

Philosophy and a Classical Education

Robin Barrow

The historian Richard Cobb, in his recent book *A Classical Education*, introduces us to an enigmatic schoolfriend who batters his monstrous mother to death. Meeting for the first time many years after the event, he wryly observes to Cobb that he regrets his classical education: it failed to teach him that to remove traces of blood from one's axe one should wash it in cold rather than in hot water. Well, fortunately or otherwise, murder is low on my list of priorities (though this could change if the anti-intellectual trend of education continues), and I have always thought my classical education to have been one of the most useful as well as worthwhile parts of my life. (If I had been less fortunate, I would probably have used the dreadful word "relevant" here, complete with obligatory disclaiming quotation marks.). The classics and the individuals who introduced me to them at all levels (I think particularly of Theo Zinn, John Gould, Peter Parsons, John Sharwood Smith and Michael Gunningham) gave me most of my ideals, generated my enthusiasm, shaped my thinking and character, and provided me with much solace and active pleasure. In particular they gave me philosophy.

When I left Oxford, David Lewis (my Greek history tutor) wrote in a reference "There were times when we thought he was trying to do too much, too fast, on too little foundation." He was of course right. I spent the next twenty years, both while teaching classics at the City of London school and while teaching philosophy at the University of Leicester and more recently Simon Fraser University in Canada, trying to refurbish my classical understanding from the bottom up. I'm sure that I still do too much too fast, but the foundations are, I hope, rather more secure. My love and need for the classical world have increased yet further, and recently I have returned to teaching classics by way of undergraduate classes in Latin and Greek history at Simon Fraser. In fact, at times, I wish that I had remained straightforwardly a classicist.

Yet, for me, the distinction between classics and philosophy is not too great. It is not just the study of both is centrally concerned with precision and form. More than that, the two are intertwined something in the manner of the interweaving of the aesthetic, religious, and political aspects of the Parthenon. I feel this interrelationship partly because of my view of philosophy, which I see as essentially an activity to engage in backed by a disposition of the soul rather than as a subject matter to be studied or a compendium of works and positions to be mastered. (No doubt to my shame, and certainly to my discredit in a North American context, the only philosophical texts I have studied in depth remain those that I read while doing Greats. Although, as many readers will know, this does mean that in my time I have pored over chunks of Hume, Wittgenstein, etc., more significantly it means that Plato and Aristotle are the philosophers I know and understand best. I also find them, perhaps as a consequence, different as they are from one another, a great deal more congenial than most of their intellectual descendants.) Where

is the joy to be found, where the passion and intellectual excitement, in a conception of philosophy as a series of courses in formal logic, standard theories of truth and traditional response to the mind/body problem?

But the coalescence of classics and philosophy in my outlook is also partly the result of my view of the classical world. Classical authors generally, and the very spirit of at any rate the Greek world, are imbued with the philosophical. Teaching the *Bacchae*, studying the *Clouds*, contemplating what Thucydides does say and what he doesn't – these to me are natural philosophical activities. They inevitably incorporate the exploration of ideas, the examination of the coherence of arguments and actions, and the puzzling over concepts that constitute philosophical activity. And while of course Greek and Roman literature are also political, aesthetic and religious productions (as are the works of a Hobbes or Locke), they are almost invariably inspired by the desire to understand, to see things more clearly, by a spontaneous drive for autonomy. From Socrates' "the unexamined life is not worth living" even to Terence's "humani nihil a me alienum puto," there is a vibrant current of zestful rationality probing that sense of awe that Plato sees as the beginning of all true philosophy.

What the classical world provides, at least as well as any other period of history and I think better than most, is the context in which to pursue the timeless and crucial questions that face mankind, while at the same time it offers a host of writers who were actually and unselfconsciously interested in those questions. It is a world that invigorates and stimulates the imagination, while demanding a rational response, because the Greeks and Romans had enormous and powerful insights and dreams which they themselves strove to understand. And in teaching classics it is easy to draw on the philosophical. From the gnomic beginnings of "nothing in excess" and "know thyself", by way of relatively prosaic authors such as Horace (notwithstanding Peter Levi's encomium!), Seneca and Xenophon, through the genuine intellectual struggle to make sense of the world of a Thucydides, Sophocles or Juvenal, the unashamed philosophy of a Plato or Cicero, there is a sustained determination to understand the nature of things. But this purely intellectual drive is always set in the context of real issues. There is nothing academic about any of the authors, as there is about so much subsequent philosophy.

In teaching philosophy it is not easy to take for granted one's audience or to cull from textbooks the elements that are an integral part of a classical education. We may all find difficulty in comprehending the idea of the good, but the classicist fails to see what, in general, Plato is about. But what about Wittgenstein about? No classicist can fail to see point in one being interested by even an author as dry as Aristotle, let alone poets and playwrights, but what is there to move a philosophy student in Locke's disquisitions?

Most of the above refers to the very great practical advantages of pursuing philosophy through the medium

great works understood in their rich wider context. On a more personal level, of course, I owe to classics the fact that I became a philosopher. But as I have already indicated, it is a trifle ironical that I should be grateful to my classical education for providing the impetus towards a subject that, insofar as it is distinct, I enjoy rather less than what I left behind! To me, as to so many others, it is a matter of enormous regret that classics

has declined as it has. It was an excellent way into philosophy, but more than that it was a complete and proper education.

ROBIN BARROW

teaches philosophy in the School of Education,
University of Leicester

Orpheus and Eurydice

(A lecture given at the A.G.M. of JACT in Newcastle, May 1985)

David West

Virgil *Georgic* 4

Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10

'Non te nullius exercent numinis irae;
magna luis commissa: tibi has miserabilis Orpheus
haudquaquam ob meritum poenas, ni fata resistant,
suscitat, et rapta grauius pro coniuge saeuit.
illa quidem, dum te fugeret per flumina praeceps,
immanem ante pedes hydrium moritura puella
seruantem ripas alta non uidit in herba.

455

at chorus aequalis Dryadum clamore supremos
impleuit montis; flerunt Rhodopeiae arces
altaque Pangaea et Rhesi Mauortia tellus
atque Getae atque Hebrus et Actias Orithyia.
ipse caua solans aegrum testudine amorem
te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum,
te ueniente die, te decedente canebat.
Taenarias etiam fauces, alta ostia Ditis,
et caligantem nigra formidine lucum
ingressus, Manisque adiit regemque tremendum
nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda.
at cantu commotae Erebi de sedibus imis
umbrae ibant tenues simulacraque luce carentum,
quam multa in foliis auium se milia condunt,
Vesper ubi aut hibernus agit de montibus imber,
matres atque uiri defunctaque corpora uita
magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae,
impositique rogis iuuenes ante ora parentum,
quos circum limus niger et deformis harundo
Cocyti tardaue palus inamabilis unda
alligat et nouies Styx interfusa coeracet.

460

465

470

475

480

exitus auspicio gravior. nam nupta per herbas
dum noua, Naiadum turba comitata uagatur,
10 occidit in talum serpentis dente recepto.

quam satis ad superas postquam Rhodopeius auras
defleuit uates, ne non temptaret et umbras,
ad Styga Taenaria est ausus descendere porta,
perque leues populos simulacraque functa sepulcro
15 Persephonen adiit inamoenaque regna tenentem
umbrarum dominum pulsisque ad carmina neruis
sic ait:

'O positi sub terra numina mundi,
in quem reccidimus, quidquid mortale creamur:
si licet et, falsi positus ambagibus oris,
uera loqui sinitis, non huc, ut opaca uiderem
Tartara, descendi, nec uti uillosa colubris
terna Medusæi uincirem guttura monstri:
causa uiae est coniunx, in quam calcata uenenum
uipera diffudit crescentesque abstulit annos.
25 posse pati uolui nec me temptasse negabo:
uicit Amor! supera deus hic bene notus in ora est:
an sit et hic, dubito. sed et hic tamen auguror esse,
famaque si ueteris non est mentita rapinae,
uos quoque iunxit Amor. per ego haec loca plena timoris,
30 per Chaos hoc ingens uastique silentia regni,
Eurydices, oro, properata retexite fata!

But what are we to make of the tone of it or the tone of any part of it? This question is never easy to answer. Ovid has the rhetorician's gift to heighten what he inherits, the dramatist's gift to explore and to represent the feelings and thoughts of his characters with sympathy and understanding, and without expressing moral judgements, the poet's gift of intensity and rightness, the gifts of a human being who is a genius at responding to the minute particulars of human life, and who takes delight in setting such daily particulars against the mighty images of classical mythology. What if a woman did turn into a tree? When the bark was forming over her breast, would your hand feel the heart beating beneath it? Ovid is the poet of 'what if?'. But do not ask him to be consistent in tone and purpose. One effect here. A different effect there. He is the great follower of scents, the great succumbent to temptation. The poet of 'what if?' is also the poet of 'why not?'.

To compare great with sublime, Ovid is the Mozart among the Latin poets. Mozart is a natural, with divine natural gifts. But he is often, praise be, lightweight and frivolous. He toils in his religious music. He vacillates over the inexcusable rascality of Don Giovanni. To a pair of fickle and foolish women he

gives in *Così fan tutte* the most irresistible declarations of imperishable devotion. But we do not go to Mozart for masses, for moral rectitude or strength or for the profundity of his Weltanschauung. This is a celebration of humanity. For his sympathy with grief and love and joy, for the warmth and amiability and fun in his nature, for his divine cleverness and abundance and invention and for that which passeth all understanding, we treasure every note. With Mozart, as with Ovid what we need is ears to hear, eyes to see and willingness to respond. This combination is rarer among scholars and critics than among painters, poets and musicians. I call to witness only four lines of Milton and their glorious realisation in Handel's forgotten masterpiece, *L'Allegro Ed Il Penseroso*:

Or bid the soul of *Orpheus* sing
Such notes as, warbled to the string,
Drew iron tears down *Pluto's* cheek
And made Hell grant what Love did seek.

DAVID WEST
is Professor of Latin at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Some Thoughts on Latin Word Order

(A lecture given at the A.G.M. of JACT in Newcastle, May 1985)

Jonathan Powell

Anybody wanting a clear and accessible account of how Latin word order works would have to go a long way to find one. The standard school grammars are silent on the subject, or virtually so. The nearest to a comprehensive scholarly work on the subject, Marouzeau's *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, is not at all easy to use, while recent academic discussions tend to be somewhat obsessive in their desire to apply some particular modern linguistic theory. Old articles and dissertations, the large German grammars and old-fashioned books on prose composition often contain valuable observations, but these are scattered and often inaccessible. The most practically useful account that I know of is in a relatively recent textbook of prose composition, *Writing in Latin* by D. P. Simpson and P. H. Vellacott; but even so, some of the principles it enunciates are very elusive.

Traditional methods tend to presuppose that the ability to appreciate and manipulate Latin word order comes only with long practice and acquaintance with the language, and that abstract codification of its principles is either impossible or undesirable. Though this may be true of the finer points, it seems to me that in general this view is both erroneous and harmful, since it discourages learners and makes it more difficult for them to take Latin seriously as a language. It seems to me that the business of learning Latin could be made easier, and perhaps also more enjoyable, if pupils were introduced to

some of the more obvious principles of word order at a relatively early stage – preferably as soon as they begin to read continuous prose. In what follows, I shall put forward a number of what seem to me the most important points. Inevitably this will seem rather dogmatic, since it is impossible in a short article to argue exhaustively for each point; one or two examples each will have to suffice. However, I hope that readers will try out the principles for themselves, and form their own impressions of the extent to which they work in practice.

I am concerned here principally with prose: although I believe that poetry is susceptible to the same sort of analysis in many cases, any attempt to consider poetic word order now would lead into too many complications and subtleties. I shall also restrict myself as far as possible to the order of words within the simple sentence or clause, though this often cannot be fully explained without reference to the wider context. The topic of sentence-structure and articulation is an important one, and would have to be covered in detail in any comprehensive account of word order in Latin; but first things first.

Some readers, brought up as I was on traditional methods of learning Latin, may still be sceptical about the whole idea of rules or principles of Latin word order. Accordingly I shall start with a very obvious example: take the sentence 'veni in

urbem'. I think that even the most confirmed believer in the freedom of Latin word order would find it difficult to maintain that it was equally correct to say 'veni urbem in' – any more than it would be to say 'I came the city into' in English. A trivial instance? Possibly, though the fact that Latin has prepositions, rather than postpositions as in Hungarian or Hindi or Japanese, is itself a substantive fact about Latin syntax and word-order; it could not be taken for granted by an impartial investigator, although we tend to do so since in this instance our own language works the same way. Another familiar rule of order in Latin is that certain particles – *enim*, *autem*, etc. – are never placed first in a sentence, but in the vast majority of instances occupy the second place: Quintilian (I, 5, 38-9) comments that placing a particle of this sort at the beginning of a sentence is a form of solecism.

Spot the second-place pronoun

A rather less well-known, but quite securely established, principle of Latin word-order is the tendency of unemphatic pronouns to be placed second in their sentence, clause or colon (known by the rather forbidding title of 'Wackernagel's Law'). Anyone could be forgiven for not knowing about this: I did not learn about it until I had started on my postgraduate work in Latin at Oxford. However, once one is alerted to it, one starts to find examples all over the place. Look for instance at the sayings of Julius Caesar reported by Suetonius: 'domum *se* nisi pontificem non reversurum'; 'Caesarem *se*, non regem esse'; 'difficilius *se* principem civitatis a primo ordine in secundum, quam ex secundo in novissimum detrudi'. If that is not enough to prove the point, look on almost any page of Latin prose from the classical period. This is not just a philological curiosity (though it certainly is that: it is found also in Greek, Sanskrit, Old Irish and other ancient Indo-European languages, and must have been inherited from their common ancestor). It can often be of great assistance to the reader, in that it can indicate how a complex sentence is to be articulated into smaller units. Nor is it, in my view, a matter only for the experts. It seems to me that nothing but good could come from teaching this principle to pupils as soon as it can be fitted into their course. Spotting second-place pronouns as they occur would be a more edifying challenge than scrabbling about in a sentence looking for an apparently missing subject or object – which I found myself doing all too often in the early and middle stages of learning Latin.

Apart from the principles just mentioned, however, there are relatively few syntactical rules governing word order in Latin: hence Latin word order is said to be 'free', as contrasted with the 'fixed' word order of, for example, English. This is somewhat misleading in that it tends to imply that Latin word order is not determined by any sort of rule or tendency, which is very far from the truth. There are principles other than syntactical ones that can determine word order, and it is to these that I now turn. I shall examine first the question of what goes first in a sentence.

Most people who study Latin have an idea that the first place in a sentence is 'emphatic', and this is in a general way true. It is not, however, quite sufficient, since there are different sorts of emphasis. (Though the term 'emphasis' can be confusing, I retain it here for want of a better alternative.) For this purpose, two types need to be distinguished. The first of these may be conveniently exemplified by the type of sentence, often occurring as the answer to a question, in which there is really

only one word that counts. For example, the sentence 'Brutus killed Caesar' might be the answer to the question 'Who killed Caesar?': the information conveyed in it could equally well be expressed in the single word 'Brutus', and in pronouncing the fuller form of the answer in English we would stress the word 'Brutus' much more than the other two words. On the other hand, if the same three words were the answer to the question 'Whom did Brutus kill?', the single-word equivalent would be 'Caesar', and the stress would be altered accordingly in pronouncing the whole sentence. In Latin, the word that is stressed in English pronunciation is moved to the front of the sentence: so we have 'Quis interfecit Caesarem? – Brutus interfecit Caesarem', or 'Quem interfecit Brutus? – Caesarem interfecit Brutus'.

English also has a way of turning the order round in this type of sentence. We may say 'It was Brutus who killed Caesar', or 'It was Caesar that Brutus killed', and so reflect more accurately the natural Latin order. This type of construction is particularly frequent in the type of English alleged to be employed by the wilder varieties of Welshmen and Irishmen, and I have sometimes found the idiom of the stage Irishman useful for explaining this phenomenon in Latin. A particularly good example of this order in Latin occurs in Tacitus, *Agricola* 10,4, where it is discovered for the first time that Britain is an island – 'Hanc oram novissimi maris tunc primum Romana classis circumvecta/*insulam* esse Britanniam adfirmavit'. 'Well, who'd have thought it? 'Tis an island Britain is!'

'Beans I can't stand'

The second form of emphasis that may result in a word being placed first in a Latin sentence is also found in English. Take a sentence like 'I don't mind peas, but beans I can't stand'. The word 'beans' is pushed to the front of its clause (or, as the linguists say, 'fronted') in order to emphasise it in contrast with what was previously being talked about, viz. other vegetables whose relative merits were being compared. In the first half of the sentence the topic of enquiry was peas, but we have now turned our attention to beans, the 'theme' or 'topic' of the second half of the sentence. The phenomenon is recognised in many languages by students of modern linguistics, as 'thematic fronting' or 'topicalisation'. To make it somewhat less technical, I prefer to characterise it with reference to a famous fictional practitioner of this type of order – Mr Micawber. 'Talent Mr Micawber has: capital Mr Micawber has not'. The words 'talent' and 'capital' are picked out as the 'topics' of their respective parts of the sentence by their prominent position at the beginning. Another way of doing this in English is by means of the phrase 'as for': 'I don't mind peas, but as for beans, I can't stand them'. For an illustration of this type of order in Latin, one can do much worse than look at the first sentence of Caesar's *Gallic War*. 'Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres, quarum unam incolunt Belgae, alteram Aquitani...': 'Let us consider Gaul, the whole of it: it is divided into parts, how many? three; now, let us consider one of these parts: its inhabitants are ... ? the Belgae; and the second ... ? the Aquitani.' This is somewhat of an over-translation, but the point to be noticed is that *unam* and *alteram* come at the beginning of their respective divisions of the sentence, stating the topic of enquiry in each case, and contrasted with each other. A similar procedure may be found where there is a whole series of divisions of subject-matter; the headings of successive sections are stated immediately in Latin, whatever their

grammatical form or function. For instance, in Quintilian's enumeration of types of literature in 10,61ff., there is almost complete uniformity in the placing of names of genres at the beginnings of their sentences, though there is about as much variety as there could well be in their grammatical forms: '*Novem vero lyricorum longe Pindarus princeps ... Antiqua comoedia cum sinceram illam sermonis Attici gratiam prope sola retinet, tum facundissimae libertatis ... Historiam multi scripsere praeclare ... Philosophorum, ex quibus plurimum se traxisse eloquentiae M. Tullius confitetur ... Elegia quoque Graecos provocamus ... Satura quidem tota nostra est*'. In fact, in this respect Latin behaves almost like the football results, which are as good an example of 'topic-predicate' order in English as could be wished for: e.g. Newcastle Utd. (topic) 2 (predicate).

It should perhaps be noted here that I do not mean to imply that every sentence in Latin may be analysed along these lines, as some theorists have apparently held. We have already seen a type of Latin sentence (the one I compared with the stage Irishman's idiom) in which the 'logical predicate' comes first; and there are large numbers of sentences in Latin, as in other languages, in which analysis of this sort is quite inappropriate – for example, most simple narrative sentences. However, it seems to me clear that 'topic-predicate' analysis works well for some sorts of Latin sentence.

White wine and WHITE wine

So far I have dealt with some things that can happen at the beginnings of sentences, which are fairly familiar in practice if not in theory. However, when one comes to enquire what happens next in a Latin sentence, it is even more difficult to find any written authority that will tell you. It has nevertheless been more or less demonstrated, by Marouzeau and others, that there are certain types of order within phrases which may be classified as 'normal' or 'unmarked' while any deviation from those orders indicates some sort of emphasis. However, it tends to be implied that it is the mere reversal of the usual order that produces the emphasis: this does not seem to me to be quite the right way of looking at it. The reversal of the order is simply the consequence of the word which would usually come second, in the unmarked order, being placed first in order that it should itself carry the emphasis. For instance, it is generally agreed that possessive adjectives, when unemphatic, usually follow the nouns they qualify: the ordinary Latin for 'my dog' is *canis meus*. If, however, I wanted to emphasise that it was *my* dog, not someone else's, that you saw wandering about the forum, I should say 'meum canem in foro vagantem vidisti'. Or with thematic (Micawberian) emphasis, 'as for *my* dog, you couldn't have seen him': '*meum autem canem videre non potuisti*'. On the whole the same rule seems to apply to ordinary adjectives and possessive genitives. The Latin for 'white wine' is *vinum album*; the Latin for 'white wine' (as opposed to red) is '*album vinum*'. 'Album an atrum vinum potas?' asks the doctor in the *Menaechmi* (line 915): 'is it white or red wine you drink?' The Latin for 'Cicero's house' is *domus Ciceronis*; 'Cicero's house' is '*Ciceronis domus*'.

I have just said that the 'normal' order of adjective and noun is noun followed by adjective. However, one will sometimes find stated in print the exact reverse of this (e.g. in Kühner-Stegmann). This must be based on a misleading use of statistics, and/or on excessive attention to particular sorts of

adjectives, like *magnus*, *parvus*, *bonus*, *malus* – which are more commonly found before their nouns, not so much because of idiomatic awkwardness as because they are usually emphasised. You say that someone is a *good* man generally more often than you say that he is a *good man* (as opposed to, perhaps, to a good Latinist). I once came across a survey of Caesar's usage that apparently showed that 80% of the adjectives came before their nouns. This naturally produces nothing about which is the unmarked and which is the marked order; it is quite possible that in a certain sample of text the marked order should turn out to be much more frequent than the unmarked. It would perhaps be a help if the misleading use of the word 'normal' in these circumstances, as equivalent to 'unmarked', were to be abandoned; both the marked and unmarked order are equally normal, and co-exist happily in the same stylistic registers of the language. Their statistical frequency must depend mostly on what is being said in the context under consideration.

It is generally recognised that the verb in a Latin sentence when it does not carry any particular emphasis, is often found at the end: the unmarked order is roughly speaking subject-object-adverb-verb. However, verbs quite often find their way to the beginning, more often perhaps than is sometimes realised. Apart from instances that would be covered by the principles of emphasis already mentioned, there are some particular categories of verb that tend to be found constantly in first place: viz. imperatives; the verb 'to be' in its existential sense ('there is' or 'there are'); the verb in passages of vivid narrative, where after all one is likely to know who the principal actors are, and what matters is what they are doing; infinitives in indirect speech, often bringing an unemphatic pronoun subject in their train.

There is another element in the behaviour of verbs that deserves more notice than it usually gets. When another word in the sentence is brought out to the front for emphasis, the relatively unemphatic verb is often drawn after it and appears in second place – particularly if it is a small verb like *sum*, *est*, *puto*. Sometimes also the presence of an unemphatic verb in a word in the middle of a sentence serves to highlight that word. The following example is from Cicero's *De oratore* (emphatic words in capitals, second-place verb italicised): '...ut in ceteris id maxime excellat, quod LONGISSIME scilicet imperitorum intelligentia sensuque disiunctum, in dicendo autem (note thematic emphasis on 'in dicendo') VITIUM VEL MAXIMUM sit a vulgari genere orationis atque consuetudine communis sensus abhorrere.' (1,12).

We now have a clue to that most pertinacious of mysterious hyperbaton. Almost every learner of Latin must at some point have groaned about this apparently meaningless and capricious tendency of Latin writers to separate words that are together grammatically. But how would it be if we were to find that the intruding word or words turned out, in a large number of cases, to be words of certain clearly-defined categories which we had already noticed as tending to come in a particular position? Particles, for a start, though these do not usually cause worry; then Wackernagelian pronouns in second place (e.g. Cic. *De senectute* 85, 'His *mihi* rebus ... levis est senectus'); then, perhaps, unemphatic verbs performing the marking function of highlighting the word before. Two examples from Caesar must suffice for this: BG 1,18,10 'eorum fuga (i.e. the flight of one section of the cavalry) RELIQUUM

equitatum perterritum', and *ibid.* 4,24,4 'non eadem alacritate ac studio, quo in PEDESTRIBUS uti proeliis consueverant, utebantur'.

Sandwiches and telegraph-poles

There is another sort of word or phrase that may intrude between (say) an adjective and its noun, and give rise to hyperbaton: an adverb or adverbial phrase qualifying the sense of the words around it. This may conveniently be called 'sandwiching' order. Many examples may be found, but again there is no room for more than one or two: Sallust, *Cat.* 1,5 'sed diu magnum inter mortales certamen fuit'; Cic. *De sen.* 80 'neque clarorum virorum post mortem honores permanerent'. In a strict grammatical analysis, these phrases qualify the verb, and could not be there at all without it; as is well known, there is only a limited number of types of prepositional phrases in Latin that can qualify a noun directly, and adverbs cannot do so at all. However, in these instances the sandwich emphasises the logical relationship of the intruding word or phrase not to the verb, but to the enclosing noun-phrase. It is as if the adverbial phrase moved in quickly to prevent any misleading or over-general impression that might otherwise have been given. For instance, in the Ciceronian example just given, the intrusion of *post mortem* before *honores* makes it precisely clear what sort of honours are being considered: otherwise we might have been set wondering how e.g. their consulships and crowds of admiring clients might be supposed to survive after death.

I believe that the great majority of instances of hyperbaton in Latin prose may be accounted for in one or other of the ways just outlined. There are other sorts that occur in poetry, but there is not enough space to discuss these now. It would, however, be interesting to see to what extent those orders which are significant or emphatic in prose preserve their significance in verse.

I shall finally mention two other phenomena of Latin word order that are a little more specialised, but no less important than the principles so far described. For the first of these I use the term 'telegraph poles', which I owe to John Griffith at Oxford. The comparison is between a Latin sentence in which the high points of emphasis are at the beginning and the end, and a telegraph wire hanging down between two poles. This may be elucidated further with reference to the types of emphasis that I classified above. Usually a sentence of this type will be found to begin with a word that is thematically emphasised (*à la* Micawber), which attracts to itself the verb and other less emphatic words, leaving the last place to carry the emphatic assertion or negation. It is not so much that the end of the sentence is a naturally emphatic position in Latin; there are plenty of Latin sentences that do not end with an emphatic word. Rather, in this sort of case the emphatic word comes at the end because the rest of the sentence had to come before: we had to have the question stated before we could give the answer, or else we needed a build-up to a particularly emphatic assertion. It may be noticed that this sort of order is particularly common when there is an emphatic negative word at the end: we entertain the idea, as it were, and then deny it forcefully. For examples we may take Sall. *Cat.* 6,1 '*Urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani*', and for the negative variety, Cic. *Tusc.* 1,99 (translated from the end of Plato's *Apology*) '*di immortales sciunt, hominem quidem scire arbitror neminem*'.

This is perhaps only one aspect of the general Latin tendency to alternate emphatic and unemphatic words or phrases, producing an effect that may be likened to a series of waves. The last phenomenon I wish to mention is another manifestation of this: the figure termed by the ancient rhetoricians 'coniunctio'. The definition is given in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4,37: 'Coniunctio est, cum interpositione verbi et superiores partes orationis comprehenduntur et inferiores, hoc modo: "Formae dignitas aut morbo deflorescit aut vetustate"'. In other words, it is what happens when two parallel words or phrases are joined by a co-ordinating conjunction, and another word or phrase (not necessarily a verb) that goes with both of them is placed in the middle between them (or in the 'train' or 'shadow' of the first of the pair). An English example of this is the phrase 'good men and true': in the same way, Cicero somewhere says 'boni viri et locupletes'. Note how the author of the *ad Herennium* used an example himself when discussing it: 'et superiores partes orationis comprehenduntur et inferiores'; this sentence from Cicero (*De sen.* 1) has two examples in one: 'Novi enim moderationem animi tui et aequitatem, teque non cognomen solum Athenis deportasse, sed humanitatem et prudentiam intellego'.

A place for word-order in Latin teaching

Much more could be said, and much investigation remains to be done. In the meantime, I hope that this short run-through of some of the more important points may encourage people to believe that it is after all possible to formulate principles of Latin word order, and that the subject is worth pursuing. As I said at the beginning, I believe that there is a place in Latin teaching for study of word order, both as regards the teaching of explicit principles, and with the object of ensuring that the made-up Latin in Latin courses keeps to classical patterns of word-order. This is as important in the early stages as later on – in fact more so, since what one learns at the beginning tends to stick longest. I believe that is wrong to start pupils on sentences that have been rearranged in English order: the effect of this must surely be to make genuine Latin more difficult for them when they reach a more advanced stage. To take an example that has recently become familiar, they should learn 'Caecilius pater est' or 'Pater est Caecilius', not 'Caecilius est pater', which as far as I can make out would mean 'Tis Caecilius the father is'. (I use this only as a convenient example, and do not wish to imply that the Cambridge Latin Course is otherwise erroneous in its word order.) Finally, I believe that attention to points of word order makes Latin appear more like a language and less like an artificial pattern of words on a page: since I started to notice these things, my own fluency and pleasure in reading has increased enormously. Word order in Latin is not just a superficial decoration, but a vital and fundamental part of the expressive power of the language in all its forms throughout the classical period.

J. G. F. POWELL

teaches in the

Department of Classics, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Language Awareness

(A lecture given at the A.G.M. of JACT in Newcastle, May 1985)

Adrian Spooner

The accumulated problem.

There is abundant information which suggests that many children underachieve across the whole curriculum because the language used in teaching all subjects which deal with concepts is of necessity latinate. These children are those who, for reasons social and cultural, are deprived of contact with this usage at home and in play. Further, David Corson¹ identifies the age of conceptualisation at around 13-14, shortly before the time at which options for courses at 16+ are being sought and the latinate content of teaching language goes on increasing. Those for whom the Latin (and Greek) content of English is alien lose out in two directions: 1) in the multiplicity of subjects across the curriculum, most using latinate terms 2) in the use of latinate language cumulatively up the curriculum, where the understanding of a further concept depends on that of an earlier one.

What Corson has termed the lexical bar swings into action, the result being that many of the children we teach do not have access to the terminology used, and consequently underachieve. In the case of these children there is a paradox: the more they are taught the more they are likely to fall behind.

Bullock 1975.

The problem of the use of language across the curriculum has long been recognised, and was investigated by Lord Bullock² in 1975. Let us look at three proposals:

- 1) the responsibility of all teachers for language across the curriculum.
- 2) the restoration of "adult time" (talking, listening and reading to an adult on a one to one basis) to children who do not get that at home.
- 3) the inclusion of language education in initial teacher training.

Though it is easy to see the wisdom of these recommendations, it is clear that there has been no general response in terms of educational practice. I believe that a course such as I present will 1) allow teachers of language to work across the curriculum, in the absence of all teachers regarding themselves as English teachers and 2) nod in the direction of the restoration of adult time. Initial teacher training is beyond our scope.

Current Practice.

There are now many different Language Awareness courses going on in schools, most of which seek to consider the phenomenon of communication in different species at different stages. I have not found one which has stated its single aim as the improvement of English language skills. The single aim of the course I present is just that.

The American Experience

In 1973 an experiment was conducted in elementary schools in Indianapolis in which simple Latin was taught to stress importance of Latin root words in English. The experimental group was compared with a control group, and testing showed that within a five month period the experimental group made the following gains over the control group:

- 1) 8 months on word knowledge.
- 2) 1 year in reading.
- 3) 1 year and 1 month in language.
- 4) 4 months in spelling.
- 5) 7 months in math computation.
- 6) 8 months in math concept.
- 7) 9 months in math problem solving.
- 8) 5 months in science.
- 9) 7 months in social science.

These figures are taken from "American Education", J. 1978.

English Language Awareness and Classical Studies.

The course is aimed at the 10-13 age group, whether in mixed ability or selective groups. At present it consists of two Units, each divided into three subsections called Section A, Section B and Section C.

Section A tells the story of a god or an incident from the early history of Rome. The story is told in language designed to excite the interest of the class and highlight the linguistic points to be made in Sections B and C. Questions are appended which might lead to drama, written work, class discussion of the nature of that deity, whatever the class wishes or the teacher deems appropriate, in accordance with the strictures of time.

Section B deals with word building using the Greek/Latin root, prefix and suffix system.

Section C requires manipulation of the Greek alphabet and goes on to basic English grammar (parts of speech, phrases, clauses, metaphor and simile).

There are revision stages for lexical work, and regular class testing so that the children can build up material on the content of Section A which will be available for revision when that time comes.

The class will need an exercise book or file and access to an etymological dictionary. A small classroom library, of a good etymological dictionary, a classical atlas and a classical dictionary is essential, while further works on classical mythology would be an advantage.

The children have a word list of all the ancient words used in the course and a map of the ancient world. A further list of brand names and styles deriving from Latin and Greek

available, and a similar one on personal names. These can be used as and when the teacher desires.

Teaching a Unit.

Unit 6: Section A tells the story of Demeter in simple, carefully graded language. It is well illustrated.

Section B offers exercises and suggestions for dealing with VOC and PHONE words.

Section C deals with the manipulation of Greek, and English pronouns.

Section A may be read to the children at this stage or held back. It does not matter. The *telling* of the story is crucial, however, and the teacher should decide on style, pace and poundage of ham which he thinks appropriate, whether he refers to Section A or not.

We first consider why Demeter, as goddess of corn, was so important to the Greeks, and also less relevant to other peoples. Does Demeter hold sway in the frozen wastes? This way one avoids the problem of man creating god in his own image, and opens the way to understanding the Greek predilection for adopting deities. Further, we read, Demeter was a mystery goddess. The class will grasp the significance of this if you tell the story of a grain of corn from planting through harvesting, threshing, winnowing, grinding and baking. John Barleycorn, though killed, lives again. We sing the song in class.

Many in the class may already have 'done' Demeter and Persephone, but that is not important. The emphasis this time is likely to be different from that of primary school teaching.

The questions appended ask nothing of context (this is picked up later in cloze testing). The children are asked to speculate on the motivation of the divines and their similarity to and differences from humans. We identify those countries where Demeter or a deity like her might be revered. The children may be asked to produce a strip cartoon illustrating the story of a loaf of bread.

These exercises can be written, oral or taken as a more extended activity. A variety of homeworks can be set. Do not overlook the possibility of asking the child to relate the story of Demeter and Persephone to a parent. Though it is difficult to check whether this homework has been done, the benefits are many. The child reinforces the lesson by restructuring the story in his own way, the parent is more directly involved in the work of the school, and we are nodding in the direction of Bullock's desire to restore adult time to the child.

Section B

The first exercise is aural. Read aloud the story of Demeter and Persephone from Section A (the children should not now have copies) and see if they can hear the words which have something in common. They will hear INVOKE, VOCABULARY, PROVOKE, VOCIFEROUS, VOCATION at least once.

Having identified the VOC VOKE sound, ask them to find out the meaning of these words and write them down. They may use a dictionary. Alternatively the teacher can write down the words and their meaning on the blackboard once the class has found the necessary information. It should then be easy to say what VOC and VOKE mean and why it appears in each of these words.

Then tell the class that the Greek word for VOICE is PHONE. The list of phone words printed in Section B will

probably be redundant as the teacher will be regaled with telephones and microphones and saxaphones. These can be written on the blackboard and the children should then go through each word and account for the presence of PHONE. It can now be pointed out that, because one understands the PHONE part of the word, other information becomes available. They are unlikely to have heard of Mr Sax and Mr Sousa before this. Then ask the children to pick on one of the phone words in the list, say *telephone*, write down the prefix (or put it on the blackboard), and then add as many tele- words as possible. Again, the dictionary is available when inspiration dries up. The test is to look at all these words and work out the meaning of the tele- part. If the class is enjoying itself, let it go on to micro- and mega- as it will.

By the end of the lesson the class will have a pool of prefixes, whose meaning they understand and can then apply to other root words as necessary.

Finally, and most fun, encourage the class to invent their own phone words. They may use the ancient words list. Discourage the use of English prefixes: funniphone isn't much use, but the following have been produced: miktophone, terraphone, antiquiphone, modernophone, montiphone. My favorite was tempiphone, a talking clock. The children should define their word, and they may wish to do this in the form of a drawing.

Elsewhere in the course Section B looks at vocabulary across the curriculum. The school timetable is considered, science in a general way and the terminology of biology in particular, astronomy, music, religion, architecture and politics.

Section C

The class is asked to write Persephone in Greek letters, then to write 'out phonetically the Greek words which contain PHONE: φωνασκεω φωνεω φωνομιμος φωνομαχια. It is common practice in Language Awareness courses to look at words in a foreign language or in alien notation in order to help them work out the meaning without the prejudice, as it were, of having met that form before.

The grammar in Section C deals with the pronoun. The children already understand the use of the noun, and the word pronoun is defined in terms of the prefix PRO added to the word noun. It is useful at this stage to let the children discover the form and use of the pronoun.

Try picking on a child in the class. Let it be Sophie. Start talking to Sophie thus in front of the class: "Teacher was shopping the other day and saw Sophie. 'What is Sophie doing?' said the teacher. 'Sophie is shopping,' replied Sophie. 'What is teacher doing?' 'Teacher is shopping as well,' replied teacher. 'Well, teacher hopes Sophie has a good shop...'" ...and so on. The class will immediately be able to correct the awkwardness of the conversation, and will do so, of course, by putting in the pronouns.

The first exercise requires a return to the written text of Section A. The children are asked to find 15 pronouns, and state what noun each stands for. There are, of course, many more than 15 pronouns in Section A, and the brightest will go on to find many more than required, but for a mixed ability group the designation of a relatively small number to be found gives all a chance of succeeding in the exercise, and the children have experienced the same mental activity to find 15 or 35.

There follows a further passage from which the class is asked to extract a further number of pronouns. These exercises can also be done as aural practice. In this case, read the passage to the class and let them indicate (by putting up hands or calling out) where a pronoun occurs.

Finally we look at relative pronouns. These are defined, practised orally in class, and a further exercise is done. These cause few problems.

Three (at least) questions remain:

1) When should the course be pursued?

The course is proposed for top primary, middle school, bottom secondary or prep. pupils, where it would serve to ease the transition to more subjects being taught in more technical language.

2) Where on the timetable should the subject be taught?

Humanities course, Classical Studies, European Studies, part of a foreign language course, or in English. In my experience English departments, even if they do not want to teach this subject themselves, are delighted that such an approach to English Language Awareness be tried.

3) By whom should such a course be taught?

The teachers whose timetable time is to be usurped, or anyone who is prepared to mug up the teachers' notes the night before.

The future.

This course could form the basis of a new language-based humanities packet to be presented to children at the ages specified. The other elements could be French and the influence it has had on English, using those stories which oriented French culture and made Frenchmen French, and a similar course in the same format concentrating on German and the Germans.

Already a unit has been established at New College, Durham, to produce the sister to this course in French.

ADRIAN SPOONER is Head of Classics
at Park View Comprehensive School, Chester-le-Street

NOTES

1. Corson, David. The Graeco-Latin lexical bar. Hesperiam 5 (1982)
2. Lord Bullock. Language across the curriculum. HMSO. (1975)

LANGUAGE AWARENESS AND CLASSICAL STUDIES

Gods and Goddesses: Demeter, whom the Romans called Ceres: Section A: Part 1. Demeter was the goddess who brought corn to the people of the world, so you can see how important she was to the people in the lands where corn was grown. Of course, in lands where corn did not grow, she would not be regarded at all highly. Eskimos certainly do not invoke Demeter.

Demeter was a strange and sometimes frightening goddess, and the rites of her religion were called Mysteries. These were celebrated at a place called *Eleusis*. Mark Eleusis on your map.

If you think about how corn is made into bread, you might begin to see why Demeter was regarded with such awe and mystery.

First the corn is cut with sharp blades to HARVEST it, and then it is cruelly beaten with sticks and flails to separate the grain from the husks. This is called THRESHING. Then the grain and the husks are thrown into the wind. The useless material is blown away, while the grain, being heavier, falls to the ground to be collected. This is called WINNOWERING. Then, as if this treatment weren't rough enough, some of the grain is kept to be buried in the earth. That which is not kept is ground between stones to extract the flour

which can be used to make bread. Note particularly the vocabulary attached to the treatment of corn.

Exercise:

See if you can find out the process for making flour into bread.

The Spring has arrived, and the corn not ground to make flour for bread is buried, as at a funeral. That should be the end of it; but the miracle Demeter performs is to provoke the corn to life in the summer. But not just that. One grain of corn was buried, Demeter brings forth many grains of corn. The EAR which appears at the top of the stalk. And this is the miracle she performs year after year. So you can see how a goddess who can bring something back after it appears to have been killed might be regarded as mysterious.

Demeter, Hades and Persephone.

Demeter had a daughter by Zeus called Persephone. Mother and daughter were very happy together and loved each other very much. Hades had a sister, Persephone's uncle and King of the Underworld (which we might call the underworld) took a liking to the girl, and carried her off to live with him in the Underworld. Persephone's complaints were vociferous but vain. Demeter looked everywhere for her daughter, but could not find her anywhere. Only the sun saw what happened, and told Demeter the sad story.

Although she appealed, once Persephone had entered Hades, she could not return. Demeter was shattered and went into mourning. She made for a rock and there sat on a rock and wept for her daughter. She was so sad that she neglected her vocation as a goddess.

This meant, of course, that nothing that was planted would come to life. There would be no corn, and no bread for mankind. The whole earth was unproductive. Zeus realised what a disaster this was, and persuaded Hades to let Persephone go to the upper world for six months of the year, although she had to return to Hades after that period. Thus Hades' claim on Persephone was revoked.

It was in this way that the seasons were formed. As Persephone left the Underworld, Demeter ceased her duties, and the plants ceased to grow. When Persephone was returned to Demeter, life came back to the earth and plants began to bloom. Notably the corn, once apparently dead, could come back again. And this was how the seasons were formed. The six months of Persephone's stay in Hades were Autumn and Winter, and these returned to Spring and Summer as she emerged into the upper world.

Section A: Part 2

Exercise:

- 1) What evidence can you find in the story book *Demeter and Hades* that the gods did have some concern for the interests of mortals on the earth?
- 2) Make a list of the countries where you think Demeter might be regarded as important, and then those where she might not be.
- 3) Gods and mortals, as you know, are very different beings. But in the story they do not seem to be so different. Consider the actions of Demeter and Hades in the story you have just read, and consider how godlike or human they are.
- 4) Make a strip cartoon illustrating the whole procedure from planting to producing flour.

Gods and Goddesses: Demeter, whom the Romans called Ceres: Section A: Part 2. The words in Section A which have been double underlined are something in common. Can you see what it is? It might help you to say the words aloud.

The VOC- or -VOKE part come from the Latin word VOX which means VOICE. Does this help you work out the meanings of those words? Try to use the words in difficulty use your dictionary.

Here are some more examples of this Latin prefix/suffix:

vocal	talkative, loud
voiceless	unable to talk
irrevocable	beyond recall, final

The Greek equivalent of VOX is PHONE. But beware, just because

appears, say, in PERSEPHONE, it is not necessarily a suffix from that Greek word. It is not in this case.

However, the fact that you know that PHONE is Greek for voice should help you understand the meaning of many English words. Look at the following:

telephone
microphone
megaphone
saxophone
phonetic
symphony
Anglophone
Francophone
ansaphone
xylophone

Exercise:

Pick out any four words from the list. Say what each means, and then say why the PHONE part should appear in that word.

By knowing the Greek part of a word, it might actually tell you something you did not know before. For instance, you know that the saxophone is a musical instrument. You know what the PHONE part of the word means, but the first part of the word refers to the man who invented the instrument. You can now guess what he was called.

Most of the words in the list above have a *prefix* in this case, that is the part of the word which comes before PHONE.

Exercise:

Write down the prefix to the following words:

telephone	Now see if you can find another word which has the same
microphone	prefix as each of these words. Then, and this might be a
megaphone	bit harder, try to work out what each of those prefixes
symphony	means. Use a dictionary if necessary.

Exercise:

If an Anglophone is someone who speaks English, what are following?

Francophone Hispanophone Italophone

Gods and Goddesses: Demeter, whom the Romans called Ceres: Section B: Part 2.

Finally:

Using any of the Latin and Greek words you have already met, and the suffix PHONE, see if you can invent any new words. Then say what your word means.

Here is an example: POMUM means apple. So a *pomophone* is a music instrument made out of an apple.

Equally, it could mean someone who speaks apple language.

Gods and Goddesses: Demeter, whom the Romans called Ceres Section C: Part 1.
Write PERSEPHONE in Greek letters.

Look at the following Greek words with their meanings. Try to say them aloud and then write them out in English letters so that if an English person read them they would get as close as possible to the Greek sound.

e.g. φωνασκεω	I learn to sing. PHONASKEO
φωνεω	I speak
φωνομιμος	imitating the voice
φωνομαχια	a dispute about words.

The English version of these words that you have written is called 'phonetic' because you have written them exactly as they sound. In some dictionaries a phonetic version of the word you have found is often given after that word. Here are three English words, followed by their phonetic spelling:

trough	trof
women	wimmin
nation	nayshun

There is an old trick you can play with these letters and sounds. Pronounce the following word: GHOTI

Take GH as in trough, O as in women, and TI as in nation, and you get FISH.

In sections B and C we have again been looking at words which are built up from two or more parts, as, for instance, xylophone. *Xylon* is the Greek for

'wood', and the instrument is 'wood-voiced' because the sounding blocks of a xylophone are made of wood. As you know, the part that goes at the front of a word is called a *prefix*, while that which is put at the end of a word is called a *suffix*.

The prefix PRO is a Latin word which means 'instead of'. The part of speech we are now going to look at is called a 'pronoun', which is simply a word which stands INSTEAD of a noun. For instance, you could call a boy 'him' instead of Jack. A girl could be called 'her' instead of Jemima. You might say 'pass me *that*' instead of 'pass me the hamburger'. All the words underlined are pronouns because they stand for nouns. Here are some more: I, you, he, we, they, this, them and so on.

Exercise:

Look back to course A of this unit. Pick out 15 pronouns, and then give the noun which you think they are replacing. Give the line number for each pronoun you chose.

Gods and Goddesses: Demeter, whom the Romans called Ceres: Section C: Part 2.
Now read the following passage and pick out ten pronouns. See which noun you think each one stands for.

Jack and Jemima were walking down the street. They looked in all the shops which were full of Christmas decorations. "Don't they look lovely, all the shops?" said Jemima. "Especially that one over there. Shall we look in it?"

"This one is my favourite by far," said Jack. To him, the most attractive one was full of toys. "I would like them all," he said. Jemima said she was particularly fond of purple stuffed ferrets. "They are so hard to find these days," she said. "We do not see many of them about."

Jack and Jemima were happy. She turned to him and smiled. That made him feel uncomfortable, and he started clicking his fingers.

"Why are you doing that?" she asked, curious. Jack made no reply, but carried on clicking his fingers, here and there, above his head and behind his back. Again she asked, so Jack, irritated, replied "It keeps the kangaroos away."

"But there aren't any kangaroos in Birtley," she replied. "There are none of them here."

"That's right," said Jack. "It works, doesn't it?"

There is also another kind of pronoun which you will meet regularly in your reading. Look at the following examples:

That is the boy *who* hit me.

This is the subject *which* I like best.

Where is the book *that* I was reading?

Because the word WHO relates to the boy, WHICH relates to the subject, and THAT relates to the book, without naming them, these too are pronouns. You can, perhaps, see why they should be called RELATIVE PRONOUNS. Look back to course A and find 4 relative pronouns, and say which noun they refer to.

Exercise:

Find at least 5 relative pronouns in the following passage:

We are looking at pronouns which we call relative. By relative, I do not mean my uncle, who is very nice. Nor do I mean my sister's gerbil, which I like very much. Sometimes my uncle, whom I call Horace, looks after my sister's gerbil, which she calls Harriet. Sometimes he buys the gerbil food that Harriet likes to eat. We do not like Harriet very much when we have to clean up the mess that she has made.