

this basis *segi* with *secundus sequor* &c., and explain its use in the sense of 'next'; starting with an integer and taking the 'next third' you obtain $\frac{2}{3}$, &c. With the reduplicated *sesqui*- compare $\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta$.

JOHN B. BURY.

STRITAUOS.—The suggestion of Mr. Peile in the July number of the *Classical Review* will equally explain, as he points out, the origin of *tritauros* if *stritauros* is the primary form or the formation of *stritauros* from *tritauros*, but leaves it undecided which is the more probable. It seems safer and more scientific to start with *stritauros*; for (1) nothing is gained by selecting *tritauros* as the older form, as the generally assumed connection with $\tau\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ etc. is

highly unsatisfactory in point of meaning; and (2) if Mr. Peile's suggestion is correct it seems rather more probable that *atauros stritauros* should become by omission of one *s* *atauros tritauros* and produce *tritauros* than that *atauros tritauros* should give rise to *stritauros*, and if it is not correct, the dropping of *s* before *tr* is intelligible, if suspicious, whereas the prefix of *s* is unintelligible.

We should expect to find in *strit-* a prefix of somewhat the same connotation as the German *ur-* (*urgrossvater, urvater, urenkel, &c.*). I propose to assume an old form **stritos*, the superlative to a basis *ster, star, stri-* 'old,' which we find in the Slavonic basis *star, 'old,'* (Old Slav. *starŭ, old.*) *stritauros* would then mean 'eldest ancestor.' For the relation of *rī* to *ar, er,* compare for example *primus: παρπυθε*.

JOHN B. BURY.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AT ATHENS.

To the EDITOR of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—It is not an easy matter to know exactly how best to comply with your kind request for a letter on "Study at Athens with special reference to the German and American Schools." A large number of those who read the *Review* will doubtless know already a good deal of that which I have to tell them, and it is therefore a little difficult to know how I ought to treat my subject; whether I should have in view those who follow, in a greater or less degree, student life at Athens, or whether those who from one cause or another have been prevented from knowing the progress of events which seem almost destined to make Athens once again in a sense a university town of the western world.

It is hardly possible to fix a date when the movement in modern times towards Athens as a centre of study may be said to have had its beginning. The works of the great travellers and antiquarians who visited Greece during the last century and during the first part of the present one had doubtless much to do with preparing the way for organized study at Athens by awakening interest in the monuments of Greek antiquity. The establishment also in 1801 by the French Academy of the School for Art students at Rome which now occupies the Villa Medici and the founding of the German Archaeological Institute in 1828, also at Rome, must naturally have shown to every one how materially the cause of domestic education might be furthered by a systematic use of the advantages to be obtained from studying the monuments of the past on the spot. At Athens the French, as they have so often been in other matters, were the pioneers. Their school was established in 1846 by royal act through a bill introduced by Salvandy then minister of public instruction. It existed, in the words of its founders, "pour l'étude de la langue, de l'histoire et des antiquités grecques," and was intended for the use of students from the *École Normale*. Some modifications of this latter restriction have, I believe, taken place, but the French school at Athens still has a much less cosmopolitan and more national character than the German institute. The work of the French school has been up to the present time very important, a fact which is amply attested by the *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* and by that series of

books on various antiquarian subjects which are published as the fruits of studies at the French archaeological schools in Athens and Rome.

The formal opening of the German institute at Athens did not take place until the 9th of December (Winckelmann's birthday) 1874, but any one who will read Michaelis's *Geschichte des deutschen archaologischen Instituts*, 1829—1879, will readily see that it had a potential existence long before that date. Everything was ready for the final step of creation; the enthusiasm among German scholars for Hellenic antiquity only needed a slight stimulus to cause it to be manifested in some concrete form. That stimulus was the imperialization, if I may so term it, of the Archaeological Institute, which was one of the educational results of the revival of the German empire at the close of the Franco-German War. Since 1828 the German Institute at Rome had been steadily rearing numbers of thoroughly trained archaeologists. The scientific method in the study of Archaeology had become firmly rooted at the German universities; it had only to be applied to Greece. One needs but to read over the names of some of the great German scholars and teachers to know what a firm foundation had been laid for the modern German institutions of archaeological and antiquarian study. At Bonn, the names of Welcker, Ritschl, Jahn, and in the present generation that of Kekulé, are known to all classical scholars; at Berlin, Gerhard, Friederichs, Boeckh, Haupt, Mommsen and Kirchoff, need no more than passing mention, and Göttingen too did much through Curtius, (now for many years in Berlin), Sauppe and Wieseler. It would be difficult also to over-estimate the influence on archaeological study of such a man as Brun at Munich, or of the writings of Michaelis. Apart however from the brilliant scholars who have made German classical archaeology what it is, there has been since 1860 a system in vogue which has acted as a direct stimulus to classical students to turn their studies in the direction of archaeology. This system is that of the *Stipendia*. A certain number of students (*Stipendiataren*) who receive from the government a specified sum of money are sent out annually to Rome and Athens where they have the opportunity

of prosecuting their work at the establishments of the archaeological institute. Previous to the founding of the Institute at Athens, the *Stipendiaten* whose tastes drew them toward Greece were travellers rather than sojourners in the land, but many of these travellers have since become the foremost among German Hellenists. These *Stipendia* are awarded only to those who have proved their industry and capacity by some markedly good piece of work. The student has some special *Arbeit* to do upon the acceptance of which his success in obtaining the *Stipendium* depends. It is my impression that the awarding of *Stipendia* is in charge of the *Centraldirection* of the Imperial Archaeological Institute and is not controlled by the ministers of public instruction in the several states, but I am unfortunately at present without books and cannot be quite sure of the point.

From what has been said it will be clear how purely formal a matter the establishment of a German archaeological centre at Athens was. Everything was ready, only organization was necessary. Thus in 1874, Dr. Lüders became the first director; but the Institute can hardly be said really to have had its beginning until the following year when Professor Ulrich Koehler assumed the dictatorship. The first years of the German Institute were rendered particularly brilliant by the splendid successes of German scholarship as shown in the excavations at Olympia. In 1876 the first volume of *Mittheilungen des Kaiserlich deutschen archaologischen Instituts in Athen* appeared, a periodical of the greatest importance which has been continued to the present time. There have also been from time to time special publications brought out by the Institute at Athens which have uniformly been weighty contributions to archaeological literature. In 1886 Professor Koehler became a member of the University faculty at Berlin and Professor Petersen of Prague was appointed to take his place at Athens. He has only been at the head of the Institute one year and has since been transferred to Rome. The German Institute at Athens as now constituted is in charge of two secretaries and a librarian. The first secretary is Dr. Doerpfeld who established his now widely known reputation by his excellent work at Olympia. The second secretary is Dr. Wolters, the admirable reviser and editor of Friederichs' "Bausteine." Dr. Lolling is the librarian and one of the very first authorities on questions of Greek topography. It is to his careful work that we owe the excellence of Baedeker's *Griechenland*. The Institute at Athens then is German's great centre for the study of Hellenic Archaeology. It is not an Institution distinctly for the instruction of students who may frequent it, but rather, to use a figure, a fountain from which they may drink at will. The *Stipendiaten*, as has been pointed out, are always young men pretty well qualified to conduct their studies for themselves. They go to Athens and enjoy the privileges of the school library and are introduced to the museums and other antiquities. These advantages however are not for the exclusive use of *Stipendiaten*; other Germans frequent the school and nearly every winter finds some Professor or *Gymnasiallehrer* at work in Athens. Meetings of the Institute (*Sitzungen*) are held fortnightly at which questions of interest are discussed by the secretaries or librarian or by any person who may be invited. The cordial courtesy with which all students of whatever nationality have been welcomed at Athens by the Germans is a pleasant instance of scholarly kindness.

I have tried in the foregoing remarks to make clear

the fact that the German Institute at Athens is distinctly the result of the work of a long line of illustrious scholars, and that the active and learned constituency from which it draws its officers and students gives the Institution unusual solidity and efficiency. Such an Institution too, especially if it exist in a foreign country, is strengthened when it derives its legal existence directly from the government of a great nation, as is the case with the German school, but this is after all a secondary matter, and the real effectiveness of the Institution lies in the strength of the sound and far-reaching scholarship upon which it rests. I emphasize this feature of the German Institute, because it is to this that the American School presents the strongest contrast. The American School unfortunately, in a far wider sense than is the case with the German, must create its own constituency. Classical scholarship in this country has had its success mainly in the line of pure philology, and archaeology is only beginning to be scientifically studied. It could not be otherwise. We are too far distant from the great museums of classical antiquity, which must always be among the chief moving forces in turning the work of students in the direction of archaeology. The American School at Athens therefore had its origin almost entirely in the desire to stimulate the study of classical antiquity in this country.¹

It is not solely an archaeological school and hence its name, *The School of Classical Studies*, but of course study at Athens must be chiefly archaeological in character. Let me now give you a brief sketch of the origin of the American School and of the methods under which it is managed.

At a meeting of the *Archaeological Institute of America* in 1881 a committee was appointed to devise a plan by which an "American School of Classical Literature, Art and Antiquities" might be founded at Athens. The sum of money required to establish such an institution without delay upon a permanent basis was too large to admit of immediate collection, and it was decided to try to form a league of the principal universities and colleges in the United States, each one of which should pledge itself to contribute annually a certain sum for the support of the school. The director was to be appointed annually and was to be a professor in some one of the cooperating institutions. He was to receive no salary for his services in Athens. This plan has been carried out, and in accordance with it the American School has been in existence since the autumn of 1882, all arrangements for it being in the hands of a managing committee of the *Archaeological Institute*. The term of the school lasts from the 1st of October to the 1st of June. Graduates of the cooperating colleges, there being now about twenty in the league, may become members of the school without other expense than that which is involved in their journey to Athens and residence there, and as a matter of fact permission to enjoy the advantages of the school has always been granted when desired to graduates of any American college. The students beside doing some general study are expected each year to hand in a thesis on some subject connected with their work which shall give evidence of time well spent, and these essays, if satisfactory to the director and the managing committee, are printed among the *Papers of the American School*. One volume of such papers has already appeared and a second

¹ "An American School in particular should at first not so much aim at distinguished achievements as seek to arouse in American Colleges a genuine interest in classical archaeology in general." Report of Managing Committee of American School, 1881-1884, p. 29.

one is now printing. The managing committee have never claimed that the school could realize its highest usefulness under the present system. It has always been regarded as a temporary arrangement. Professor D'Ooge, the late director, but repeats the opinion of his predecessors when he says in his report: "With each year the disadvantages of an annually changing directorship become more patent." They are indeed so plain as to need no comment. The following quotations from the Managing Committee's Report, 1881—1884, show plainly their attitude toward the present constitution of the school: p. 27, "The school cannot hope immediately to accomplish special work in archaeological investigation which will put it on a level with the German and French Schools"; and again, p. 28, "That the director should through all the future history of the school continue to be a professor sent from one of the contributing colleges under an annual appointment is an arrangement which would be as undesirable as it would be impossible." Meanwhile the friends of the school are at work collecting money for the establishment of a permanent fund.

Has then the American School, in spite of its admitted limitations, justified its existence? I think this question may be answered unreservedly in the affirmative. In the first place an excellent working archaeological library has been collected; the school now owns a building at Athens which ensures to the director and students a comfortable and convenient place for work; in a word, a good foundation is being slowly and surely laid for a more important institution. Further, some fifteen or twenty young men have returned to America from Athens with a much better preparation both for teaching and for private work than would have been possible had not the school existed, and the professors who have had the advantage of a year in Athens ought certainly to bring that back with them which shall tend to quicken the intellectual life of the several institutions with which they are connected. The volume of *Papers* too although it may perhaps display no very great amount of original research, and although some of the contributions may already have become some-

what out of date through recent excavations, has in this country at any rate been a useful book, and such an essay for example as Professor Goodwin's on the Battle of Salamis is a contribution of lasting value to Greek History. The foregoing facts are a sufficient answer to the unjustifiable attack on the school and its managers which Mr. W. J. Stillman made about a year ago in the *New York Nation*. Those who have studied at Athens previous to the establishment of the school bear testimony to the enormous advantages which its existence has brought to American students of Hellenic antiquity. The work of the students of the American school is done under the oversight of the director, who however is not called upon to give regular instruction. It has been the custom of the school to visit and discuss in a body the ruins in and about Athens, and a more formal meeting has been held weekly for the discussion of various topics connected with classical study and for the reading of papers. Enough, I think, has been said to show that it is intended the American students should be under much more close direction than is desirable in the case of those who study at the German Institute; indeed in this respect the American school rather resembles that of the French. But this closer oversight is eminently proper, for the American college graduate has rarely had such training as would fit him for independent investigation. The German *Stipendiaten* however are trained to this very work. This lack, in one department at least of American education, we may hope the school at Athens will tend to supply.

In the meantime, while trusting that the American School at Athens may come to do much more than it has yet done, we who have profited by the advantages which it affords cannot be too grateful to the men whose unselfish and untiring labour has made it possible for us to work with so much ease in that far-away home of learning.

J. R. WHEELER.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS.

October 27th, 1887.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

IV.

Ce ne sont pas les réformes assurément qui ont manqué aux études classiques en France dans ces dernières années. Il y en a eu de salutaires, dénuisibles et d'indifférentes. Il s'en était produit déjà sous le second empire. Ainsi M. Fortoul a attaché son nom à une mesure qui introduisait dans les lycées la bifurcation, c'est à dire la nécessité de choisir, à l'entrée de la troisième, entre les études classiques et les études dites spéciales, qui ont pour objet les mathématiques, les sciences physiques, etc. C'est aussi un ministre de l'empire, M. Duruy, qui, en créant l'École des hautes études, a infusé un sang nouveau à notre

enseignement supérieur. Enfin, plusieurs jeunes savants, groupés principalement autour de la *Revue critique*, avaient répandu des idées sur les sciences historiques et leurs méthodes, qui ne pouvaient manquer d'exercer une influence considérable sur les méthodes d'enseignement. Mais c'est surtout la République qui a tout remué et beaucoup développé. Elle porte ses faveurs avant tout sur l'enseignement primaire, qui est censé plus démocratique. Mais les deux autres degrés ne sont pas oubliés. L'enseignement supérieur y a gagné incontestablement beaucoup. Pour l'enseignement secondaire, c'est plus douteux. Cependant, c'est quelque chose de s'être ébranlé, d'être sorti de l'ornière, de chercher, alors même qu'on n'aurait pas encore trouvé. Et puis, il ne faut pas oublier que l'important, dans l'enseignement,