

HYPERBOREUS

STUDIA CLASSICA

ναυσι δ' οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν κεν εὔροις
ἔς Ἑπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θαυμαστὰν ὁδόν

(Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 29-30)

EDITORES

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA
DENIS KEYER DMITRI PANCHENKO
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

PETROPOLI

Vol. 19

2013

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
VERLAG C.H. BECK MÜNCHEN

INSTITUTIONS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP
in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

INSTITUTIONEN DER ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT
in den 19. und 20. Jahrhunderten

АНТИКОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ
В XIX–XX ВВ.

EDIDERUNT

NINA ALMAZOVA SOFIA EGOROVA DENIS KEYER
DMITRI PANCHENKO ALEXANDER VERLINSKY

adiuvantibus

Valentina Khodareva Daria Kondakova
Natalia Kuznetsova Jr. Tatiana Shaburina
Arsenij Vetushko-Kalevich Vera Zhizhina-Gefter

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
PETROPOLI
MMXIV

INSTITUTIONS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP
in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

INSTITUTIONEN DER ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT
in den 19. und 20. Jahrhunderten

АНТИКОВЕДЧЕСКИЕ ИНСТИТУТЫ
в XIX–XX вв.

ПОД РЕДАКЦИЕЙ

Н. А. АЛМАЗОВОЙ, А. Л. ВЕРЛИНСКОГО (*отв. ред.*),
С. К. ЕГОРОВОЙ, Д. В. КЕЙЕРА, Д. В. ПАНЧЕНКО

при участии

А. А. Вегушко-Калевича, В. Б. Жижинной-Гефтер,
Д. Д. Кондаковой, Н. А. Кузнецовой-мл.,
В. А. Ходаревой, Т. В. Шабуриной

Санкт-Петербург
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA PETROPOLITANA
2014

HYPERBOREUS: Классическая филология и история

Выходит два раза в год

Редакция: Н. А. Алмазова, А. Л. Верлинский (отв. ред. тома),
С. К. Егорова, Д. В. Кейер, Д. В. Панченко

Редакционный совет: Михаэль фон Альбрехт, А. К. Гаврилов,
Пэт Истерлинг, Карло Лукарини

Адрес редакции и издателя: 197198, С.-Петербург, ул. Красного Курсанта, д. 6/9
Античный кабинет (HYPERBOREUS)
Факс: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com

По вопросам подписки обращаться по адресу редакции

HYPERBOREUS: Studia Classica

HYPERBOREUS wurde im Jahre 1994 durch die Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana gegründet.

Der Vertrieb außerhalb Rußlands erfolgt durch den Verlag C. H. Beck (Oskar Beck),
Wilhelmstr. 9, D-80801 München, Postfachadresse: Postfach 400340, D-80703 München.

Die Zeitschrift erscheint ab 1996 in zwei Halbjahresschriften. Abonnementpreis jährlich ab
Vol. 2 € 34,90 (in diesem Betrag sind € 2,28 Mehrwertsteuer enthalten), für das Einzelheft
€ 19,50 (Mehrwertsteueranteil € 1,28), jeweils zuzüglich Vertriebsgebühren; die Kündigungs-
frist des Abonnements beträgt sechs Wochen zum Jahresende. Preis für Vol. 1, 1994/5, auf
Anfrage bei dem Verlag C. H. Beck.

Herausgeber: Nina Almazova, Sofia Egorova, Denis Keyer,
Dmitri Panchenko, Alexander Verlinsky (verantw.)

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat: Michael von Albrecht, P. E. Easterling,
Alexander Gavrilov, Carlo M. Lucarini

Alle für die Redaktion bestimmten Manuskripte und Einsendungen sind zu richten an:
Bibliotheca Classica Petropolitana (HYPERBOREUS)
ul. Krasnogo Kursanta 6/9
197198 St. Petersburg, Russia
Fax: (812) 274-3395, (812) 235-4267
E-mail: hyperbicl@gmail.com

Die Publikationssprachen im HYPERBOREUS sind Russisch, Englisch, Französisch, Deutsch,
Italienisch und Lateinisch; den Beiträgen wird jeweils eine Zusammenfassung auf Englisch
und Russisch hinzugefügt.

Entgegnungen werden im HYPERBOREUS nur ausnahmsweise aufgenommen. Eingegangene
Druckschriften werden nicht zurückgeschickt. Mit Namen gezeichnete Artikel geben die Auf-
fassung des Verfassers, nicht der Redaktion wieder. Alle Nachrichten werden nach bestem
Wissen, aber ohne Gewähr gegeben.

CONTENTS

Preface	7
---------------	---

ACADEMIES OF SCIENCES AS CENTERS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

EKATERINA BASARGINA Classical Studies in the St Petersburg Imperial Academy of Sciences in the 19 th – early 20 th centuries	11
ALEXANDER GAVRILOV Russische Institutionen des 19. Jhs und der Akademiker Avgust Karlovič Nauck	26
STEFAN REBENICH Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Zeit von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931), A. von Harnack (1851–1930) und E. Meyer (1855–1930) ...	44
BERND SEIDENSTICKER Die Altertumswissenschaften an der Berliner Akademie: Rückblick und Gegenwart	72

CLASSICS IN UNIVERSITIES: EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

WILT ADEN SCHRÖDER Das russische philologische Seminar in Leipzig: das Seminar unter Ritschl und Lipsius (1873–1890) und der Versuch der Wiederbegründung (1911–1913)	91
JÜRGEN V. UNGERN-STERNBERG Gustav Wilmanns, ein Schüler Mommsens, an der Kaiserlichen Universität Dorpat (1869–1872)	147
ALEXANDER VERLINSKY <i>Philologia inter Disciplinas</i> : The Department of Classics at St Petersburg University 1819–1884	162

Статьи сопровождаются резюме на русском и английском языке
Summary in Russian and English

ORGANIZING CLASSICS FORMALLY AND INFORMALLY

BRIAN A. SPARKES	
Classical Associations and Societies in the United Kingdom	205
CHRISTOPHER STRAY	
The Absent Academy: the Organisation of Classical Scholarship in Nineteenth-century England	214

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIETIES

YURI KALASHNIK	
Gangolf von Kieseritzky and the Classical Department of the Hermitage in the Last Decades of the 19 th Century	229
JURIJ A. VINOGRADOV	
Die Kaiserliche Archäologische Kommission und die Erforschung der klassischen Altertümer im nördlichen Schwarzmeergebiet (1859–1917) . . .	239

CLASSICAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ANNA USPENSKAJA	
Das dritte Petersburger Gymnasium	275
VSEVOLOD ZELTCHENKO	
Gymnasium Classicum Petropolitanum	289
Key Words	297
Indices	
Index nominum	299
Index institutorum, sodalitatum, actorum	307
Правила для авторов	316
Guidelines for Contributors	318

THE ABSENT ACADEMY:
THE ORGANISATION OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

In this paper I want to look at the overall shape of the organisation of Classics in England in the nineteenth century, both formal and informal. The focus on Academies of the conference at which the paper was originally delivered prompts thoughts of the institutional organisation of scholarship and of the concentration, even centralisation, of decision-making and finance. We might imagine, if only as an ideal type in Max Weber's sense, a completely organised system, with a single national or imperial university forming part of a state apparatus. Funding and patronage alike would be contained within it, scholarly careers controlled by its functionaries. This would in fact be – to use the term employed by Franz Neumann in his classic study of the National Socialist regime in Germany, *Behemoth* – a “command economy” of knowledge.¹ To imagine such an ideal type is to realise first, that the organisation of scholarship in some European countries has approached it in some respects and at some times. But secondly, it makes it clear that scholarship in Britain has resembled such a type to a very small degree. To some extent this is a result of the distinctive pattern of British state formation. An insular state whose political and physical boundaries coincide and which has not experienced large-scale internal conflict for over a century can be expected to be relatively relaxed about the internal organisation of intellectual life. The most serious threat to this stance, as we shall see, came in the Napoleonic period.

At the institutional level of the university we find again a distinctive English pattern. The relative autonomy of Oxford and Cambridge from the state was reflected in the fact they were alike yet in some ways different: non-identical twins. Oxford and Cambridge were unique among European universities. On the continent the arts faculty had

¹ F. Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933–44* (London 1942).

atrophied since the Middle Ages, while the professional faculties had developed and expanded; but in England training for the church was hardly carried on seriously, although the two ancient universities were wings of the Anglican Church, and legal training was dominated by the Inns of Court in London, which were in effect England's third university. On the continent the faculties ruled: in England the colleges had taken over. The conjunction of this collegiate focus and arts training together produced the tutorial system, as opposed to the professorial lectures common on the other side of the Channel. In addition, continental universities had been either destroyed or reconstructed in the wake of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, neither of which had had much direct effect in England. In the first half of the nineteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge were thus anomalous institutions which did not correspond to any of the four European models of the university: the corporate institutions of Scotland and Russia; the state universities of Austria, Spain, Holland and Belgium; the French *Université*; and the Humboldtian idealist model of Germany. The two English universities entered the nineteenth century as conservative, collegiate and confessional institutions, run by small bodies (the Hebdomadal Board in Oxford, the Caput Senatus in Cambridge) whose powers of veto made successful reform very hard to achieve.²

On the other hand, the French Revolution had not gone unnoticed in England, nor had the Terror, and the moral alarms they generated reinforced conservative views in England. French clergymen fleeing from Paris were given refuge in Oxford in the 1790s, and a causal link can be established between the revolutionary alarms of that decade and the Oxford statute of 1800 which established the modern system of examinations in that university. What was set up in 1800 was a control system: the concern at its heart was *disciplina* in both senses: learning and discipline.³ But this was not the state at work: it was an institution at one remove from the state, a university which was technically an educational wing of the established church. The moral alarms which lay behind it will have been maintained by the noticeable rise in admissions between 1800 and 1825, which opened up the prospect of large numbers of educated but

² See L. W. B. Brockliss, "The European University in the Age of Revolution, 1789–1850", *History of the University of Oxford VI* (Oxford 1997) 77–133. Cf. R. D. Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914* (Oxford 2004).

³ W. R. Ward, *Georgian Oxford* (London 1965) 1–20; M. G. Brock, "The Oxford of Peel and Gladstone", *History of the University of Oxford VI* (Oxford 1997) 7–71.

unemployed young men ripe for the temptations of radical thinking and revolutionary activity.⁴ We should notice further that the statute of 1800 represented the extension to the whole university of teaching and examining systems already in place in some of the leading colleges; and the withering of the higher faculties of theology, law and medicine meant that the curriculum transplanted from the colleges to the new university examinations was dominated by Classics.

Meanwhile, in Cambridge a very different situation obtained. The university was much less High Church than Oxford. A declaration of allegiance to the doctrines of the Church of England was demanded from students on graduation, rather than at matriculation as at Oxford. In a period when it was very common to attend university without graduating, this must have led to significant differences in the climates of opinion in the two institutions. In 1800 Cambridge already had an honours examination whose roots went back almost a century, but it was dominated by mathematics.⁵ Undergraduates who excelled in Classics could find recognition only within colleges or by winning one of the university prizes and scholarships, many of which were hedged with entry restrictions, only irregularly available and almost entirely confined to Latin and Greek composition. As at Oxford, the interaction between college and university was important, but in Cambridge academic life was dominated by two colleges, Trinity and St John's, which were much larger than the rest. Further, the tension between collegiate Classics and university mathematics was replayed at collegiate level in the rivalry between Trinity, whose great strength was in Classics, and St John's, the leading centre of mathematics. James Henry Monk of Trinity, who succeeded Richard Porson as Regius Professor of Greek after the latter's death in 1808, campaigned for the creation of a university Classical examination but was blocked by the St Johns mathematicians, and by members of other colleges suspicious of Trinity expansionism. Not until Christopher Wordsworth became first Master of Trinity in 1820, then Vice-Chancellor of the university in the following year, did movement begin. The Classical Tripos was set up in 1822 and first examined in 1824. The compromises necessary to get it accepted were made plain in its rules: this was a voluntary examination, to be taken after the mathematical test and

⁴ L. O'Boyle, "The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe, 1800–1848", *Journal of Modern History* 42 (1970) 471–495.

⁵ J. Gascoigne, *Cambridge in the Age of the Enlightenment* (Cambridge 1989) 270–299; A. Warwick, *Masters of Theory: Cambridge and the Rise of Mathematical Physics* (Chicago 2003).

open only to those who scored high honours in mathematics. Not until 1857 was the Tripos completely free of restrictions on entry.⁶

Just as the Anglican church was not the state but was closely bound up with it, so Classical scholarship in turn had close ties to the church. The standard career pattern for talented graduates was to gain a college fellowship, usually held for 6–7 years as long as one did not marry, then move out to a clerical living, a rural post as a clergyman; the Oxford and Cambridge colleges held some hundreds of such livings in their gift. The university posts which would have enabled men to stay on and practice scholarship were very few. Both universities had chairs of Greek, but they were poorly paid and most holders did not lecture – some did not even reside in their university. Oxford had no Latin chair till 1854, nor Cambridge till 1869. The ablest men were promoted, but within the church, if their theological views were orthodox. Thus James Monk and Charles Blomfield, editors of the *Museum Criticum* founded in 1812, both became bishops, and turned away from classical scholarship to ecclesiastical politics. The editors of the next Classical journal, the *Philological Museum*, were theologically suspect: they imported liberal views from Germany, including those of Schleiermacher.⁷ One, Julius Hare, went to a living within his family. The other, Connop Thirlwall, ended up with a bishopric in Wales, but only after his orthodoxy was challenged. Hare wrote no more on Classics; Thirlwall wrote his history of Greece, a remarkable feat but soon eclipsed by that of Grote. In general, orthodoxy led to promotion, heterodoxy to exclusion: both of them discouragements to scholarly work.

In the capital, the secular London University was established in 1827, attracting dissenters, Catholics and non-Christians. Almost immediately an Anglican institution, King's College, was founded in response. When an umbrella organisation, the University of London, was set up in 1836, the London University was renamed University College London. It drew on the London middle classes, but also had strong links with the German emigré community, strengthened by the liberal emigration after the 1848 revolution. Though it grew slowly, hampered by financial weakness,

⁶ C. A. Stray, "The first century of the Classical Tripos: High Culture and the Politics of Curriculum", in: id. (ed.), *Classics in Cambridge: Curriculum, Culture and Community*. PCPS, Supp. Vol. 24 (1999) 1–14; id., "A Parochial Anomaly? The Classical Tripos 1822–1900", in: J. Smith and C. A. Stray (eds.), *Teaching and Learning in 19th-century Cambridge* (Woodbridge 2001) 31–44.

⁷ C. A. Stray, "From one Museum to another: the *Museum Criticum* (1813–1826) and the *Philological Museum* (1831–1833)", *Victorian Periodicals Review* 37: 3, Autumn (2004) 289–314.

this metropolitan institution had the potential to establish a centre of Classical scholarship independent of the two ancient universities. For several decades, however, both UCL and King's College taught at a fairly low level, and it was common for their graduates to go on to Oxford or Cambridge to take a second bachelor's degree.

What were the bases for a Classical community in England? The most powerful potential basis lay in the large numbers of Anglican gentlemen scholars who attended public schools (that is, fee-paying schools, mostly boarding), then Oxford or Cambridge, went on to occupy church positions or teach in public schools, and often belonged to one of the London clubs. The dominant ethos in this world was resolutely amateur, and a favourite pursuit was composition in Greek and Latin, in prose and especially in verse.⁸ We can see the beginnings of a different kind of scholarly organisation in the informal networks of the early part of the century. Men like Samuel Butler, Richard Porson, Charles Burney, Peter Elmsley, James Monk and Thomas Gaisford conversed both orally and in letters on matters of scholarship. Some of their communication was concerned with the availability of Classical editions, which they lent and borrowed among themselves, and also obtained from the libraries of sympathetic noblemen. The Napoleonic blockade made it difficult to obtain German books, but personal links to scholars like Friedrich Wolf, Gottfried Hermann and the brothers Dindorf led to exchanges of book parcels. Scholarly encounters also took place during visits to France, Germany and Italy to inspect manuscripts. Porson notoriously never travelled abroad, but Elmsley and Gaisford did so more than once.

Classical journals

A new focus for such networks was provided by the founding of Classical journals, whose contributors often formed loose-knit communities of like-minded scholars. In some cases, such groups developed their identities in contrast with, and even in conflict with, other groups. This was the case with the first two periodicals of the century, the *Classical Journal* (1810–1829) and the *Museum Criticum* (1813–1826). The former was established in London by the printer and publisher Abraham Valpy, who saw himself as a kind of modern Aldus Manutius. The *Journal* was a rag-bag of articles, news, verses and reviews, and appealed to a gentlemanly and antiquarian public. The *Museum Criticum*'s subtitle was "Cambridge

⁸ C. A. Stray, *Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities, and Society in England 1830–1960* (Oxford 1998) 68–74, 124–126.

Classical Researches"; it was founded by a group of Cambridge scholars concerned to perpetuate the legacy of Porson, who had died in 1808. The editors, James Monk and Charles Blomfield, saw themselves as practitioners of a rigorous Porsonian scholarship which focused on the detailed textual analysis of Classical literature, especially Greek drama. Their contempt for Valpy and his allies led to several published controversies. The *Museum* closed down in the 1820s after both Monk and Blomfield were given Church positions.

The next two Classical journals represented attempts to introduce German scholarship into England. Julius Hare and Connop Thirlwall's *Philological Museum* (1831–1833) also ended when its editors went to Church positions. But they found it hard to attract enough contributors or subscribers, and the later issues were increasingly filled with German essays translated into English by Thirlwall. The *Classical Museum* (1843–1849) was edited by a German, Leonhard Schmitz, a pupil of Niebuhr, who married a Scotswoman and became headmaster of a school in Edinburgh. His major helper was William Smith, a London dissenter who went on to edit a Classical encyclopedia which was much used in Britain into the twentieth century. The *Museum* printed lists of its committee and subscribers, giving a glimpse of the informal community which supported it by advice, writing and purchase. With the *Classical Museum* we glimpse the emergence of a new potential community of scholars, based in London and Edinburgh, outside the traditional Anglican circles of Oxbridge. We can also see an attempt to extend the study of Classics beyond the Porsonian focus on texts and into history and archaeology.

Two journals of the 1850s and 1860s make a natural pair, since both were founded in Cambridge and the latter was seen as a revival of the former. The *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (1854–1859) was set up, as its title suggests, by men who were committed to theology as well as to Classics: its editor was John Mayor, son of a missionary and later professor of Latin at Cambridge. Mayor reported that he closed the journal because of a lack of contributions of sufficient quality. The *Journal of Philology* was founded in Cambridge in 1868 and survived till 1920. The crucial factor in this unprecedentedly long life was that the Cambridge Philological Society, founded in 1871, bought the Journal for all its members. Here for the first time in Britain we witness a formal link between an organised Classical community and a journal. The next journal to be founded took this a step further: the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, established in 1879, planned a journal of its own from the first, and the first volume of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* appeared in 1880 – the earliest British Classical journal which survives to this day. The dominance of Hellenism over the study of Rome in Victorian

Britain is shown by the fact that the Roman Society was not founded till 1910, the *Journal of Roman Studies* appearing the following year.⁹ With *JHS* we can see a significant move toward specialisation: not just in the singling out of Hellenic Studies, but also in its initial focus, which was exclusively on history and archaeology rather than language and literature. The growing interest in archaeology, fired by the discoveries of Schliemann in the 1870s, fused with patriotism to found the British School at Athens in 1886. Here was a new institutional basis for the Classical community, one which was followed in 1900 by the British School at Rome. Both Schools established annual journals to publish their findings; the *BSA Annual* thus began to compete with *JHS*, initiating a chapter of competition and conflict between journals.

One more journal needs to be mentioned: the *Classical Review*, which first appeared in 1887. Its founder was Joseph Mayor, younger brother of John Mayor of Cambridge, who had edited the short-lived *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* in the 1850s. The review is important in the growth of scholarly communities in two ways. First, it was designed to circulate reviews of British and foreign books among classicists, and soon after its foundation was enlarged to include a section edited from the USA. Here we can see the emergence of an Anglo-American alliance from the shadow of the adulation of Germany; an adulation which was soon to be lessened by the *Kulturkampf* of the 1890s. Second, the elder Mayor had warned his brother that it was important to establish a solid contributor base if the journal was to flourish. Within a year, Joseph Mayor had recruited over 80 scholars. The review thus had a firm basis of both contributors and subscribers from the beginning.

The founding of the Classical Association of England and Wales in 1903 for the first time provided an inclusive body for classicists in both universities and schools. In 1909 it bought both the *Classical Review* and the new (1907) *Classical Quarterly* from their publisher, David Nutt. Plans were then laid for the publication of a journal dealing with the only obvious area not covered by existing British Classical journals: the history and archaeology of Rome. This led to a collision with the Roman Society, then being formed, which went ahead with its own journal, the *Journal of Roman Studies* (1911). During the difficult negotiations between the different Classical bodies in 1909 and 1910, three different strategies were proposed for dealing with the lack of organised study of Rome. First, that the Hellenic Society should extend its reach from Greece to

⁹ C. A. Stray, "Patriots and Professors: a Century of Roman Studies", *JRS* 100 (2010) 1–31 / *Britannia* 41 (2010) 1–31.

Rome. Second, that a new Society should be founded – which is what happened. The third suggestion is now, with hindsight, the most intriguing: D. G. Hogarth, director of the British School at Athens, proposed that an umbrella body should be founded which he called an Institute of Classical Studies. This idea found little favour, but was in fact the name chosen in 1953 for the new institution set up by the University of London, as part of an agreement with the Hellenic and Roman Societies. Not only were they given office space in the new institution, their libraries became the basis of its library, the reference books being transferred to the University. The Institute is now part of the School of Advanced Study, and its library, now of about 125 000 volumes, forms the heart of an international centre of research in Classics. Its programme of seminars and lectures, and the research projects it houses, have made it a focal point for the Classical community in London and for the nation as a whole.

Careers

Having looked at the nature and sources of scholarly communities in Classics, let me go back to the nineteenth century to consider another basis for scholarly community: academic careers. The English gentlemen scholars of the early nineteenth century had no academic career structure to follow. After graduation they left university, or stayed as college fellows for six or seven years as long as they remained celibate. Many then took college livings (church positions) all over the country. As we have seen, promotion within the Church brought to an end the publication of the *Museum Criticum* and the *Philological Museum*. Not till the reforms of Oxford and Cambridge introduced by Royal Commissions in the early 1850s did this change. New subjects were introduced, religious restrictions were relaxed, and between 1855 and 1885, it became increasingly common for the cleverest graduates to go not into the Church, but into teaching or academic posts.¹⁰ Slowly the number of academic posts increased, as the colleges, which were rich, were forced to hand over money to the universities, which were poor. In the first half of the century, Oxford and Cambridge had Classical professors, but neither Porson nor Gaisford, for example, gave public lectures. Many professors in fact did not even reside in their university. Teaching in colleges was variable in quality, and in small colleges inadequate. The gap was filled by private tutors, often called coaches. These men, often young graduates looking for income, but

¹⁰ A. G. L. Haig, “The Church, the Universities and Learning in Later Victorian England”, *Historical Journal* 29: 1 (1986) 187–201.

also senior undergraduates, provided teaching which was for most of the century regarded as essential for any student who wanted to gain a good degree. Some of these coaches became very well known – for example Richard Shilleto at Cambridge, who had 12 children to support and so laboured at teaching all through the day, sustained by mugs of beer.

Reform of this situation began in Cambridge in the 1860s, when Richard Jebb and his colleagues at Trinity College reorganised college teaching and started a system of lectures open to members of other colleges. By 1900 the system was well established, and a similar development had taken place in Oxford. University positions in Classics were slow to be created, because the agricultural depression of 1870–1890 severely reduced college incomes, which were largely based on rural rents. The chair of ancient history at Cambridge was only established in 1898, and those of ancient philosophy and comparative philology only after a benefaction in 1931. The Faculty of Classics, bringing together the university teachers of the subject, was set up only in 1926. In Oxford, teaching was more heavily based in colleges, and in the late nineteenth century a long battle raged between the supporters of college-based tutorial teaching, led by Benjamin Jowett, and those, led by Mark Pattison, who wanted to move toward a German model of a professoriate and research.¹¹ The outstanding representatives of the research movement in Classics were Henry Nettleship in Latin and Ingram Bywater in Greek – both of them respected in Germany for their rigorous scholarship.

The Classical communities in the two universities displayed both common features and some interesting differences. The tutorial vs research conflict was much more low-key in Cambridge, where mathematics had long been the dominant form of knowledge, and where the ideology of the one-to-one morally educative tutorial was much weaker. Hence it never rivalled the Oxford tradition of what might be called Hellenic Homosexuality.¹² Both universities had Philological Societies: Oxford's was begun in 1870 by the Homerist David Monro, Cambridge's in 1871 by the Sanskritist Edward Cowell and the young classicist John Postgate. The societies' policies on publications were very different. The Oxford Society printed copies of its transactions for members, but these never became a published journal. The Cambridge Society began in the same way, but in 1882 started its *Proceedings*, which are still published annually

¹¹ H. S. Jones, *Mark Pattison and the Invention of the Don* (Oxford 2007).

¹² L. Dowling, *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford* (Ithaca CT 1994); C. A. Stray, "Curriculum and Style in the Collegiate University: Classics in Nineteenth-century Oxbridge", *History of Universities* 16 (2001) 183–218.

but have recently been renamed the *Cambridge Classical Journal*. Not only this, once the Society was founded, it arranged with Macmillans, the publishers of the *Journal of Philology* (1868), a bulk subscription for its members. This kept the *Journal* alive until 1920, when the subscription was cancelled and the *Journal* collapsed. The contrast is striking between the larger community of classicists in a humanities-based university which did not publish, and the smaller community in the science-based institution which was so much more active. Perhaps a well-known law of capitalist enterprise operates here: the second-ranking firm tries harder. It is perhaps relevant here to point out that the majority of the classical journals of 19th-century England were founded in Cambridge rather than in Oxford.

The British Academy

The time has come, fittingly at the end of this paper, to describe what has been called “the strange late birth of the British Academy”.¹³ Not so strange, perhaps, that it was set up so late as 1902, in country whose state formation had lagged so far behind that of continental countries. To take only one example, mass education systems had been created in France and Germany at the beginning of the 19th century. In Britain state elementary schooling began in 1870 and was not compulsory until the 1880s; state secondary schooling began only in 1902, the year of the Academy’s foundation.¹⁴ Reinforcing this pattern of lagging state formation was a conservative anti-centralist ideology derived from the traditions of civic humanism. It was visible in the defence of Oxford by Edward Copleston against the attacks of the *Edinburgh Review*. Here he celebrated in metaphor the freedom of Englishmen, who grew like oaks, as opposed to the espaliered hedges of the French.¹⁵ The theme was revived in the 1850s, once again against French regimentation, by R. C. Trench, the advocate of a historical dictionary of English, who denounced the centralised definition of meanings by “one, or forty self-made dictators”.¹⁶

¹³ R. Drayton, “The Strange Late Birth of the British Academy”, in: M. Daunton (ed.), *The Organization of Knowledge in Victorian Britain* (Oxford 2005) 389–400.

¹⁴ A. Green, *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the USA* (London 1990).

¹⁵ E. Copleston, *A Defence of the University of Oxford against the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review* (Oxford 1810).

¹⁶ R. C. Trench, *On Some Deficiencies in Our English Dictionaries* (London 1858) 5. The reference was to the forty members of the Académie Française, source of the official dictionary of French. Trench’s appeal led eventually to the publication of the *New (now Oxford) English Dictionary*.

What prompted the foundation of the Academy was combination of international academic organisation and embarrassment. In 1900 the International Association of Academies held its inaugural meeting in Paris. Invitations were sent out to the scientific and literary bodies of many countries, but it was found that in Britain, while the Royal Society represented science, no institution existed which could represent the humanities. Attempts were made to persuade the Royal Society to extend its reach to the humanities, but this fell through. It was therefore proposed to set up a new body, and this was granted a royal charter in 1902 as “the British Academy for the promotion of historical, philosophical and philological studies”. Much of the initiative came from the Cambridge philosopher Henry Sidgwick, who before his death in August 1900 held several meetings with two Cambridge colleagues: the historian Lord Acton and the Classical scholar Richard Jebb. (Notice, in the light of my previous remarks, that this planning was at first done in Cambridge alone.) One of the first tasks was the selection of the founding fellows of the Academy; and it is curious that though since then they have elected new fellows themselves, the first group were in effect a self-created oligarchy. The correspondence between Jebb, Acton and Sidgwick and others whom they consulted is full of lists of possible candidates; lists which are designed, inter alia, to satisfy the concerns of Oxford for its due share of honour. They also discussed the grandiose scheme of the archaeologist Charles Waldstein, a German-American Jew who taught in Cambridge, for an “Imperial Academy of Arts and Sciences” which would combine the sciences and the humanities.¹⁷ At some point an informal Oxford-Cambridge committee was formed, which Jebb seems to have led, Sidgwick being dead and Acton abroad. Frederic Kenyon of the British Museum also became involved, and in 1901 hosted an informal meeting of interested parties at the Museum. Kenyon sent Jebb a list of those who might be made founding fellows of the Academy. The classicists named were:

Classical Philology: Jebb, Bywater, Robinson Ellis, J. E. B. Mayor, E. Maunde Thompson.

Archaeology: [Francis] Penrose, Percy Gardner, A. S. Murray, Arthur Evans.

In both cases, the names come from Oxford, Cambridge and the British Museum. The first four names were those of the professors of Greek and of Latin at Oxford and Cambridge. The power base of the new institution was plain.

¹⁷ See C. A. Stray, *Sophocles' Jebb: A Life in Letters*, Cambridge Classical Journal Suppl. 38 (2013).

Kenyon divided his list into departments, “after the pattern of the Prussian Academy”. In the light of his use of this Germanic model, it’s interesting that in 1903, when asked by the secretary of the new Academy whether he preferred to join its History and Archaeology committee or that on Philology, Richard Jebb asked to be included in both committees. He explained that he had long interested himself in both history and archaeology, though his central focus was on literature and language. He went on to deplore the increasingly rigid specialisation in the Classical teaching of his own university, and to express the hope that the Academy would not foster that kind of organisation, which split scholars into separate groups.¹⁸

The Academy was for a long time severely under-funded. Not until 1924 did it secure any state funding, a few years after the universities began to receive grants from government. Reviewing a half-century history of the Academy in 1953, the ancient historian H. M. Last delivered a negative verdict on its meagre funds and achievements. As he pointed out, it lacked the ability of its continental counterparts to organise research projects and to publish their results.¹⁹ Only in the 1950s did the current Academy support for the British Schools at Athens and Rome begin; and this funding is currently threatened by the continuing world economic crisis.

Conclusion

I have tried to show how communities of Classical scholars have been formed, how informal networks have been encouraged within institutions and by journals, and how the emergence of academic career structures fostered the development of organised scholarship. Part of this development, as we see in the case of Richard Jebb, was an increasing specialisation, and the loss of the integrated vision of the ancient world held by the romantic Hellenists of the nineteenth century. (In the twenty-first century, it could be argued that we are witnessing a synthesis of specialisation and vision: an exciting prospect.) The developments I have outlined above have taken place in a distinctive setting, where late state formation was reflected in a tardy establishment both of primary and secondary school systems and also of a humanistic Academy. The

¹⁸ *Sophocles’ Jebb* (n. 17) 254.

¹⁹ H. M. Last, review of F. G. Kenyon, *The British Academy: The First Fifty Years* (Oxford 1952), in *JRS* 43 (1953) 231–233. Last was not a fellow of the Academy, and it has been suggested that he refused to join.

British Academy began life as a frail plant, welcomed but not funded by the state; only after World War II did it become a major channel for research funding. Its current status is that of a national forum with strong links to, and overlaps with, the universities, especially with Oxford and Cambridge. For many classicists, it is an important source of funds; for a few, it offers fellowships, and an opportunity to join in the making of research policy. All this, however, is of recent growth: in the nineteenth century, scholars had no such institution to call on.

Christopher Stray
Swansea University
c.a.stray@swansea.ac.uk

The focus of the paper is on the surprisingly late creation of the British Academy (1902). It is shown how, in the absence of an Academy, Classical studies were organized in nineteenth-century Great Britain: the peculiarities and correlations of the Universities, the emergence of Classical journals, and the possibilities of building a scholarly career.

В центре внимания автора – на удивление позднее создание Британской Академии наук (1902). Рассматривается, как в отсутствие Академии были организованы различные сферы британского антиковедения в XIX в.: взаимосвязь между университетами, возникновение специализированных журналов и возможность сделать академическую карьеру.