

traditions have ever been powerful in the older American colleges, as is seen, for example, in the custom of daily prayers or chapel; in fact, such traditions have brought into existence numerous colleges which, though at their foundation of the nature of denominational institutions, have mostly lost their sectarian character. The growth of Harvard is an interesting illustration of the development of the American college. It was founded in 1636 as 'a school or college,' and it remained a college for nearly two centuries: in 1812 the Divinity School was established, in 1817 the Law School, in 1847 the Lawrence Scientific School. The 'University now comprehends the following departments: Harvard College, the Divinity School, the Law School, the Lawrence Scientific School, the Medical School, the Dental School, the Bussey Institution, the School of Veterinary Medicine, the Graduate Department, the Library, the Observatory, the Botanic Garden and Herbarium, and the Museum of Comparative Zoology.' These departments are all under the control of the Corporation, consisting of the President, five Fellows—elsewhere usually called trustees—and a Treasurer, and each is administered by its own faculty or board of instruction and management. The Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore—the best known of the newer universities—was founded in 1876, and at once began with a graduate department (non-professional, philosophical faculty), and with a small undergraduate department. It is the only university in the country where the graduate or university element is not distinctly overshadowed by the undergraduate or college element. Its unique and signal success is due to the skilful development of the graduate side.

There has been of late years a gradual rise in the average age of students coming to college: whereas fifty years ago this age was below seventeen, it is now

close upon twenty. Professional schools have likewise improved and prolonged their courses of instruction, and a demand for skilled and accomplished teachers in the higher schools, academies, and colleges has led to the establishment of graduate courses of liberal study at the University. A consequence of these movements is that college graduates enter active professional life from three to five years older than was the case fifty or even thirty years ago, and on the average do not become self-supporting before the age of twenty-eight or thirty. The effect of this is to diminish proportionally the number of men who go to college: young men prefer to omit the collegiate stage of education and to begin professional study without adequate preparation. Among the remedies which have been suggested that of the reduction of the college course from four to three years has met with some favour.

Such is the environment of classical education in the United States, and such are the general conditions under which classical studies are here pursued, and classical scholars and teachers produced. We are now in a position to undertake a detailed examination of our subject, which it is hoped will be the more intelligible for the foregoing remarks. In subsequent letters I propose, in compliance with the Editor's invitation, briefly to describe the discipline received in the classics by the vast number of youths who still make classical studies the basis of their education, and to point out the main features of our higher classical scholarship as shown in the special training received by our advanced teachers, and in the contributions made by American scholars to classical philology.

J. H. WRIGHT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
December 14, 1888.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE PROFESSOR PALEY.

By Professor Paley's death, which took place on Saturday, December 8th, at his residence in Boscombe, one of the ripest and most industrious classical scholars of our day has passed away, at the age of seventy-two. Many notices of his life and works have appeared in the *Times*, *Athenæum*, and other papers; and in Timbs's *Men of the Time* a catalogue of his chief works, corrected by himself, is given, so that perhaps it is needless to repeat them in detail here. He was born in 1816, at his father's rectory of Easingwold near York, the eldest of several still living brothers, grandson of the well-known author of the *Evidences of Christianity*. Thence he moved to Shrewsbury School, then under the rule of Dr. Butler (afterwards Bishop of Lichfield), and thence in due time to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1838, not appearing as a candidate for classical honours: for he had

no fancy for mathematics, even to the extent demanded for obtaining a 'junior optime,' which was then required from all classical honour candidates. As he did not win any of the University scholarships, there really was no evidence in his earlier career of the eminence he was ere long to attain as a student of the classics. His M.A. degree was taken in 1842, and he resided at Cambridge, reading and taking pupils, for four years. In 1846 he joined the church of Rome, left the University, and resided in Peterborough, Dover, and elsewhere for fourteen years, which he devoted (though never neglecting the Greek and Latin languages, which he loved so well) to the study of Gothic architecture, and also of natural science. He became a skilful botanist, and spent some time in studying the habits of earthworms: in fact, if it had not been for the appearance of Darwin's monograph on the subject, he might not

improbably have published the various notes he had made as to their habits, and their use in preparing the soil for the growth of plants. He was one of the original and most active members of the Cambridge Camden Society and edited (besides many contributions to the *Ecclesiologist* and similar publications) notes on churches round Cambridge, and also those round Peterborough: remarks on the architecture of Peterborough Cathedral, a manual of Gothic moulding (which has gone through four editions) and other works. He published also a Flora of Peterborough, a Flora of Dover, and various minor papers in Botany.

He returned to the University in 1860, on the partial removal of religious disability, and remained there for fourteen years, practising as a tutor in the classics, with marked success. He was a most conscientious and careful teacher. In 1874 he was appointed Professor of Classical Literature in the Roman Catholic college at Kensington, and soon afterwards Classical Examiner to the University of London.

Numerous editions of classical authors, both Greek and Latin, in the *Bibliotheca Classica* and separately, attest his industry, and, latterly, the accuracy of his scholarship. The first author which he took in hand was Aeschylus, publishing the plays separately with Latin notes. These were afterwards issued in one volume, and later in the *Bibliotheca Classica* with English notes. It is no treason to his memory to say that in the later editions his riper scholarship removed various blemishes which had marred his earlier work: he was himself fully conscious that we all must be learners to the end of our lives. However the early practice of composition in the Latin and Greek tongues secured him against the error of treating passages as if the order of the words had little or no significance, and the meaning of the text could be arrived at, after the fashion of some modern editors, by transposition of words, as one might deal with the pieces in a Chinese puzzle.

Besides the Aeschylus, he brought out editions of Sophocles, Euripides, three plays of Aristophanes, Hesiod, Theocritus, the *Iliad*, some private orations of Demosthenes, Ovid's *Fasti*, Propertius and some epigrams of Martial. He also published various English translations, one of the Fifth Book of Propertius in verse, portions of Plato and Aristotle, and, quite recently, the Gospel of St. John, and some witty fragments of the comic poets of Athens, in

NO. XXI. VOL. III.

English verse, very clever, accurate, and amusing. At an earlier period he issued two volumes of extracts from the Greek prose writers under the title 'Greek Wit.' Many of the above have passed through several editions. Various articles also in the *Edinburgh* and other reviews, in the *Journal of Philology* and other serials, are due to his fluent pen.

Notwithstanding all this industry, he was strangely indifferent to the study of modern tongues. He did not know a word of German, a singular thing for a student of the classics. Still his varied knowledge, quiet humour, and wide charity made him a delightful companion; it was impossible to be in his society without realising the charm of his conversation, and often gaining valuable information and unexpected light on difficult questions.

His views on the subject of the authorship of the poems which bear the name of Homer are well known. In sundry publications, as well as in the preface to his edition of the *Iliad*, he pointed out that the various legends connected with the story of the fall of Troy, which form the theme of many dramas of the Greek tragedies, are not to be found in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* as we now have them, but are in fact embodied in the poem ascribed to Quintus of Smyrna, who is commonly supposed to have derived his materials from the Greek poets Arctinus and Lesches. Paley argues that we have in these books the substance of the so-called *κύκλος* or round of legends clustering about the story of the siege of Troy: that this mass of semi-mythic tales formed really the Homer of the tragic poets, while our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* appear first distinctly in Plato's quotations—and were, in the Professor's view, themselves modelled out of the general stock of traditions, either in or not much before the age of Pericles: the language itself being no true ancient dialect, but artificial in its colour of antiquity, and full of comparatively modern phraseology. His views have found more acceptance in Germany than in England: it cannot be denied that he makes out a strong case, though it is hard to believe that a poet (or poets) of such transcendent genius as to give to each of the two poems their consistent unity and marvellous power and beauty should have arisen in Athens in the fifth century B.C., at such a brilliant epoch of literature, and left no trace of himself or his name for later generations. However, Paley himself never wavered in his convictions on this point.

Another favourite subject of discussion with

G

him was the unfair estimate usually formed of Euripides: he was fond of dwelling on his singular mastery of language and skill in argument, as well as his knowledge of human nature, though some perhaps will think that this is rather in regard of its frailty and weakness than of its nobler gifts. He was indignant also at the charge brought against Euripides of being a woman-hater, pleading that Alcestis was one of the noblest figures on the Greek stage, and that quite as many virtuous as vicious heroines were depicted in the extant plays of this dramatist.

Dr. Paley continued to the close of his life in the communion of the Church of Rome, and was buried with her rites in the churchyard of St. Clement's in Boscombe, a sort of suburb of Bournemouth, where the last seven years of his life had been spent. Still his loyalty to his adopted Church was not inconsistent with a spirit of the most free speculation, for he allowed no barriers to interfere with the search for truth. He was persuaded that no delusions, however time-honoured or approved, would avail to help a man in the last resort.

By Dr. Paley's death a gap is left in the ranks of living English scholars which there is no one exactly fitted to fill. Those who have enjoyed the privilege of intimacy with him now feel keenly the loss of a friend of singularly clear and candid mind, always ready to welcome any additions to his stock of knowledge, ready to listen to any argument temperately urged, and if he could not assent, to give reasons for his own view. The members of his own family know best the unvarying kindness and

unselfishness which prompted his every word and act in the social circle, but even friends who only were able to visit him occasionally could see something of the rare beauty of his character. No one who has known anything of him in social converse could fail to recognise in him an earnest seeker after truth, a gentle and loving nature, ever considerate towards others, and anxious to help them in all ways to the utmost of his power: as well as a mind stored with the most various and interesting knowledge, always at the service of his friends, but never forced upon them, worn, as has been well said of another pure soul, lightly, and like a flower.

C. B. S.

THE Rev. Thomas Field, late fellow of St. John's College, and one of Mr. Paley's younger contemporaries at Cambridge, writes as follows from Bigby Rectory, near Brigg, in Lincolnshire: 'Being at Madeira in November, 1852, I went round by the north side of the island and spent a night or two at Santa Anna, a house kept then by a Portuguese doctor. I there found and copied from out of the Visitors' book the following *poëmatia*, written by Paley's own hand not very long before.'

ἐνταυθοῖ νόσφ τετριμμένος ἦν τις δδίτης
 ἔλθῃ, ἢ στρυγερῶ πένθει τηκόμενος,
 τῶνδ' ὄγκῃς ἐπάνεισι καὶ ἀρτιμελῆς ἀπὸ χώρων,
 καὶ νόον ἐκ δακρύων τρέψει ἐς εὐπαθίην,
 ὦδε γὰρ αἰὲν ἔχεις ἕαρος πολυανθέος ὄρην,
 ὦδε πῶον ζήσεις αἰθέρα λαμπρότατον.

Venimus huc, vernos cum spirans blanda per agros
 Panderet aura tuas, insula dives, opes:
 Venimus—et scopulos requievimus inter et umbras,
 Egimus et laetos non sine sole dies.
 O fortunatos, quis sors hic degere vitam,
 Inque tuo, felix terra, jacere sinu.
*Hic praeuens Deus est, loquitur Natura; jugorum
 Culmina respondent, hic manifestus adest.*

F. A. P.

ERNST VON LEUTSCH.

THE death of Professor von Leutsch which, it will be remembered, occurred in the summer of 1887, has caused the *Philologischer Anzeiger* to be discontinued. The last number, which completes Vol. xvii., appropriately ends with a monograph on the venerable scholar from the pen of Dr. Max Schneidewin, his successor in the editorship of the *Philologus*, and son of Professor F. W. Schneidewin, the founder of that periodical. The following is an abstract:—

Ernst Ludwig von Leutsch was born on August 16, 1808, at Frankfort-on-Main, where his father was at that time Saxon ambassador. After removing to Dresden and thence to Leipzig, his father settled finally at Celle as member of the Supreme Court of Appeal (*Oberappellationsgerichtsrath*) under the Hanoverian government.

E. v. Leutsch entered in his nineteenth year at the University of Göttingen, where he studied under

Mitscherlich, Dissen, and Otfried Müller, while among his friends as fellow-students were numbered L. Ahrens, C. L. Grotefend, F. W. Schneidewin and A. Geffers, a special bond of union being the 'philologische Gesellschaft' they formed among themselves. In this the discussions were held in Latin: the favourite subjects were the Cyclic and Hesiodic fragments, whence the thesis—*Thebaidos Cyclicae Reliquiae*—on which Leutsch graduated (1830). The following session saw Leutsch at Berlin where he studied under A. Böckh. In 1831 he returned to Göttingen as *privatdocent*. His breadth of study is shown by his propounding and upholding no fewer than sixty theses, on July 6, 1833, for the post of 'assessor' to the classical faculty. He became extraordinary professor, May 2, 1837, and regular professor, with F. W. Schneidewin, in 1842, on the demand of K. F. Hermann, who before accepting a