

III. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6—owe their posthumous publication to a personal feeling of respect for one who, as we understand from the Introduction, was a lovable man and an inspiring teacher. This naturally secures them some exemption from criticism; and it is therefore fortunate that their character can be adequately represented by quotations:

‘No English can do perfect justice to the lines closing stanza three [II. 3. 11 sq.]—

*quid obliquo laborat
lympha fugax trepidare rivo.*

We can but analyse each word and hold it up to the light. *Lympha* calls up bright, clear water. *Fugax trepidare* pictures trembling haste, an eagerness to flow and flee. In *obliquo laborat rivo* we see the stream as, obstructed by its winding channel-bed, it

frets and struggles, and so gives forth a murmuring protest in its quivering haste.’

‘See the labour and skill and expense lavished on the feast to tempt the sluggish appetite, the jaded palate—

*Siculae daptes
dulcem elaborabunt saporem.*
[III. 1. 18 sq.]

Yet all in vain this profligate waste.

See, the dark word *non*.’

This exuberance of appreciation and a strong vein of Christian moralising which runs through the interpretations are possibly not the best aids towards the understanding of Horace; but the work is conscientiously done, it is not without insight, and some teachers, especially in America, may find the volume of service.

X.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE REPORT OF THE HEAD-MASTERS' CONFERENCE ON THE CURRICULUM.

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Not long ago some remarks on the Head-Masters' Report appeared in the *Classical Review* which indicated a misleading idea as to the purpose of the Report and even as to its contents. It was stated, if I remember right, that the Greek question was shelved, whereas, in fact, the Report was mainly concerned with that question. Moreover, the unexampled unanimity with which the Report was welcomed by the Conference makes it certain that its proposals will be acted on, and not unlikely that its appearance may mark an important moment in the history of the classical controversy.

The curtailment of classical teaching in England in the Public Schools has been effected by Modern Sides, in which some Latin is taught, but not as a primary subject; Greek not at all. French and Mathematics are the principal subjects, as measured by time given to them. Science for the older boys frequently displaces Latin. In the Grammar Schools Greek has largely disappeared without the school being divided into two sides.

Now, the proposals of the H.M.C. aim at an educational settlement of the Greek question, wholly differing from the Modern Side arrangement, which was merely an accommodation to a (perhaps) passing public whim adverse to classics, and based on no principle whatever. The Conference recognise that Greek is in danger because slow boys are still made to learn it along with Latin, to the lasting detriment of both—and of the boys' minds to boot. A Modern Side ignores this difficulty altogether. It may relieve a Classical

Side of a good half of the laggards, but it always leaves a good many behind; and at the same time it absorbs a good many boys of ability who ought to study Greek anyhow till sixteen years of age, unless some very exceptional reason of a professional character forces them to specialise earlier.

The H.M.C.'s principles, then, in regard to the Greek question, are three: (1) No boy should begin Greek till he has mastered the rudiments of Latin, and if this does not happen till he is fifteen, he should not begin at all. (2) Boys who can profit by learning Greek should learn it. (3) The selection of those who ought and those who ought not to learn Greek should be in the hands of the schoolmasters. For details I must refer your readers to the Report itself, which can be obtained for 2d. from the Secretary of the H.M.C. (12, King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.). So much, however, is plain from this bald statement. The Head-Masters are as desirous of fostering Greek for the quicker boys as they are of withdrawing it from the slower. And they are prepared with very good arguments for both policies.

There is one more aim prominently set forth in the Report—the development of the teaching of English. Other subjects are treated of at some length, and the object has been steadily kept in view of arranging the Entrance Examinations into the Public Schools on rational lines, and one alteration is laid down for the Scholarship Examinations.

In short, it may be said that the Report does for Classical Sides that which, if it had been done in time, would have rendered Modern Sides needless.

E. LYTELTON.