A SONNET FROM CATULLUS.—XXXI.

HALF-ISLET Sirmione, gem of all
The isles, which God of sea or God of mere
Upholds in glassy lake or ocean drear,
On thee with heart and soul my glances fall.

Scarce can I think me safe when I recall
Bithynia's plains afar, and see thee near.
Ah, what more joyous than the mind to clear
Of care, and burdens lay aside that gall!

By distant travail worn we win our hearth,
And on the long-wished couch siesta take:
This is the one reward for those who roam.
Hail, Sirmione fair! Greet me with mirth.
Be mirthful, Lydian waters of the lake!
Laugh out, ye realms of merriment at home!

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—I can only be grateful for Mr. Lyttelton's careful and detailed criticism of one part of my scheme. He could not be expected to look at it in the light of the other parts; but, when it is so looked at, I trust that the criticism loses some of its force.

On the matter of fact, how much time is actually taken in composition? Mr. Lyttelton's one hour a week is a great surprise to me, and I am thankful to hear that it is so little; even now, I can hardly believe that it applies, in most schools, to the great mass of the boys who are not told off to non-classical subjects. But (1) he can only mean the hour in school: there is the time taken in doing the piece out of school, and that may be a great deal; (2) there is the time taken in other kinds of composition, for the boys who do it; (3) most important of all, the 'hour a week' stage comes late in the boy's time. 'Up to fourteen, all boys must do sentences or elementary prose.' I presume that these boys have begun at some age not later than ten, perhaps at eight. Now, 'sentences' must involve the learning of grammar, as things are now; the two together represent a very much larger slice out of a boy's first four or even six years of his Latin time than 'one hour a week.'

By 'learning grammar' I mean the learning of inflexions by heart, to be carried in the memory when they are not present in a text. I never proposed to dispense with the other kind of grammar, the knowledge of inflexions *ad hoc*, when you come to them. Mr. Lyttelton does not think that this can be got without the old list-and-paradigm knowledge, but he does not allow for two or three points. (1) The boy is to do a much greater quantity of reading from the beginning than he does now; that reading will give familiarity with the ordinary inflexions. Of course, the master must assist it. '*Nulli*. How is that different from *boni*? What other datives like that have we come to this week?' (2) The boy is always to have the grammar by his side and refer to it in saying his lessons and in examination, just as much as in preparation. So far as prose may be retained, he is to have it for prose also. Theuth ought to have answered Thamus that the book does not weaken the memory; it sets it free for better things. (3) (A point which I omitted in *How to save Greek*). A great deal of the work of making the language familiar can be done by oral practice, in reading aloud and learning repetition, with careful and even exaggerated attention to rhythm and word-grouping and emphasis. Repetition is not a burden if the passages have been very lately translated and read aloud. This does not involve the great drawback of the conversational method, the fixing of the boy's mind on what he has to say instead of what the author has to say. (4) I desire boys to begin Latin later than they do now, when their minds are more mature.

This last point leads to a difference between us which I suspect to be fundamental. Mr. Lyttelton is apparently content to go on teaching Latin to boys who, in my opinion, ought not to be learning it at all (and *a fortiori* not Greek). When I wrote (*How to save Greek*, p. 11) that I proposed to begin Latin later than we do now, at about eleven or twelve (of course with an earlier and later margin for quick and slow boys), and that a literary preparation for it should precede in English history, English literature, Scripture, and so on, and if possible in ancient history and literature (and I ought to have added a linguistic preparation in some modern language), I ought to have stated explicitly what I meant implicitly, that this preparation should also be a sieve to sift out the boys

who have not linguistic capacity enough to learn to read Latin, and literary capacity enough to be interested in it.

Mr. Lyttelton apparently puts these boys at 70 per cent. of the whole. 'We should achieve it (the 'contact with the life of Greece and Rome') 'more successfully with 70 per cent. of the schoolboys if they read English books about Greece and Rome.' 'Many boys never get beyond this stage if their teachers are aiming at grounding them soundly in the rudiments of Latin.' 'A boy who will never know at which end of any sentence to begin.' Apparently, Mr. Lyttelton thinks that this percentage is fixed by nature, and still desires to go on teaching them. If he is right, I should say that we ought to drop Latin altogether, and *a fortiori* Greek, except for the 30 per cent., not merely to leave off early, but never to begin.

But is not it possible that his figures condemn our method rather than the capacities of the boys? Grammar and prose have failed, *ipso iudice*, except with 30 per cent., to produce the results which alone make it worth while to teach Latin at all. Suppose we try what we can do without them. Sift out the incapable, first on the easier subjects that come before Latin, then in the first year of Latin itself; they will not be Mr. Lyttelton's 70 per cent., I trust not 20, certainly not more than 30. Teach the capable majority, with an eye to 'great literature' and to the principles of 'history and politics' from the beginning. 'Extensive culture' of the language first and for everybody; 'intensive culture' second and for those who have the gifts for it. When we have done that for a generation, see what our percentage of success and failure will be. It cannot be worse than that which Mr. Lyttelton confesses.

On a kindred question, I suspect that we differ just as absolutely. Mr. Lyttelton contemplates the continued existence of Pass men at the Universities. I care for their abolition, at all Universities alike, even more than for the universal retention of Greek in two Universities. To secure that, I would admit Greekless Honour men to Oxford and Cambridge, if that is the price that must be paid. But I hope for better things.

Both these questions—what boys are to be taught Latin, and what men are to be admitted to the Universities—are parts of a much wider question. What are the places of the clever boy, the ordinary boy, and the stupid boy, in a national system of education? That is happily too wide for the *Classical Review*. But I am afraid we cannot escape the duty of thinking about it.

T. C. SNOW.

HORACE, *ODES*, BOOK I. 5.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Perhaps you would admit into your learned journal the suggestions of an amateur who has loved his Horace for fifty years. To come to the point at once, what is the meaning of *multa in rosa* and *grato sub antro* in the first lines of this ode, which has generally been regarded as one of the most perfect in Horace. A literal translation might be, I suggest:

'Pyrrha, what slim and graceful lad [*gracilis* = the French *gracile*] well oiled with fragrant unguents, now wooes thee ardently beneath a pleasant bower (festooned) with many a rose.' The *antrum* referred to is not a natural cave, but a bower or grot, or something half bower, half grot artificially constructed. If *antrum* is construed to mean a natural cave or grot, then *sub antro* must mean, strictly speaking, underneath and not within it, though Ovid uses *Idaeis sub antris* loosely.

I think that the prepositions *in* and *sub* are 'determinants' as to the true meaning of the passage, and submit that my suggestion is the only construe which gives them their grammatical and proper force. Even the *curiosa felicitas* of Wickham fails him here. When I read, 'What delicate stripling is it, Pyrrha, that is now wooing thee on the heaped rose leaves in some pleasant grot?' I picture to myself a golden-haired damsel lying on a bed of rose leaves ($6 \times 5 \times 2$ feet) in the embrace of a perfumed youth in a natural cave within the walls of Servius, and rub my eyes, and ask am I awake or dreaming? Now there were no natural caves in Rome, with the possible exception of the *Tullianum*, which was scarcely *gratum*, and some holes in the tufa. Nor were there any outside Rome until you reached *Tibur* (16 m.), where the limestone formation begins. And Horace was not referring to some rustic Pyrrha near his farm on the Sabine hills. On the other hand, there were cave-like summer-houses or bowers, and some were probably partly grottoes, in the public gardens over *Tiber* and in the open spaces (*campus et cereae*) elsewhere. And there were doubtless bijou bowers in the gardens of Maecenas on the Esquiline, in one of which Horace may have 'meditated this trifle,' and possibly been 'urged' ineffectually on some previous occasion, when he hung up his dripping garments to dry for another farewell performance.

According to my suggestion *sub antro* will receive the same construction as *sub arta vite bibentem*. There is a delightful Old English garden at Golder's Hill, Hampstead, in which will be found bowers of both kinds. There is an open arbour where a vine is trained over a framework of timber. There is also a bower, the interior of which is like a cave, where roses and other plants are trained in like manner over a timber framework. Opposite to the mouth of this cave is a fountain, simple yet tasteful (*simplex munditiis*), which diffuses a refreshing coolness in the summer-time. And within it I have sometimes heard in the twilight the *lenes susurri* of which the poet speaks. And all this quite Horatian in Happy Hampstead!

ARTHUR UA CLERIGH, K.C.

30, *St. Ann's Terrace, St. John's Wood.*