Smarmy, take this down, if you can stop yourself heaving; one battered head, some big chunks, a right hand, a left hand, a - oh no. No, oh no. O.K. Smarmy, you can go, and thanks a lot. -

"Seneca, my friend, listen to me. This here play is for the moh, remember? They may be dim in some ways, but they're mighty quick in others, and I'm telling you, since you've obviously still got many illusions, that they're quickest of all at taking things the wrong way. For a public performance, lines 1265-1267 just will not do, especially in this day and age, and if you insist on keeping them, I flatly refuse to have anything more to do with you and your beastly play, and that's my last word!"

(Written with very close reference to the Loeb text and translation of Seneca's Phaedra, and to Léon Hermann's article in the 1924 Revue Belge de Philologie, demonstrating that many of Seneca's tragedies, including this one, were written with a theatrical performance in view. Clarence Mendell's book "Our Seneca" had something to do with it too.)

ROSEMARY BANCROFT

THE MODERN GREEK LANGUAGE PROBLEM

What would be the reaction if an announcement was made by Parliament that it had been agreed in principle that, since Shakespeare marks the climax of British culture and civilisation (assuming, that is, that such was the case), all of Britain should aim at using the language that was current in his times, both in speaking and writing, and in the future all education should be directed to this end? Everyone, I suppose, would react by saying that the idea was absurd. In the first place, one cannot force a people to speak a type of English which does not come naturally to it. Secondly, language is not an end in itself, but merely a means of expressing thoughts and ideas. It is always the contents of speech which is the most important thing, not the words and phrases in which it is couched. And thirdly, what proof is there, anyway, that by speaking a more noble type of English, the English nation would itself become more noble?

Despite all these objections, such a situation does, and has, existed for many centuries in Greece. Let no one think that this is something to be laughed at and forgotten. It is an integral part of modern Greek life, and, incidentally, something that almost all European countries have gone through at one time or another. The roots of this Greek *δισυλωσσία* can be traced back to the second century A.D. By then, ordinary spoken Greek had changed considerably from the days of Pericles, and a movement called Atticism came about which regretted this state of affairs. The Atticists felt that this was the reason why Greece had declined from the golden age of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Plato and Demosthenes, and they urged all Greeks to start speaking and writing Attic Greek again. This, they thought, would remedy the deplorable stage of affairs. That this was impracticable they would not accept - indeed, it can be questioned whether such an idea ever occurred to them. It all boiled down to education, they felt.

The Byzantine Empire, a Christian Roman Empire, but far more Greek than Roman, adopted this idea. All educated people, everybody who was anybody, tried to be able to speak and write a sort of Greek which was as Classical as possible. Most of their attempts were feeble, but not all. An educated man like Michael Psellos, as late as the eleventh century, could write a type of Classical Greek which was even more Classical than Classical Greek itself, a language which contained more duals, for example, than one could find in any genuine Attic writer. It was only in the provinces and among the uneducated οἱ Πολλοὶ in Byzantium itself that the demotic, or normal spoken Greek of that period was used for literary purposes, and the literature produced in this natural language consisted mainly of poetry which was handed down by oral tradition, and of which only a small proportion has reached us.

The Classicizing trend in official and literary Greek continued until the 1880s, through the capture of Constantinople by the 'Christian' crusaders in 1204, the final overthrow of the Byzantine Empire by the Turks in 1453, and the final and successful *Ἐπανάστασις*, the revolt of the Greeks against Turkish rule, begun in 1821, which ended with the foundation of modern Greece in 1829. Archaic Greek - to call it Classical Greek would be a travesty: much of it was no

more Classical than the attempts of some Exeter University students at writing Greek proses - flourished among the educated, the demotic only among the 'plebs', among those, that is, who were simply not intelligent or educated enough to write the Archaic language. The first signs of a literature worthy of the name which used the demotic consciously as its normal means of expression appeared in Crete in the period between 1500 and 1669. This burst of literary energy came to its end when, in 1669, the Turks engulfed this island. But it was a start, and although it was not immediately noticed on the Greek mainland, already under Turkish domination, its influence was to penetrate and to provide a valuable precedent for later literature.

The next development in the history of our problem occurred in the years between 1780^{and 1820}/approximately. Greece was now ready to revolt against the Turks, and, in connection with the new national movement, the language problem raised its head again. In the new country, the 'plebs' would have to play their part, and they would be in need of education and knowledge of their glorious ancient past - but in what language? The demotic, with its many dialects and its alleged vulgarity and baseness was rejected, but so was the ultra-archaic language, on the grounds of being too alien to the ordinary spoken language understood by most people. A compromise was reached with the adoption of a new language, the *Καθαρεύουσα*, or purified Greek, as devised by Adamantios Korais. This was a purified (strictly speaking: 'purifying') Greek in the sense that it claimed to purify the modern language from 'vulgar' and 'base' expressions supposed to be the result of the many years of foreign occupation. With the establishment of the new Greek Kingdom in 1829, this Katharevousa was adopted as its official language. There even grew up a literary school, the Old School of Athens, which utilized it for the production of literature. But, while this was happening on the mainland, another literary school developed in the Ionian islands, which made use of the demotic language as its means of literary expression, just as the Cretan school did before. The Ionian School of literature produced works of higher literary merit than those of most members of the Old School of Athens.

The most decisive stage in the struggle of the demotic to become the literary language of Greece was reached in the 1880s. In 1888, Ioannis Psychari, the champion of the demotic, published his famous book *Τὸ Ταξίδι Μου* ('My Journey'). Under the disguise of a travel book written by a Greek professor in Paris on a trip to his native land, Psychari demonstrated, both in principal and in practice (for the book is written in an extreme demotic), that work of literature could be written in the language spoken by the man in the street. Psychari had to fight for many years, but his influence, and the influence of his followers in Greece, who formed the New School of Athens, a literary school which used the demotic both in prose and verse, finally prevailed, and the demotic won the day in the literary field after a period of 1700 years of existence. Literature in Greece began to be written - and is still written today - in the language used by the people. The older kind of literature which used the stilted archaic Greek was usually too artificial, and was too often concerned not so much with what it said as with how 'purely' it said it.

There, no doubt, the matter would have rested. In time, the demotic would have prevailed everywhere, as it prevailed in the field of literature. But problems arose. The Katharevousa still looked modern and 'demotic' enough for many people - and, to make it worse,

the Language Problem was now turned into a political issue. The demotic, being 'the Language of the People', came to be identified with the Left, and the Right, naturally enough, came to the support of the Katharevousa. The more extreme Left, the Communist Party, have even formed their own 'Demotic', a language as incomprehensible to the common people as it is to the more educated. There is now also a social side to the Language Problem. The Katharevousa has come to be a sort of status symbol. The average Greek would no more speak in the Katharevousa to his mother than the average Englishman would say to the Queen, when meeting her, 'Hallo, dear', but he will quite openly and without any qualms 'put it on' when talking to people whom he does not know intimately and to whom he believes he should show respect. And so the Problem is marching on.

A sort of solution seems to be making its appearance at the moment. As education is becoming more widespread - and education in Greece is run by the state, and in the official language of the state, the Katharevousa - more and more people are acquiring a knowledge of the official language. Thus, a new compromise is now taking place - not, this time, between a purely archaic and a demotic language, but between the demotic and the Katharevousa, itself a compromise. The result is that a new type of Greek is now developing, a language called the Simple Katharevousa, which combines aspects of the two modern languages. Whether this may lead to a solution of the Language Problem or not is still difficult to say. It is a possibility.

But is this all merely a problem for scholars and linguists? Is it something which does not concern the man in the street? Not entirely. It is very difficult for us, faced by no problems of this sort, to understand fully what such a situation really implies. No one has ever actually suggested that we should all write or speak like Shakespeare. 'There's the rub!'. For the Greeks, however, the Language Problem is something they have to live with every day, and it has caused problems at every turn. Education being carried out in the Katharevousa, students and teachers have to learn to speak it during lessons and lectures - a situation reminiscent of the days past, when much of the education in British and European universities was carried out in Latin. The papers are written mostly in the Katharevousa. The Church, which is a very important institution in Greece, uses a type of Katharevousa in its official publications. All official publications and correspondence, as well as most business correspondence, are carried out in the Katharevousa. In Parliament, you often have the spectacle of speeches being delivered in the Katharevousa with interruptions made in the demotic. Menus in restaurants are in the Katharevousa - though, of course, you order your food in the demotic. In fact, everything that is of a public and official nature is conducted in the official language. Thus the ordinary Greek, if he has anything to do with public or official life, still has to learn the Katharevousa. Even in literature, the only kind of public activity where the demotic language has won acceptance, one still finds people using the Katharevousa - especially so in prose of information. Works of information or research written in prose are often judged as reactionary or revolutionary according to the sort of idiom used by the author.

Thus the Language problem, and the necessity to learn the official language, has still a profound effect on the life of the average Greek. Not allowed to use, on so many public and official occasions, the language which comes naturally to them, the Greeks labour under a difficulty which has, in the past, both impaired their cultural growth and the development of their nation in the political sphere.

Robert D. Nutt.

BOOK REVIEW

N.J. Pobble's "Complete Guide to Victorian Scholarship" (10 volumes)
O.U.P. £37. 12. 6d. First published 1921, reprinted and enlarged 1968.

We are pleased to see this magnificent work again in circulation, after 47 years of unjustified and utter neglect. The scandalologist will of course recall the furore that followed upon its first publication, due to the author's unparalleled mastery of suggestive description and intimate knowledge of the varied and often disgusting private habits of certain scholars. The main points of interest to the enquiring mind are the publishing (for the first time, in Appendix A to Volume 5) of the celebrated love letters of J.B. Humberton-Fugg, the great Aristotelian scholar; details of the orgiastic parties of Fennimore J. Flump, the Oxford Plautologist; the sad decline of Rev. Dr. A. Pilford-Bright, found dancing naked in the Bodleian; the polyhedral relationship among certain Fellows of Trinity, leading to the notorious and unexplained murder of Rev. M.J. Frufflecloth, shortly before the due completion of his "Liber de moralibus Imperatorum Romanorum"; by no means below this high standard are the selections from the obscene poetry of the famous Latinist Dr. Oswald Ditcher. The University Press must be congratulated upon the usual sumptuous quality of layout, and for the excellence of the plates and the clarity of the diagrams. The indices are comprehensive and accurate, especially Index IV - Private Life.

Fulbert Hith
(uaddog urttem seltiv)

The following letter has recently been received by the Editor:

The Ballard Essay Prize

I should be glad if you could bring this competition to the attention of students who have recently contributed to your journal because essays on any topics which have been published in student journals are now eligible for the competition.

A prize of £20 is offered to the winner of the Ballard Essay Competition. Students who are eligible whilst studying at the University and for one year after leaving, are invited to submit an essay of not more than 5,000 words on one of the following topics:

Student Unrest, Surgery and Ethics, Science Fiction as an Art Form, Moon Landing, The Decline of the Cinema.

Alternatively, competitors may submit an essay on any topic which has been published in a student journal.

Entries, stating the Competitor's name, course of study, and the name of the journal in which the article appeared, (where relevant), should be sent to:

Miss P.S. Cunliffe
Room 109,
Northcote House

by 31 December, 1969