

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 school-boys 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 woos 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 grove?' I picture to myself a golden-haired damsel lying on a bed of rose leaves (6 × 5 × 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 arva 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.