

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1903.

SOME FRIENDS OF THE CLASSICS.

Of the pamphlets published in the last twelve months, two claim attention as proceeding from scholars who hold high positions in the classical world, and who have had the problems of the classical education of to-day brought in different ways under their notice.

'*Archaeology in Schools*' by Professor P. GARDNER and Mr. J. L. MYRES¹ is a valuable and timely contribution to a department of classical instruction which has but lately won its way to proper recognition. The text is from the pen of Prof. Gardner, a dissentient opinion of Mr. Myres upon a particular point being recorded in a note.

It consists partly of advice to classical teachers upon the best mode of introducing archaeology into their instruction, a province in which Prof. Gardner's knowledge and experience enable him to speak with weight, partly of a more general treatment of principles and methods. Here also there is much that is valuable. Prof. Gardner is fully alive to the defects of modern classical education. He says:

¹ *Classical Archaeology in Schools*, by Percy Gardner, Litt. D. Lincoln and Merton Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford; with an Appendix containing list of Archaeological Apparatus by Professor P. Gardner and J. L. Myres, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. (Printed by request of a Committee of the Head Masters' Conference.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1902. Pp. 35. 1s. net.

'In my experience young men coming to the Universities from the great schools are remarkably deficient in the power of observing accurately and recording their observations. And they are usually entirely unversed in the weighing of evidence or discerning degrees of probability' (p. 16).

He recognises, as many do not, the high qualifications demanded by elementary teaching.

'As is the case in many other subjects, these most elementary teachings are perhaps the most difficult, and require the greatest care and skill' (p. 11).

The various series of illustrated classics he judges as follows.

'All that I have seen are incorrect or inadequate, and tend to mislead as much as to help...the illustrated classics of which mention has been made are produced with a quite insufficient knowledge, and are in most cases full of bad blunders and show great want of judgement' (p. 7).

Coming from one in Prof. Gardner's position this is very depressing. I wonder if he realised when he wrote it how very depressing it is. Let us hope that the judgment is somewhat too severe. But if not, it rests with archaeologists to find a remedy. We do not indeed expect Prof. Gardner to abandon his other employments and illustrate school classics as he thinks they should be illustrated; but surely there is by this time a sufficient supply of younger men, some of them, it may be, pupils of the Professor himself, who would be able and

willing to help in a matter of such vital importance to elementary classical teaching? There is danger too of the illustrations in these books being gauged by inapplicable standards. They should of course be correct as far as they go, but that a consummate archaeologist should find them inadequate is not such a serious objection. The information which is described as 'scrappy' and of little use for methodic study in the subject may for all that greatly help a beginner in getting some real hold of the ancient culture and forms of thought, so different from our own. The illustrated dictionary of Anthony Rich, to take a single instance, has probably done much more than any book of its size to make antiquity real to the student. Its merits are acknowledged in Germany; yet I have read a lofty condemnation of it by an eminent English archaeologist. A new edition is badly wanted, and we look to professed experts in archaeology to supply it.

Mr. Myres' Appendix, we need hardly say, should be of the greatest use to classical teachers. It supplies a long-felt want. An estimate of its utility and completeness in detail is outside my province. But chance enables me to offer one suggestion. Ought not the list of diagrams, etc., of Roman antiquities (p. 33) to include Dr. Albert Müller's useful models of Roman soldiers with the accompanying pamphlet in which the ancient sources are cited and explained?¹

Professor G. G. RAMSAY'S address² as first president of the Classical Association of Scotland, the formation of which the

¹ These models, with the pamphlet *Die Ausrüstung u. Bewaffnung des Römischen Heeres in der Kaiserzeit* (pp. 32), may be obtained from the manufacturer, J. E. Dubois (Zinnenfigurenfabrik), Seilwinderstrasse, Hanover. Price in Germany, 3 M. 75 pf. (Booksellers are asked to order several at a time.) If the pamphlet were translated into English (not what passes with a German publisher's hack for such) they might have some considerable sale in England and America.

² *Efficiency in Education*. Inaugural Address delivered at the First Annual Meeting of the Scottish Classical Association, 29th November, 1902, by the President, G. G. Ramsay, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. Jas. MacLehose and Sons. 1902. Pp. 41.

Classical Review noted last year, will be read with interest in many quarters. We are glad to see on the first page a disavowal of all professional and personal motives on behalf of members of the Association: the battle of Classics is lost if it is to be fought upon the field of material interests. Prof. Ramsay does well to point out what may be learned from studying contemporary experience in Europe and America. The increasing vitality of Greek and Latin in the United States is already known to readers of this Review. Prof. Ramsay adds to this facts relating to France and Germany which deserve the widest currency and from which I regret I can select but two. In the year 1898-99 out of a total of 152,019 pupils in Prussian Secondary Schools only 39,323 were in non-classical schools, while no less than 83,272 were pupils in the Gymnasien whose school-course embraces both the classical tongues. In France not only teachers and professors but the majority of the Chambers of Commerce and of the Conseils Généraux have petitioned in favour of the retention of Latin.

The weak point of Prof. Ramsay's address is its dearth of practical proposals; for the proposal that schools should be divided into two main types—a literary and a scientific one—can hardly rank as such. The urgent need for improvement in our modes of teaching Latin and Greek he does indeed acknowledge; but his suggestions for reform are the merest generalities.

The situation, which he with many other teachers of Greek and Latin fails sufficiently to realise, is this. Classics are now being pressed on the one side by the advance of science, on the other by that of modern languages. The latter are its more dangerous opponents. They promise to a certain point the same advantages as the classics; their methods are up to date and their teachers alert and enterprising. How then can they be resisted if confronted only by antiquated methods and a defence which is both backward and supine? High aesthetic and intellectual considerations are all very well; but they are of no avail in a squeeze.

J. P. POSTGATE.