

## OBITUARIES

## C. H. KEENE.

CLASSICAL learning in Ireland has sustained a serious loss by the death of Professor Charles Haines Keene, which occurred on February 13. Born in 1847, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, in 1865, and had a distinguished course, graduating with First-Class Honours in Classics, and Second-Class in Logics and Ethics. He also obtained very high honours in Hebrew. His tastes were always for learning and scholarship, and he had all through life to the very end the true spirit of a scholar, in that 'gladly would he learn and gladly teach.' In 1876 he went to the Queen's College, Belfast, as locum tenens for the Professor of Latin, and performed the arduous duties of that Chair with conspicuous success. He was one of those men—and they are not many—who, without any effort whatever, are able to maintain discipline in large classes and gain the respect and regard of students. From 1888 to 1890 he acted for the Professor of Greek in Belfast with equal success. In 1895 he was elected Professor of Greek at Cork, a post which (along with that of Dean of the Faculty of Arts since 1909) he held until just before his death. From 1900 to 1910 he was a Fellow of the Royal University. He was a constant and earnest worker, never sparing himself in any respect in which he considered that he could bring distinction on, or promote the usefulness of, the positions he held. His principal works were editions of Calpurnius (1887), of the *Electra* of Euripides (1893), of some books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and of Rutilius (1907), an author for whom he had a great affection. In all these he exhibited sound and solid learning, and a just appreciation of the spirit of the authors. Keene had a grave courtesy of manner, and withal a very quick sense of humour; and he was a most agreeable conversationalist. His nature was essentially human and sympathetic, so that he was capable of putting himself in the place of junior students and feeling what would interest them; and thus he was able to produce for such readers excellent little volumes

of judiciously chosen selections from Xenophon, Caesar, and Pliny. He was a frequent contributor to the *Classical Review*. He was one of the most sociable of men; and, possessing a good knowledge of foreign languages and considerable powers of observation, he used to enjoy foreign travel thoroughly, and gain therefrom very great advantage. He was a prominent personality in the City of Cork. For two years he was President of the Cork Literary and Scientific Society, one of the most important societies of the kind in the country. He was of course admired in that city for his learning, and respected universally for his high character, though he made no secret of his very definite Unionist opinions; and his kindly and considerate nature won for him the affection of all classes. His loss will be very sadly felt in that genial community.

L. C. PURSER.

## S. SUDHAUS.

LATIN scholars will learn with regret the death of Dr. S. Sudhaus, of the University of Kiel, who was killed in the first weeks of the war.

Dr. Sudhaus was one of the delegates of German Universities who visited Oxford on the occasion of the Tercentenary Celebrations of the Bodleian Library in the summer of 1903. He stayed in Corpus, where he was much pleased to make the acquaintance of Robinson Ellis. He and Ellis took a long walk together, conversing exclusively in Latin and upon Latin subjects. 'I didn't like to ask him,' said Ellis in his naive way, 'how he came to think the first *e* of *creber* short' (an allusion to a blunder in Sudhaus' *Aetna*). Both Ellis and others who met Sudhaus in Oxford were much impressed by his simple good-nature and by his vigour of mind. As a scholar he is best known, at any rate in this country, by his edition of the *Aetna*. The preface to Ellis' edition of that poem assesses with perfect fairness both the merits and the defects of Sudhaus' work. Ellis speaks of him as 'a perfectly independent in-

quirer,' whose discussion of critical and exegetical difficulties throughout goes hand-in-hand with an enlarged scientific perception, such as neither Jacob nor Munro could claim.' His principal defect was not individual but the mark of a school—he was 'trained to the belief that the Ueberlieferung, or MS. tradition, of the text is to be defended at all costs.' Sudhaus' *Aetna* was published

in 1898. Six years previously he had published, in the Teubner series, *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*. In 1909 appeared his *Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica*. He wrote a good deal in the learned periodicals: and it was reserved for him to make quite recently one of the few certain corrections which have ever been made in the text of Horace (S. I, 4, 35).

## CORRESPONDENCE

PROP. III. x. 27.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I owe it to Dr. Postgate to acknowledge that his text in the *Corpus Poetarum* has *gravius*; the language of my note made a too sweeping implication that all editions gave *gravibus*.—Yours.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

April 11, 1915.

AESCHYLUS, *PERSAE*, 332-3.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—May I put on record a suggestion as to one of the passages discussed in Mr. Shepard's interesting paper upon a play which is *Ἄρεως μεστόν* and good reading at any time? It was proposed in a school edition in 1879, and so is eight years older than the *Classical Review*, and I have had no opportunity of bringing it before scholars. But I still think, though I may be sanguine, that it is right. In 332-3 M has

τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων ὑπεμνήσθην περί·  
πολλῶν παρόντων' ὀλίγ' ἀπαγγέλλω κακά.

And so Wecklein. In M *νυν* (*sic*) is added over the line by a later hand. There is a scholium to the second line *λείπει τὸ κακῶν*.

Omit 332. Then 333 closes and clenches the messenger's narrative in a manner which is abrupt and also Aeschylean. For such a single line without a connecting particle, cp. *Agam.* 680 or 1046 (Dind.), also such half lines as *πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον* (582). When the best has been done for it, 332 is a poor line. The process by which it was constructed is perhaps best left to the imagination of readers. Briefly, *ἀρχόντων* (perhaps *τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων*) is a gloss, as Blomfield, Hermann; not, however, on some word which it has replaced, as *ἀρχῶν, ταγῶν*, but on *πολλῶν* in 333, which the writer, in spite of the scholium, or not having it before him, understood to be masculine, and to refer to such Persian captains as those named above. So understood, the genitive requires *περί* or the full *ὑπεμνήσθην περί*, probably a tag from some play familiar to him.

*δὲ* in 333 is merely intrusive. Still, it would

be right to know *which* secondary MSS. show it. It is found in two late MSS. in the Bib. Nat. and, I think, in several now in England, but none of these need count.

A. O. PRICKARD.

March 19, 1915.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I add two queries on the text of Plutarch's *Moralia*.

1. *De Defectu Oraculorum*, c. 20, p. 420C, runs:

Ῥηθέντων δὲ τούτων, ὁ Ἀμμώνιος, ὀρθῶς, ἔφη, 'μοι δοκεῖ Θεόφραστος ἀποφῆναι· τί γὰρ κωλύει φωνὴν δέξασθαι σεμνὴν καὶ φιλοσοφωτάτην· καὶ γὰρ ἀθετομένη πολλὰ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων, ἀποδειχθῆναι δὲ μὴ δυναμένων, ἀναίρει, καὶ τιθεμένη πολλὰ συνεφέλκεται τῶν ἀδυνάτων καὶ ἀνυπάρκτων;'

Query, read *καὶ τιθεμένη οὐ πολλὰ κ.τ.λ.*?

2. The fragment from Stobaeus ascribed to Themistius, but redeemed for Plutarch's dialogue *περὶ ψυχῆς* by Wyttenbach in 1772, has in chap. ii. (Wyt., vol. v., p. 724; ed. Teub., vol. vii., p. 22):

καὶ τὴν τελευταίην ἀπόλυσιω καλοῦσι· ἂν δὲ ἔρημαι σώματος.

Query, *ἂν δὲ ἔρη*, καὶ σώματος—i.e., 'if you ask the question (from what?), why from the body?' A. O. P.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

IN the notice of my *Elementary Latin Grammar* (*Classical Review*, February, 1915) my critic denies the truth of my statement that no imperative of *ēdo* occurs in Classical Latin, affirming that *es* occurs in Plautus (e.g. *Mil.* 677) and Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. Permit me to point out (1) that Plautus does not fall within my definition of 'Classical Authors' (see p. v Introd. of my *Grammar of Classical Latin*); (2) that the reading *es* in Ovid *l.c.* is merely conjectural and does not occur in any MS.

A. SLOMAN.

[Mr. R. T. Clark writes to say that the third of the emendations suggested by him in our March number (p. 48, Notes on *Vespa*) is 'unreservedly withdrawn.'—ED. C. R.]