

pamphlet the necessarily detailed discussion of each of the heads in the editor's answer, their nature is such that I cannot let them remain entirely unchallenged till then. In the attempt to construct a *prima facie* case in his own favour, he gives a misrepresentation of the facts and my arguments the gravity of which will appear hereafter. In No. (3) of his heads, on the other hand, he is arguing directly to his own confusion. Apparently from his remark 'In this the reader, etc.' (which is an entire mistake), and from his reference to the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he has not even yet realised the nature of his error and my argument from it. It is as if a foreigner were to say that the immortality of the soul (Wordsworth's ode) 'is affirmed by the author of the *Golden Treasury of Lyric Verse*, a work of uncertain date.' It is one of a number of proofs indicated in the review, and to be detailed in my pamphlet, of the nature of the editor's learning.

I conclude by giving the reader a test of the value of the statements which the editor makes in his answer, in a matter which will take little space. In No. (2) he says 'furthermore it might be interesting to learn wherein consists an attack upon Martin which our critic attributes to me. I refer to Martin three times in this connexion, and each time

with approval.' My point was not that the editor attacked Martin but that his attack was unsuccessful. The editor in reply contends that he did not attack Martin at all. Now these are the facts. In 38 D τὴν ἐναντίαν εἰληχόρας αὐτῷ δύνανται, said of Mercury, Venus and the Sun, is interpreted by Martin to mean that Mercury and Venus revolve in a direction opposite to that of the sun, though he admits, as the editor himself says, that there are difficulties. The editor attacks this theory and interprets quite differently. Martin's words are 'Platon a voulu dire bien positivement que ces deux planètes suivent une direction opposée à celle du soleil.' The editor says 'If the contrary motion' [*i.e.* the kind meant by Martin] 'of the two planets is insisted on, the result follows that we have here the one theory in the whole dialogue which is manifestly and flagrantly inadequate. Plato's physical theories, however far they may differ from the conclusions of modern science, usually offer a fair and reasonable explanation of such facts as were known to him: they are sometimes singularly felicitous, and never absurd. I cannot then believe that he has here presented us with a hypothesis so obviously futile.'

J. COOK WILSON.

OBITUARY.

THOMAS MAGUIRE, LL.D., D.LIT.,

Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin.

Died 26 Feb. 1889.

DEATH has made another gap in the ranks of Irish scholars. Little more than a month after Dr. Davies, his friend and predecessor in the Chair of Latin, Queen's College, Galway, Thomas Maguire passed behind the veil.

He was born in Dublin on 24 Jan. 1831, and even from his boyhood showed remarkable intellectual power. His University career was one long succession of the highest honours in Classics and Philosophy, and he graduated in 1854 with a gold medal in each subject, being the only man of his year who obtained two gold medals at degree. He had already won the Wray Prize in Logics and Ethics, and subsequently

gained the Berkeley gold medal in Greek. Excluded by his religion from competing for the University scholarship, he was the first Roman Catholic to win one of the non-foundation scholarships. The same relic of old exclusiveness which practically limited Fellowships to members of the established Church, until Fawcett's Act of 1873 swept away the last remnant of religious disabilities, caused him to turn aside to the study of law. Here too he carried off first prizes in Political Economy (1856), in Civil Law (1858), in Feudal and English Law (1860). In the next year he won the Lincoln's Inn studentship on what was said at the time to be the best answering on

record, and was called to the English bar in 1862. But he did not suffer his legal studies to banish his old love for Classics and Philosophy, and in 1866 appeared his work on *The Platonic Idea*. The profound study of Plato, and the comprehensive grasp of the loftiest philosophy evinced in this work and in his subsequent *Essays on Platonic Ethics* (1870), may be judged from the words of Professor Gustav Teichmüller of Dorpat.

‘Maguire’s book deserves to be specially appreciated by us Germans, for Maguire belongs to the most speculative order of intellect that England and Ireland have ever produced. . . . But amongst British savants Maguire is, of Platonic scholars, assuredly the most interesting and profound.’—*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen unter der Aufsicht der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1874

His masterly edition of the *Parmenides* in 1882 shows the continuity of his Platonic studies, though like some other eminent Platonists, notably the late Dr. Thompson, Master of Trinity, his published works are small in amount compared with their importance.

In 1869 he was appointed Professor of Latin in Queen’s College, Galway, and his memory is warmly cherished by many distinguished alumni of that seat of learning. He resigned the professorship in 1880 on winning a Fellowship in Trinity College, Dublin, for which he always maintained a most loyal affection. He was appointed lecturer in Greek and Latin composition in 1881, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in 1882. He contributed to every number of *Hermathena*, sometimes discussing legal points in Cicero, Horace, and others, where his great knowledge of Roman law stood him in good stead, sometimes commenting on Homer, Pindar, Herodotus, Thucydides, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal, or treating of grammatical points such as ‘potential optative,’ the existence of which he denied. One of his most important contributions was an exhaustive treatise ‘On the Prosody of βλ and γλ in Old Comedy and Tragedy.’ For this he re-read all that remains of the Greek Tragedies, Aristophanes, and the Fragments, and arrives at the result that a vowel cannot remain short before βλ or γλ in Old Comedy, nor in Tragedy except before the words βλαστάνω and γλωσσα. In these papers, as in his teaching, it was very striking how he sought to pierce to the heart of the matter,

and spared no laborious research that could give him a thorough mastery of first principles. He at one time purposed editing Aeschylus, and his own Greek verses have been characterised by one of the best living composers thus: ‘They are the most Aeschylean I have ever read; Maguire reproduces not only the form but the spirit in a way I have never seen equalled, and believe can scarcely be excelled.’ His Latin composition shows boldness, vigour, and terseness, as may be seen from *Kottabos*, or *Dublin Translations*.

He was an uncompromising supporter of the claims of Greek to be retained as a compulsory subject in University education. His reading was very extensive, and his love for Classics ardent and sincere, but it is perhaps for his philosophic work that he is most widely known. His lectures on metaphysics were attended even by his brother Fellows, and I have been present on an occasion when the interest of an accomplished metaphysician overcame the silence of an auditor, and gave rise to a dialogue vividly suggestive of Socratic times.

His views were given to the public in his *Lectures on Philosophy* (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1885), and in various articles on Ancient Philosophy in *Hermathena*. At the time of his death he was correcting the proofs of a lecture on ‘Mr. Balfour on Kant und Transcendentalism,’ and a paper on Aristotle for *Hermathena*. In the last number of that journal appeared a very interesting review of Mr. Archer-Hind’s *Timaeus*. Its final paragraph, his last published words, forms a fitting conclusion to this imperfect sketch of one of the deepest and most original thinkers who have ever shed honour on our *Alma Mater*.

‘Mr. Archer-Hind well puts it: “The material universe is, as it were, a luminous symbol-embroidered veil, which hangs for ever between finite existences and the infinite, as a consequence of the evolution of the one out of the other. And none but the highest of finite intelligences may lift a corner of this veil and behold aught that is behind it.” True, but as now we may know that the Infinite must be, so the veil may become more and more luminous, until the whole material cosmos becomes as purely symbolical as the signs of that science which Plato held divine:—

This use may lie in blood and breath,
Which else were fruitless of their due,
Had man to learn himself anew,
Beyond the second birth of Death.’

P. SANDFORD.