



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

on The Life of the ancient Greeks, describing various starting-points (birth, going to school, entering on a trade or occupation, matrimony, etc.: seven stages in all) in the career of a typical Greek. Some points in the paper were new; the other materials employed were grouped most effectively.

Dr. Sturtevant discussed Horace Odes 1.16, holding that the mater of the Ode is Canidia, and that the filia, her daughter, is identical with Tyndaris of Odes 1.17.

The Association adopted resolutions expressive of its appreciation of the hospitality shown to it by Princeton University, the Classical Department of the University, and by the Local Committee. The Association also directed the Secretary to convey its thanks to the Classical Associations of the Middle West and New England for sending delegates, and to the delegates for their presence, and expressed the hope that the custom of interchanging delegates would continue.

The officers elected for the new year are as follows: President, Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Charles Knapp, Columbia University; Vice Presidents, for New York, Professor P. O. Place, Syracuse University, and Professor G. D. Kellogg, of Union College; for New Jersey, Mr. W. F. Little, Battle High School, Elizabeth; for Pennsylvania, Mr. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Philadelphia, and Professor H. F. Allen, Washington and Jefferson College; for Maryland, Miss Mary E. Harwood, Girls Latin School, Baltimore; for Delaware, Mr. Floyd P. Johnson, Friends School, Wilmington; for the District of Columbia, Miss A. S. Rainey, Central High School, Washington, D. C.—The editors of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY were reappointed by the Executive Committee; Professor Knapp was reappointed as Business Manager of the paper.

The meeting at Princeton, it may be said in conclusion, takes rank as one of the best meetings of the Association.

C. K.

### WHY STUDY GREEK?

Reasons for the study of subjects which are technically allied to professional or specialized pursuits of life lie open before the most superficial observer. The boy who intends to become a civil engineer perceives that he must study mathematics. The embryo physician readily sees his need of knowledge of chemistry and biology. The future lawyer can realize without argument that he must study statutes. Any one of these young men is likely to see that he requires some study of English. He may appreciate

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read before The Humanist Society of The University of Iowa, on May 3, 1900, and was published in the Bulletin of the State University of Iowa, New Series No. 203, in June, 1900. It seems well worthy of republication here. Lack of space, unfortunately, has compelled certain omissions. Copies of the full paper may be obtained from the author.

C. K.

that knowledge of history or of German and French will be of practical use to him. He may even yield reluctantly to the plea that Latin has some more or less vital connection with his particular profession. Unfortunately the claims of Greek for the most part do not lie so near the surface and are more easily overlooked. The purpose of this paper is briefly to present these claims. Neither the claims nor the presentation is new. Originality in this line would be difficult, but a brief statement may prove of some interest and value. . . .

In general the same arguments hold for the study of both Latin and Greek—disregarding for the present the fact that Greek is still a living tongue, spoken daily in a form close to that of ancient times by some fifteen or twenty millions of men over most of the civilized world. . . . Together they must ultimately stand or fall. Were it not for the accidental and trivial circumstance that Greek is written in a partially different alphabet from our own, this fact would be more generally recognized and their study would be nearer on a parity than they happen to be today. But this does not mean that the two are duplicates, the one of the other. The ancient Greek was speculative and imaginative. He developed philosophies, literature, and artistic forms. He made constitutions and planned ideal states but not law. The Roman was practical, matter-of-fact, and imitative. He adapted with consummate skill to his own use other men's creations. He developed law and legal codes but not political theory. The two nations complement and supplement rather than duplicate each other. In this field the "full man", as Bacon calls him, is made by study of the two civilizations. . . .

The "practical" is the standard to which all branches of learning must square. If a subject be not practical, we have no time for it. The world demands, and has a right to demand, of us efficiency. If a boy is to study Latin or Greek, or, for that matter, German or physics or history or sociology, solely that he may be able to teach it later on to other wretched beings who are aiming at the same end, let us release him at once. . . . The teaching argument is a "vicious circle", unworthy of consideration, though one sometimes hears it used. No, by "practical" (a good Greek word) we mean something that we can use in our daily lives. But just here we must exercise care that we understand what we are saying. If by "practical" we mean only that which we are sure to need in some specific task of today, we have narrowed our field so as to shut out liberal education altogether. Academic halls cannot foresee every specific experience of the individual. They can only teach him general principles and augment his ability to apply these principles to the particular emergency. Speaking generally, in so far as the college departs from this ideal, it loses

its real function in preparing men for life. "Education is not a trade to be mastered by learning a set of recipes". And right here is where many modern courses err. Work purely technical is expected to supply the "recipes" with which the man is to meet his emergencies. The "recipes" may fit; they may not. And so the student thus prepared is foreordained to fall short when the great opportunity comes.

And besides, the practical means something higher also. Man is capable of a nobler and better life than mere bread-and-butter existence. "Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment?" The true practical includes the highest and fullest development, mentally, morally, and spiritually. It provides for leisure as well as for toil, and it is concerned with the man's highest general happiness. An education that does not take into consideration these loftier things is worse than deficient.

Much of the claim of Greek to be considered practical, at least the part most worthy of presentation, is of this higher type, though some reasons are nearer to the surface, as we shall see. Comparatively few men are required to use Greek in performing their daily routine. If only these few are to be trained, it is doubtless futile to urge its more general study. Most men not professionally engaged in Greek will forget after ten years how to read Aeschylus and Homer, just as they will forget how to read Goethe or Molière, or to analyze rocks and flowers, or to solve problems in calculus. The only difference may be in degree according to the talent of each. Fortunately this is of little consequence—valuable as it is to retain one's former skill—provided he has been honest in his first acquisition of it. The residuum remains, and that after all, with the added polish that comes with the attrition of time and with further study, is what will mark him as superior to his fellows.

Greek is valuable as a teacher of discrimination. Not that it is the sole teacher. Discrimination comes from the study of Latin, from the study, properly conducted, of zoology and botany or of modern languages. But Greek preëminently requires this quality. It may be a trifle *per se* to place a Greek accent correctly, or perhaps to differentiate by their accents two words similarly spelled. It is a small, but more important, matter to discover the precise meaning of a Greek word or idiom, to weigh the niceties of an expression, or to unravel the thought of an author, but in so doing the student must exercise to a peculiar degree both his power to observe correctly and to discriminate. And through discrimination comes judgment, and power in these matters helps the man to observe, to discriminate, and to judge in the problems of life. To deny this is to deny altogether the utility of education.

Allied to this training in discrimination is the

formation of a correct taste. Taste implies discrimination and not only does the Greek language by its sensitiveness compel the exercise of correct choice, but the literature of which the language is an expression is particularly distinguished for its dignity and sanity. Plainness, simplicity, nobility, moderation, correctness of touch, delicacy and sweetness of thought, along with rapidity of movement and human sympathy, are lofty ideals to set before the mind.

Observation, discrimination, and taste, with a cultivated power of expression, are precisely the qualities required by men in the various professions. The lawyer must observe and discriminate correctly. He must analyze the statute or the decision or the evidence before him word by word and sentence by sentence, to discern the precise meaning and its application to the case before him, and these are the very processes that he has been cultivating in his study of Greek. . . .

The case is not far different in regard to the needs of students of the various branches of engineering and for those who are to engage in business. We have too many illiterate engineers and business men. The huckster must be expected to get along as best he may with the knowledge of mere technical details, but not so the man who hopes to take a leading position in his profession or business. He must have discrimination and taste and power of expression as truly as the lawyer and physician.

In addition to these general reasons the student of natural science, whether as physician or investigator, has a special cause for acquiring a knowledge of Greek. His working vocabulary is largely derived from Greek. A glance in a scientific book, or, say, at the pages of the catalogue of a medical college ought to convince. *Allopathy, homeopathy, hygiene, anatomy, sepsis, autopsy, bacteriology, pathology, histology, pharmacology, clinic, therapeutic, anaesthetic, thoracic*—but why multiply examples when their name is legion? . . .

Still more cogent reasons should incite the student of Christian theology to study Greek. Greek is the original language in which the New Testament, the revelation of his religion, has come down to us, and its fullness will never be revealed to him who will not take the trouble to study it in the Greek. Shades of meaning which none of the many translations or commentaries has revealed, and which no translation or commentary can reveal, are spread on every page before the diligent student of the original text. And this is to take no account of the inspiration and illumination that will dawn on the religious teacher who reads deeply in the classical Greek literature, who absorbs into himself such a book as Plato's *Phaedo*.

The economist and the historian have also much of special interest in Greek. For them Greece is

a microcosm in which they can see in their inception and evolution many of the theories which still want an ultimate solution. Socialism is there, and the rest. Not that the Greeks were always successful—but herein may lie the lesson, and he who will read aright must drink deeply at the original spring.

Students of English and English literature must especially acknowledge their debt to Greece. The large Greek element in the English vocabulary and the immeasurable influence of Greek, both directly and indirectly, on English literature cannot be gainsaid. Many, perhaps the majority, of our best English writers have been saturated with the thoughts and the expression of Greek literature, and not to go to the same sources for our interpretation is to acknowledge that we are willing to fall short of appreciating to the full measure our birthright. . . .

The student and teacher of Latin is "doomed to mediocrity" if he has not Greek. . . . As Professor Bennett justly remarks, "All Roman civilization is so dominated by Greek influence and Greek ideas, that the person ignorant of Greek is incapable of understanding and interpreting to others the significance of Roman life and thought".

But the most important and the highest reason for the study of Greek has only been intimated. This is the securing of a familiar acquaintance with the world's greatest literature, a literature that originated and that embraces nearly all literary forms, epic, lyric, dramatic, historical, philosophical, romantic, and scientific, and that has been actively increasing nearly all of the time from the ninth or tenth century before Christ till the present day. Says Lessing, "Should one have lived only to read the 23d song of the Iliad, he could not lament of his existence". And it is worth while to learn Greek, so as to read the lines of "burning" Sappho and "melodious" Pindar, to read the sublime dramas of Aeschylus and of Sophocles and of "Our Euripides, the human" . . . It is worth while to study Greek, in order to read the superb stories of Herodotus and Lucian and the mellifluous dialogues of Plato and the earnest thunderings of Demosthenes. It is worth while to study Greek so as to become acquainted with that great soul, Socrates the philosopher. The influence of these has penetrated to the heart's core of our civilization, so that, whether we will or no, "we are all Platonists or Aristotelians". In the hurly burly of modern materialism we have particular need of the dignity, moderation, and fidelity of taste displayed not only in Greek literature but in Greek art and Greek living.

The argument is sometimes presented that we may gain this contact with Greece through translations and other secondary means. Like all specious arguments this contains a little verity. Good translations—and such are rare indeed—have their use for

the busy man who has already learned the ring of true gold, to assist in completing his picture of a literature, or for the man who is too advanced in life to drink at the spring. But they are only a makeshift and usually a sorry substitute for the original. A translation can at best carry over only a certain percentage. A comparatively prosaic author like, say, Diodorus can be translated with no great loss, but the nearer we approach literature of real tone and color, of unique imagery and style and thought, the more is lost in the transference, until we come to Homer or Aeschylus or Pindar or Sappho, when the loss is often greater than the gain. Witness the almost complete failure of all translators of Homer and Aeschylus, even of such masters of poetry as Pope and Browning. But, like the comforts of religion, this cannot be demonstrated to the Philistine. The man who is smugly satisfied with "good enough" will not care, nor is he to be regarded save in so far as he "make his brother to offend". Fancy turning into another tongue some such imaginative passages of English poetry as Shakespeare's "With love's light wings did I o'erperch these walls" or Gray's "Where through the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault, The pealing anthem swells its note of praise", or such poems as Shelley's "To a Skylark", or Poe's "The Bells" or almost any poem of Tennyson. What lover of English would wish these known only through German? And of course the argument holds good for other languages, so that when the translation-plea is used by devotees of modern languages the retort courteous is to observe that they should also lead the preference for translations of Schiller and Racine and Dante. Doubtless better than nothing.

The entrance into the curriculum of various new subjects has indirectly been of benefit to classical studies. The classics were at least in danger a generation or so ago of having their life sapped by being made a *corpus vile* for syntactical vivisection, but the majority of classical teachers today have come to realize that syntax, as such, belongs to graduate study, and they have returned to more sympathetic study of literature and life. Instead of the formal syntactical scalpel the teacher of today uses the instruments which he has learned from science, the stereopticon, photographs, models, casts, archaeological results, every means to help the student to realize that the Greeks and Romans lived, were men and women of flesh and blood as we are. Under this true impulse Greek throbs with new life. The intrinsic value of Greek will never change; its potency is eternal. It has ushered in more than one renaissance. Perhaps it is destined again to deliver a race from utilitarianism. Who knows?

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA. CHARLES HEALD WELLER.