



Photograph by Elliott & Fry, 1934

HERBERT JENNINGS ROSE

HERBERT JENNINGS ROSE

1883-1961

HERBERT JENNINGS ROSE was born on 5 May 1883 at the town of Orillia, Ontario. His father, S. P. Rose, was a Methodist minister and the son of a Methodist minister who had been brought to Canada as a child early in the nineteenth century and was, according to family tradition, of Scottish descent. His mother, Jean Andrews, was the daughter of a Glasgow merchant and Sarah Jennings, a member of an old Ulster family, said to have been established in Ireland since the days of Strongbow. Of the children born to them only Herbert and a brother eight years younger than himself survived infancy, so that he grew up virtually as an only child, and that in a succession of homes, since his father under the Methodist system had several changes of pastorate in those early years. His parents believed him to be of delicate constitution, and he was accordingly educated, except for a year at Ottawa Collegiate Institute, entirely at home, first by his father, who had a scholarly mind but had been denied a scholarly training by early ill health, and later by a series of private tutors, whose instruction was supplemented (if that is the right word to use) by their precocious pupil's extensive and multifarious reading on his own account. By 1900 he had made sufficient progress to win an exhibition at McGill University, where, after a moment's hesitation between a classical and a chemistry course, he chose the former and graduated with First Rank Honours in 1904. His chief teacher at McGill was Professor F. Carter, but he was also taught by the distinguished Latinist and Principal of the University, William Peterson, who formed the highest expectations of his future career as a classical scholar, and, in philosophy, by A. E. Taylor.

Cecil Rhodes's famous will came into operation in the year in which Rose graduated at McGill. The trustees had intended to allot only one scholarship to the province of Quebec, but Principal Peterson urged so strongly upon them the exceptional qualifications of two McGill students, of whom Rose was one, that they decided to award scholarships to both. Thus it was as a Rhodes Scholar that he came to Balliol in October 1904. A First in Classical Moderations at the end of his second term and a First in Literae Humaniores at the end of his third year

were accompanied by the winning of the Ireland and First Craven Scholarship in 1905 and the Chancellor's Latin Essay Prize in 1907. The Passmore Edwards Scholarship (for proficiency in the comparative study of the literatures of Greece, Rome, and England) followed in 1908. Meanwhile in 1907 he had been offered and had accepted a Fellowship at Exeter College. This proved to be of great significance for his later work, for among his senior colleagues in the college were L. R. Farnell and R. R. Marett, and it was under their influence that he first became interested in anthropology and comparative religion. Next door, in Lincoln, was Warde Fowler, who 'taught me to take a deep interest in the religion of ancient Italy' (*Primitive Culture of Italy*, Preface).

In 1911 he married Eliza Harriet (Elsie) Plimsoll, elder daughter of the celebrated Samuel Plimsoll, so widely known as 'The Sailor's Friend'. In her he found an ideal life's partner: *coniunx incomparabilis* were the words he put after her name on her gravestone when she died in 1939. Of their marriage four sons and two daughters survive, all of them married and the parents of children who were a great delight to their grandfather in his old age.

His marriage and the consideration that as a Rhodes Scholar he had a debt to repay to his native country led him to apply for an associate-professorship in McGill. In this he was successful and from 1911 to 1915 he taught in his old university. In the latter year he enlisted in Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry and was posted to a reinforcement company which was sent to England. He was found physically unfit for service at the front, but he was an excellent shot, and did useful work with his regiment in England as a musketry instructor.

At the end of the war, to his own country's great loss, he decided to stay in Britain and in 1919 secured the post of Professor of Latin in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.

He enjoyed his stay in the Principality, but when the much older chair of Greek at St. Andrews fell vacant in 1926, he naturally enough put in for it and was appointed to it in 1927. This was to be his last permanent post, and it is with St. Andrews, where he added fresh distinction to a chair already made famous by its three immediately preceding occupants—Sellar, Campbell, and Burnet—that his name will always be associated. St. Andrews had not yet ceased to be a Scottish university, but he found it easy to settle down in an atmosphere and a tradition that were unfamiliar to him. (Not that he ever

ceased to regard himself as a Canadian; writing in 1960 of his service in the Home Guard, he says: 'An incidental result was to increase my love of this beautiful city and raise my already high opinion of the good qualities of my Scottish neighbours.')

He threw himself into the work of teaching with enthusiasm, giving a very large number of lectures per week in addition to individual instruction. His great powers of memory and readiness of speech—he was as little liable to charge into an anacoluthon as to trail away into an involuntary aposiopesis—commonly dispensed him from the necessity of writing out his lectures at length. He gave courses on Greek religion and ancient history, but he devoted his lectures mainly to poetical texts—Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes (with peculiar zest), Callimachus, and Theocritus; Herodotus was also sometimes taken up. Much attention was of course given in his prelections to religion, mythology, and folklore, but many other aspects of the works studied were also dealt with, and he never failed to impress his hearers alike by his capacity for clear exposition and his far-flung erudition. The individual instruction he gave was in composition, prose and verse, mostly the former. He very often provided the fair copies himself, frequently making a totally new version when the piece had been set in a previous year; he was full of resource in rendering English into Greek, and up to the last continued writing Greek more or less *currente calamo*. He was well liked by his students, and if their affection permitted them to be amused by his manifold unconventionalities and informalities, it was allied with a respect, approaching awe, which forbade any thought of familiarity, let alone indiscipline.

He invariably pronounced Greek in accordance with modern theory, as represented by Sturtevant, of the manner in which the classical Greeks spoke their language. Doubtless his pronunciation was a good deal nearer to theirs than is the traditional Scots pronunciation and much nearer than that traditional beyond the Border. But it may be questioned whether Plato and Demosthenes would have understood him as readily as he believed: to some he seemed merely to be raising his eye-brows when he supposed he was raising the pitch of his voice. Certainly his pronunciation made things harder for the weaker student, and it might perhaps have been wiser to reserve it for the Honours Classes.¹

¹ In this connexion it may be of interest to record that when James Donaldson was Rector of the Royal High School and taught the senior class,

Under the regulations regarding superannuation he retired from the chair on attaining the age of 70 in 1953. In the course of his twenty-six years' incumbency he had twice been granted a term's leave of absence, in 1935 to lecture at Harvard and in 1939 to function as Sather Professor in the University of California. After his retirement he was happy to be able to resume teaching in the United College, when, at the instance of the Professor of English Literature, he was appointed by the Court to lecture on the Classical Background of English Literature to Honours English Classes. The courses which he gave on this subject in the four sessions 1956-9 were much appreciated by those to whom they were addressed, the more so because they were accompanied by lively discussions.

In April 1960 he had an attack of pneumonia, from which he had not well recovered when a second attack occurred. Thereafter his health deteriorated in various ways. By the end of October he was unable to go up and down stairs, and before long he was virtually confined to bed. His mental powers remained unaffected, however; he continued to read and study, dictating reviews to within a fortnight of his death. The end came on 31 July 1961.

Rose had a very prolific pen. Beginning with a characteristic article on the witch scene in *Lucan* vi 419 sqq. in the *Classical Review* in 1913, he continued ever after to pour out a stream of articles and reviews. His first book was mainly written by 1915 and was completed in 1919, although post-war publishing difficulties postponed its appearance till 1924: the last was issued in 1959.

His work may be divided into two main classes according as the public to which it was addressed included readers without knowledge of the ancient languages or was restricted to classical scholars and students.

To the former class belong seven books dealing with religion and mythology and three on the history of literature, and in addition many articles in works of reference (*Hastings's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ed. 14, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*, new ed., *Encyclopaedia Americana*). The first of these books, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch: A New Translation with Introductory Essays and a Running Commentary* (pp. 220; 1924) was favourably received he used the Romaic pronunciation in the weekly New Testament lesson, while otherwise keeping to the Scots pronunciation. Burnet, who was one of his scholars, found it a sound practice.

by critics—among them De Sanctis, who remarked on his independence of judgement—but later he came to be dissatisfied with it himself and thought his reviewers had erred on the side of indulgence.

The Roman Questions was quickly followed by a pair of works of moderate compass, *Primitive Culture in Greece* (1925) and *Primitive Culture in Italy* (1926), each of which provides an admirably clear and well-balanced exposition of its subject. After a lucid account of characteristic features of savage life and thought in general and a discussion of the particular ethnological factors involved in each case, the author proceeds to consider, one after the other, the various facets of the two cultures. At every turn apt illustrations and parallels are forthcoming, such as no one could have produced unless he was possessed of a great fund of knowledge covering the whole field. Everywhere the reader feels that he is learning from a man who has succeeded to a high degree in thinking and feeling himself into the atmosphere of primitive and relatively primitive forms of society. At the same time, his obviously intense interest in such ways of life is linked with a sobriety of judgement which prevents him finding the savage and primitive where it is not. That is particularly so in regard to Greek culture, in which he felt that the highflyers of his own, the anthropological, school had made excessive claims for the presence of savage elements.

In the preface to *Primitive Culture in Greece* he speaks of 'the few details of my own excogitating', and in that to *Primitive Culture in Italy* he says that he has 'ventured here and there to introduce, at doubtful points, views of my own'. The half-dozen points in *Primitive Culture in Italy* on which he refers to articles of his own in periodicals include one in which he put forward a wholly new view about the nature of the *genius*, and it is worth noting that it was in this book that the virtual equation of *numen* with *mana* was first explicitly made in print (a thesis which he modified twenty-five years later). Some have found these two books useful as an introduction to the study of primitive culture in general. In course of time they both went out of print, and it seems rather strange that second editions were never called for.

Rose might owe his interest in anthropology, comparative religion, and the religion of ancient Italy to Farnell, Marett, and Warde Fowler, but he was *von Haus aus* a lover of stories and story-telling, a born court shenachie, had his lot been cast in the Middle Ages.

His next book, a large octavo of 364 pages entitled *A Handbook of Greek Mythology, including its Extension to Rome* (1928), sprang from this love. Of all his works it was the one which it gave him the most pleasure to write. It was also the most successful. An authoritative manual of the kind was much wanted, and the *Handbook* was found to meet the want admirably. By 1958 it had reached a sixth edition, while a German translation which was published in 1955 went into a second edition in 1961. As explained in the preface, it was designed for three classes of readers: (1) students of ancient and modern literature desirous of acquaintance with those stories of gods and heroes generally known and more or less believed by the classical Greeks; (2) readers who wish also to know about late, obscure, or local tales; (3) readers who wish to pursue the study of the subject farther. Matter intended for the first class (i.e. for all readers) is printed in large type and that for the second in smaller type, while the third class is catered for in notes giving references to the ancient sources and modern elucubrations—an excellent arrangement, except that the notes are inconveniently buried between the chapters (this publisher's blunder was not repeated in the German translation nor in the author's later manuals). Full indexes make it easy to use the book as a work of reference. In the preface Rose says that his manual 'claims no originality, being frankly a compilation from such standard works as Roscher's *Lexikon*, Preller-Robert, and others named in the Bibliography'. But judgement is constantly needed, especially in the discrimination of early and late items in our mostly late sources, and it is invariably his own, not any one else's, judgement that he relies on. And anyone who was personally acquainted with him knows that he carried an enormous amount of the subject-matter in his head.

A sort of pendant to the *Handbook* is formed by a small publication, *Modern Methods in Classical Mythology* (1930), originally delivered as three lectures at King's College in London University. It is notable for a bold but well-argued account of the myth of Oedipus as a development out of historical fact and an exposition of the writer's researches into the *Fabulae* of Hyginus, which he was later to edit.

A good many of the readers for whom the *Handbook* was intended, especially perhaps students studying it for examination purposes, found it too large and elaborate. In response to this feeling Rose wrote a much shorter book, devoid of all references and notes, on the same subject in 1957, entitled *Gods*

and *Heroes of the Greeks*. This is an abridgement of the larger textbook, but in every sense of the term freshly written. Most university students will probably find that it provides them with all the general mythological equipment they want in their courses. Though hardly what is ordinarily understood by a child's book, it is dedicated 'to all the children who like me to tell them stories'—a goodly band, if we include with them all who as children at any time have listened with wonder and enjoyment to the big man *πολλὰ μυθολογοῦντι*.

From primitive culture and mythology Rose turned to the history of literature and in 1934 brought out *A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the Age of Lucian* (large 8vo, pp. 454). The *raison d'être* of this book is thus stated in the preface: 'My explanation [for adding to existing manuals on the subject] is, that I do not find any book in English and at present in print which covers the whole field, is of moderate length yet not so short as to include the principal authors only, and takes account of the latest results of investigation.' The typographical arrangement is similar to that of the previous *Handbook*, except that the notes are put in their proper place at the foot of the page. Like its predecessor, this manual showed that it met a real need by reaching a fourth edition in 1950. It was followed in 1936 by a companion and very similar but considerably larger *Handbook of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine*, which proved equally successful, attaining a fourth edition in 1954. In the preface to the *Greek Literature* (and he would doubtless have repeated the remark in the companion volume if he had thought it worth while) he says: 'Brevity has also been sought by cutting down aesthetic criticism to the barest minimum.' Literary judgements there are in plenty, but they are mostly bald and summary and marked rather by robust good sense and sincerity than by delicate perception and subtle appreciation.¹

The merit of these two books, which has won them so much favour, lies chiefly in the abundance of factual information and the clarity with which it is set forth, together with the lucid and balanced discussion of problems and the guidance given for their further study. No doubt he owed much, especially in

¹ In this connexion it may be pertinent to quote a passage from the preface to the *Commentary on Aeschylus* (1957): 'Of aesthetic criticism the reader will find little or none. This is deliberate. Aesthetic criticism, unless it is very good indeed, is apt to be dull and to tell a reasonably intelligent student nothing which he cannot see for himself.'

regard to the last, to the massive *Handbücher* of Christ-Schmid-Stählin and Schanz-Hosius (which themselves of course contain much tralatitious scholarly material), but he had an uncommonly wide first-hand acquaintance with both literatures (including the Greek scholia, Servius, &c.) and was as widely read as most in what (to use a phrase of Burnet's) 'is facetiously called the literature of the subject'. And everywhere he shows complete independence in his opinions and conclusions. Two years was perhaps too little time to devote to the writing of the Latin volume, the first edition of which contained a large number of errors, but these were for the most part petty inaccuracies, easy to eliminate in later issues.

Out of the lectures given in the English Department after his retirement grew his last book, a 300-page small octavo with the title *Outlines of Classical Literature for Students of English* (1959). Its objects are clearly stated in the preface: 'What I have attempted is to give a brief account of such ancient writers as have demonstrably influenced the moderns by providing them with technique, subject-matter, or both, omitting the many, often important in themselves, who have exercised no such influence. Following on this account I have something to say of the form this influence has taken, the more outstanding who have imitated the ancients in question, and the trends or schools which have resulted.' The first of these aims is admirably realized. The choice of authors dealt with is sound, and the distribution of space between them judicious, while the two ancient literatures are wisely not dealt with separately but fused in one continuous account, the writers being taken, broadly speaking, in chronological order without regard to whether they wrote in Greek or Latin. In general, great care is taken to assume only the most elementary knowledge of Greek and Roman history and geography in the reader. The attainment of the second aim presented greater difficulties, even though modern continental literatures are deliberately ignored, except for purposes of occasional illustration. Many will probably feel that the treatment should have been fuller. Rose had an extensive knowledge of English literature of all periods and could no doubt have expounded the classical influences upon it at greater length without very much trouble, but he may well have felt that any considerable increase in the bulk of the book would tend to reduce the number of the readers and thereby its usefulness.¹

¹ Even so, and in spite of what he says about the impossibility of discussing the all-pervasive philosophical influence of Plato, a few lines ought surely to

In any case, what he has written is reliable, interesting, and suggestive, and should stimulate the keen and able student to read further on the subject, if he has time.

A few years before this he had produced a pair of small books on Greek and Roman religion as a whole, *Ancient Greek Religion* (1948) and *Ancient Roman Religion* (1949). These form part of a series (Hutchinson's University Library), and the writer was rather cramped for space. But, as elsewhere, he showed himself skilled in writing to scale, and the main features of both religions and the developments they underwent are brought out very clearly. Readers of the Roman volume who do not share the author's gusto for the details of superstitious ritual might be willing to forgo some of the rites described to make room for a fuller treatment of some of the later developments. But it is doubtless only at the cost of some boredom that such readers can be made to realize adequately certain important elements in the Roman character.

The three *Handbooks* were the work of a single decade (1926–36), but, as if they were not a sufficient ten years' output for one man, Rose brought out in the same period the first of his three books intended only for readers acquainted with Greek and Latin. This was an edition of Hyginus Mythographus: *Hygini Fabulae recensuit, prolegomenis commentario appendice instruxit H. I. Rose* (Leiden, Sijthoff).¹ An edition of the *Fabulae* had long been a desideratum. The latest two text-editions, those of Bunte (1856) and M. Schmidt (1872), were highly unsatisfactory, while the latest commentary, that of van Staveren (1742), though good for its time, long antedated the birth of mythological science. In undertaking to edit the *Fabulae* Rose was under no illusions as to the author's intellectual stature: in the *Handbook of Latin Literature* he describes him as a 'miserable sciolist', with an 'extremely imperfect knowledge of Greek' and afflicted with 'incredible stupidity'. But although capable of writing a chapter on *Melanippen Desmontis filiam*, i.e. Μελανίππην (τὴν) δεσμῶτιν, in which Desmontes puts out his daughter's eyes, Hyginus gives myths and variants of myths unknown elsewhere which are of have been spared for the imposing Janus-like figure of Boethius (to say nothing of the interaeval *Pervigilium Veneris*), and it seems strange, especially on the part of one who had himself become one of the 'Eminent Men of Fife', not to have mentioned the great Dunfermline fabulist, when room is found for a reference to the much slighter *Fables* of John Gay.

¹ By a strange oversight this landmark in the study of Hyginus bears no date. It was either 1933 or 1934 (Rose gives both these dates in different places elsewhere).

great interest to modern mythologists, whenever it can be shown or made probable that they belong to genuine mythological tradition, i.e. go back to classical times. In one respect the *Fabulae* is an easy text to edit. Codicological problems there are none: only eight fragments of a single manuscript are extant, and the indirect tradition is of the most exiguous, so that the text has essentially to be based on Micyllus's *editio princeps* of 1535. Collation of manuscripts and codicological investigations never seemed to hold any attraction for Rose, and he was probably glad to be spared that kind of labour. But the *Fabulae* has an uncommonly complicated literary history, on which much research had been done and a fair measure of agreement reached in the preceding sixty years or so. The outlines of this history, as set out by Rose, are as follows: Hyginus's manual, compiled by him in the age of the Antonines, was excerpted two or three hundred years later by two or more epitomators who, besides 'interpolating' the extracted matter, added to it, especially from Servius, and then later these sets of excerpts were clumsily fused by a numskull of an editorial conglutinator; what we have is this conglutinate as transmitted by fallible copyists through a single ninth-century manuscript to an inaccurate sixteenth-century *editor princeps*. The modern editor's task is not to restore the manual as it left its author's hands, but as it left the conglutinator's, a task made none the easier by the circumstance that Hyginus wrote in 'a pitiable jargon wherein vulgarisms mix with would-be archaic words and phrases', but so adequately discharged by Rose that his text is likely to hold the field for an indefinite period.

The constitution of the text was, however, only of secondary importance to the editor, and his edition is above all valuable for the commentary, written in a Latin affording agreeable relief from that of the text. To the writing of this he brought his unsurpassed knowledge of the Greek myths and their manifold sources, and if in it, as one of his most careful reviewers, L. Castiglioni, put it, 'non ha dato tutto quello che forse si doveva dare ed egli certamente poteva, ha, con questa edizione sua d'Igino, reso alla scienza un altro utile e nobile servizio'.

The eight lectures which he delivered as Sather Professor in the University of California in 1939 before audiences assumed capable of reading Latin appeared as a book in 1942 with the title *The Eclogues of Vergil*, in which they are accompanied by extensive notes for the benefit of scholars. The topics dealt with include the meaning of Horace's *molle atque facetum*, Virgil's early

home or homes, the scenery of the *Eclogues*, what we can ascertain about the poet's friendships, the extent to which the poems are allegorical, the unity of the 6th *Eclogue*, and, of course, the Wonder Child of the *Pollio*. These subjects are discussed with much learning, no little vivacity, and occasional asperity. He has some interesting original suggestions to make and is generally circumspect in his conclusions. One of the liveliest of the lectures is that on *molle atque facetum*, in the discussion of which he displays more capacity for literary criticism than some reviewers of his handbooks on literature had credited him with.

The last of his major works was *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus* (2 vols., 1957-8), published in the *Verhandelingen* of the Royal Netherlands Academy. The last complete commentary on Aeschylus in English was that of Paley (4th ed., 1879) and the last abroad that of Wecklein and Zomarides in Romaic (1891-1910), so that the time was fully ripe for another. The new commentator brought to the interpretation and illustration of the most deeply religious poet of antiquity a greater knowledge of ancient religion than any of his many precursors, and it is on this side that the special value of his commentary lies. But he had also a lively dramatic sense, and throughout he visualizes well and, like a true successor in office of Lewis Campbell, never lets the text occult the stage, while acute observations of all kinds are scattered up and down its pages. The work has its shortcomings, however. The selection of matters for annotation sometimes seems capricious, and not a few difficulties are either ignored completely or resolved in peremptory terms without argument. In the field of grammar and language, too, the commentator's footing is apt to be less firm than where points of religious belief or practice are concerned. For all that, this is a commentary to be reckoned with, and it is a matter for regret that it had to be published in a form which virtually excludes it from the personal possessions of university students. For a variety of reasons it would have been better if the notes on each play could have been published separately.

Already before the publication of his first book in 1924, Rose had begun to acquire a reputation at home and abroad by his contributions to learned periodicals, and it was consolidated and steadily enhanced by the articles and reviews which he continued to write down to the last. No account of these can be attempted here, but the hope may perhaps be expressed that one or more of his old students will undertake the laborious but

eminently worthwhile task of compiling a complete bibliography of his writings.

Besides his many original works, Rose translated a number of books from various modern languages; amongst others, *The Origin and Growth of Religion* from the German of W. Schmidt (1931), *Greek Piety* from the Swedish of M. P. Nilsson (1948), *The Ancient Chronology of Western Asia and Egypt* from the Dutch of P. van der Meer (1955), and *The All-knowing God* from the Italian of R. Pettazzoni (1956). In the preface to the last the author writes: 'My friend Professor H. J. Rose, besides being a translator past compare, has been a valuable collaborator and my undying gratitude goes out to him.' The writers of the other books had equally good reason to congratulate themselves on having found so able a translator.

A superb memory and vast knowledge were the outstanding elements of Rose's intellect. But the weight of his learning did not retard his mental movements. On the contrary, he was extremely agile of mind; the hosts of facts were kept in a state of permanent mobilization, and ordinarily the particular item or items required on any occasion could be brought into play on the instant. His intellectual measure cannot be taken from his books alone. Many, perhaps most, of his original contributions to classical learning are to be sought in his numerous articles in journals, and it would be a service to scholarship, if a selection of these could be made by some expert in his own field and published in book form, along with the already suggested bibliography of his writings. For many years before his death he was recognized everywhere as one of the leading authorities on ancient religion, and many honours came his way. He was made a Corresponding Fellow of the Royal Lombard Institute of Sciences and Letters (1932); Fellow of the British Academy (1934); Visiting Professor at Harvard University (1935); Sather Professor in the University of California (1939); Honorary Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford (1944); Foreign Member of the Royal Society of Letters of Lund (1945); Andrew Lang Lecturer in the University of St. Andrews (1950-1); LL.D., St. Andrews (1954); Eitrem Lecturer at the University of Oslo (1955); and at various times he held the Presidencies of the Folklore Society and the Scottish Anthropological Society. He belonged to what may be called the right wing of the anthropological school of students of ancient religion, whose general views he expounded and applied over the whole field, making, in particular, great use of the concept of *mana*

and handling it with virtuosity. He was primarily interested in the more primitive forms of belief and cult, but hardly less so in the religious thought of Aeschylus and Pindar; to the religion of Plato and the mysticism of Plotinus he devoted much less attention. His reaction to psycho-analysis was negative and to the end he could not find that its discoveries threw any light whatever on the making or shaping of myths.

He was a sworn foe of democracy in every form, but his belief in autocratic government in state and university was happily tempered by firm adherence to the principle that regulations exist to be broken and by defiance of petty conventions (he is said to have been the first undergraduate at Oxford to wear a soft hat on Sundays). But although he was no committeeman, he was regular in his attendance at meetings of the Senate and the Faculty of Arts, where, if his contributions to debate were sometimes more interesting than strictly relevant, his facility in finding formulae and improving phraseology was often useful.

Rose stood six-foot-two and was of massive build. In growing up he had developed weaknesses in his feet and ankles which unfitted him for marching and made him prefer bicycling to walking even short distances. Home Guard exercises were a sore trial to him, and he heartily endorsed the proposition that, if we had been meant to get to the top of hills, they would have been made flat (therein contrasting strongly with his colleague, Lindsay, who climbed Brae Riach thrice in one week in his 79th year).

He had, moreover, very little sense of locality. But if he may be said to have been at sea on land, he was very much in his element in the sea. In the summer months he regularly bathed in the Bay up till the age of 76; in earlier years he often swam the three-quarters of a mile between the pier-head and the Step Rock.¹ His chief domestic recreation was chess, in which he showed first-class amateur strength as an Oxford undergraduate. His great occasion was a match by cable between Oxford and Cambridge and the American Universities in 1907, in which he played on top board against the future world champion, Capablanca. Speaking of that period in his autobiography, the Cuban states that he was 'mowing down the strongest players in the Manhattan Chess Club' and claims that his 'superiority was becoming manifest'. After 31 moves, however, Rose held

¹ At Oxford he took up rowing and rowed in the Balliol second boat in Torpids.

his opponent in the hollow of his hand, but he was getting fatigued and failed to see the simple move required to ensure victory, and Capablanca was able to elude defeat and make a draw of it. After his Oxford days Rose seems to have restricted his playing to games with friends, but he devoted time to problem-solving and scored frequent successes in newspaper competitions. He had a good ear and greatly enjoyed listening to classical music (always excepting Brahms, whose compositions he despised as heartily as he despised the poetry of Wordsworth).

Rose's was a strongly marked personality, some traits of which were thrown into relief by a healthy, if at times exaggerated, disregard of convention. Genial and hearty, bluff, when he saw fit, to the point of brusqueness, he had much kindness and no malice in his make-up. He was fond of children and readily won their trust. With colleagues he was ever generous of his time and his rich stores of learning, though his superior knowledge and nimbleness of mind were apt to render discussion difficult. Robust self-confidence stood him in good stead throughout his long life; during his protracted last illness visitors found him ever patient, cheerful, brave.

W. L. LORIMER