



CHARLES BRINK

## Charles Oscar Brink 1907–1994

CHARLES OSCAR BRINK was born Karl Oskar Levy on 13 March 1907 in Charlottenburg, a town later to be incorporated within the city of Berlin. He changed his surname on 31 August 1931 and his first names in March 1948, having been known already for some time to English friends as ‘Charles’. He died in Cambridge on 2 March 1994.

Between 1963 and 1982 Brink published three large volumes on those poems by Horace which concerned poetry itself. These gained for him an authority in every active centre of Latin studies. He was engaged on an edition of Tacitus’ *Dialogus de oratoribus* and held the office of President of the International Commission in charge of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*ThLL*) when he died. He wanted to be remembered above all as a Latin scholar. It should, however, also be recalled that by middle age he had won some eminence as a historian of post-Aristotelian Greek philosophy and that many credited him with having helped to move British study of ancient philosophy away from an exclusive concern with Plato and Aristotle.

Scholarship cannot claim Brink’s whole person. He played a large role in the struggles which took place over the classical curriculum in English schools and universities during the 1960s and 1970s. He was for many years an influential member of the council of an ancient Cambridge college and could fairly be regarded as one of the founding fathers of a new one. When an account comes to be written of the contribution made from 1933 onwards to Anglo-Saxon science, scholarship and cultural life

by men and women educated in Imperial or Weimar Germany, he will be seen as a figure of some significance.

Brink's courteous bearing struck everyone from those who taught him at school to those who only came across him for the first time when he was an old man. Beneath it lay not only a genuine respect for social convention but also a quite uncomplicated joy in the company of other human beings. In conversation he always steered the subject towards the interests of the other party. He did not like to talk about himself. A powerful ambition, directed at least as much by the causes he believed in and by the interests of friends he respected as by any kind of egotism, did not escape notice. In the political disputes of academe he never adverted noisily to his own aims but was wont to press hard particular points he thought might find favour with others. Strongly conservative though he was in personal behaviour, religious practice, and political opinion, he kept his eyes firmly on the present and his thoughts on the future. Straightforward intellectual disagreement drew him towards rather than away from the person of an opponent. His persistence knew no bounds. He had more close friends among his elders and juniors than among his contemporaries, but it cannot be denied he also had enemies. Not surprisingly, stories abound which are either unverifiable or demonstrably untrue. These tell more on the whole about their purveyors than about Brink himself, and they have been ignored in this memoir.

## Berlin

Brink's father, Arthur Levy II, and mother, Elise Misch, were the children of prosperous Jewish businessmen born in Berlin. Two years after Brink's birth, Arthur Levy moved from Charlottenburg to Berlin and registered as a lawyer (*Rechtsanwalt*) at the lower court (*Amtsgericht*) of the working-class district of Wedding. In November 1918 he was serving in the counter-intelligence section of the General Staff. At meetings in the barracks during the revolution he spoke strongly against the Spartacists. After he returned to civil life his career prospered. He was appointed a notary in September 1922. He enjoyed the respect of senior judges and regarded himself as a loyal citizen of Germany. He could never understand why in May 1933 he should have been stripped of his notaryship or in October 1938 forbidden all practice of law. Elise Misch is said to have been a woman of great intelligence, wide cultural

interests, and open emotions. The two sons to the marriage were registered as being of the 'Mosaic' religion. The household maintained, however, few, if any, peculiarly Jewish customs. The musical, artistic, and literary culture of the Christian bourgeoisie enjoyed, on the other hand, more respect than it did in many an Evangelical or Catholic household. The young Brink (henceforth B.) played the piano from an early age.

The Lessing Gymnasium in Wedding, which B. entered in 1916, was a school of the type his father attended. It taught a large amount of Latin, Greek, and mathematics, far more indeed than it did German, history, geography, religion, French, and natural science put together. Parents who wanted for their children a career in the higher administration of the State, in the Church, in law, in medicine, or in the universities chose such a school rather than a *Realgymnasium* or an *Oberrealschule*.

B. did well in all his studies. A medical certificate had him excused from physical training. Those who taught him Latin and Greek were less enthusiastic in their praise than those who taught him German, history, and geography. He made a 'good' contribution to an *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* on German literature and a 'very good' one to another such group on philosophy. In what ways the approach to the German poets differed from that to the Greeks and the Romans it would be interesting to know. A Rabbi Dr Alexander rated B.'s knowledge of religion as 'good'. B. directed the school orchestra in a way which excited general admiration.

B.'s schooling ended in the summer of 1925. A coalition government under the chancellorship of Hans Luther, a man who had moved from administration into politics without joining a party, had been in office since 16 January. Paul von Hindenburg, a military man not identified with any party, had been elected President of the Republic on 26 April. The publication of the first volume of Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* on 19 July had passed almost without notice. B. remained for a time undecided about a future career. He began to take instruction in musical composition, with thoughts of becoming an orchestral conductor—no totally fanciful ambition in the Berlin of the 1920s. In November he entered the Friedrich Wilhelm University with the intention of devoting himself in the main to philosophy. During the winter semester he attended the lectures of Werner Jaeger (1888–1961) 'on the foundations [*Grundlagen*] of humanism'. Jaeger's charismatic manner had a strong effect on him, as it had on other young men of an anxious and

disturbed era. B. was to shake off much of Jaeger's influence, but he could still recall with admiration in 1961 'an ability to make an intellectual position a personal one between teacher and learner . . . to communicate himself, at a high intellectual level, when he taught'. He also went in that semester to lectures given by Paul Maas (1880–1964) on the metres of Greek poetry. In the summer semester of 1926 he listened to Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931) on the history of the Greek language and to Eduard Norden (1868–1941) on the history of Latin literature. By the end of the academic year he was determined to become himself a professor of classical philology. He attached himself firmly to Jaeger, a scholar at the height of his powers and reputation in the late 1920s, and a personage of weight and resonance in high places.

A scholarship enabled B. to spend the summer semester of 1928 in Oxford. W. D. Ross (1877–1971), fellow of Oriel College and deputy White's professor of moral philosophy, who had been for some time on friendly terms with Jaeger, looked after the visit. B. found the atmosphere of the ancient English university more congenial than Berlin's and treasured the memory of the personal tutorials he received and the lectures he heard: on Kant from Ross, on Cicero from A. C. Clark (1859–1937), and on Roman history from H. M. Last (1894–1957). It was in Oxford that he came across for the first time both the poetry and the philological writing of A. E. Housman (1859–1936).

B. completed with the winter semester of 1928–9 the attendance at classes formally required of him by the Berlin philosophy faculty. In the Latin *vita* which accompanied the dissertation he submitted in September 1931 he listed as his teachers Jaeger, Maas, Ferdinand Noack (1868–1931), Norden, Wolfgang Schadewaldt (1900–74), Wilhelm Schulze (1863–1935), Eduard Spranger (1882–1969), Wilamowitz, and Ulrich Wilcken (1862–1944). The German *Lebenslauf* which he attached in May or June of 1933 to a number of copies of the printed version of the dissertation omits Maas from the list, and adds Franz Beckmann (1895–1966) and Richard Harder (1896–1957). One of the few things in his early life B. liked to talk about was his presence at the final meeting of Wilamowitz's seminar in the summer of 1929, but he hesitated to call himself one of the great man's pupils. He and Maas were to be fellow employees of the Clarendon Press between 1939 and 1941.

B.'s personal charm and social grace brought him many friends among the children of well-to-do Christian families studying at the

Friedrich Wilhelm University. He took a keen interest in political debate and often expressed himself critically about the economic policies of the coalitions which tried to govern Germany up to 30 May 1932. If he voted, it would, I think, have been for the Deutsche Nationale Volkspartei (DNVP) at federal and state elections, and for Hindenburg at the presidential elections of April 1932. The national question obsessed him. He came to think that a religion as well as a language, habits, and a culture defined an inhabitant of Germany as truly German, in other words as a member of the nation. Early in 1931 he joined the Evangelical Church of the Old-Prussian Union, an act which caused no breach with his family. On 31 August he gained permission to assume the surname 'Brink', an obsolete German name semantically associated with the land (*Brink*, a hilly piece of grassland), but phonetically similar to 'Ring', the original family name of both his grandmothers. Writing to a friend on 27 February 1933 Jaeger declared:

Dr. Brink [Jaeger anticipated the formal conferment of the degree] . . . ist ein gebildeter, geistig feiner Mensch, nicht urkräftig, aber gewandt und elastisch, und intellektuell und künstlerisch hat er Niveau . . . Ich verschweige nicht, daß er Jude von Herkunft ist. Man merkt es ihm kaum an, wenn man es nicht weiß, zumal er bewußt sich davon loszulösen und in der deutschen Kultur und Nation aufzugehen strebt. Politisch denkt er ziemlich 'rechts'.

It would be easy to see worldly ambition as the motor of B.'s adhesion to Christianity. The teaching of Greek and Latin in Germany, as in other European lands, was part of a system of education which derived its authority from the churches which operated it. Secularisation did not destroy, indeed it helped to feed, the notion that a teacher of the German youth should be in some sense a Christian. Even in comparatively liberal Berlin the professoriate was reluctant to admit a Jew to its ranks unless he had been at least formally baptised. Nothing, however, in B. suggests the opportunist. He thought long and hard about the intellectual implications of his decision. He customarily emphasised that it was the Lutheran wing of the Prussian church—conservative in regard to theology, forms of cult, organisation, and relations with the state and the nation—to which he adhered. A suspicion of Calvinism and its spiritual descendants manifested itself in some 1932 remarks about the writings of Alfred de Quervains (1896–1968) on theology and politics (see bibliography, no. 2, \*7) and remained with him all his life. Again, although he was to move ten years later from the Prussian to the Anglican church, the basic character of his churchmanship did not change, and no one who knew him in later life could doubt the depth

of his religiousness. The character of his view of religion should not be overlooked in any consideration of his view of classics. He came to reject the romantic paganising of the subject's principal exponents and harked back to a time when Christianity and classical culture seemed to move in tandem.

In the summer of 1929, B. began to give Jaeger assistance with the editing of *Die Antike*, a journal which the latter had founded in 1925 for the purpose of providing men and women of the middle and upper classes with scientific knowledge of antiquity relevant to their intellectual lives, whether they had attended a humanistic gymnasium or had had some other kind of secondary schooling. Such was the confidence Jaeger came to repose in B. that he entrusted him with writing a bibliographical supplement (see bibliography, nos. 1 and 2). The second instalment appears to have been drafted, or at least to have received its finishing touches, after Franz von Papen (1879–1969) replaced Heinrich Brüning (1885–1970) as Federal Chancellor. At several points it went beyond the recording brief B. had been given. Scarcely concealed was a fear of the revolutionary movements on the extreme Right and the extreme Left, and a relief at the advent of a government which looked capable of containing them. B. declared that not just Germany but the whole of Europe faced a spiritual crisis fed by moral, intellectual, and artistic relativism, by tension between classes and groups unable to accept common norms, and by lack of respect for pastors, teachers and statesmen; that Germany's crisis was peculiar only because of the peculiarity of the relationship between German nation and state, in as much as the German working class had not effectively become part of the state until the revolution of 1918; and that the German nation lacked an intellectual and political stratum capable of giving general leadership and of steering the vigour of the masses onto sensible paths.

B.'s dissertation had started out as a paper delivered in Jaeger's seminar about the authorship of the *Magna Moralia*. It assumed that Jaeger and Richard Walzer (1900–75) had refuted the view of Hans von Arnim that what we have is an early work of Aristotle's heavily interpolated by an editor, and sought to show first how the verbal, phasal, and argumentative style of the treatise depended on and yet differed from that of Aristotle's genuine *πραγματεῖαι*, and second how its form related to that of the *Ethica Eudemia* and that of the *Ethica Nicomachea*. He hoped the results of his research might throw light on other works of the early Hellenistic period. Writing the dissertation took him about two years. Never one to shirk the tedium of prolonged labour

if it seemed necessary, he supplemented the information provided by Hermann Bonitz's *Index Aristotelicus* with three perusals of his own of the entire corpus of Aristotle's alleged writings.

The examiners of the dissertation, Jaeger himself and Ludwig Deubner (1877–1946), graded it as an *opus valde laudabile*, i.e. below an *opus eximium* and above an *opus idoneum*. Deubner, in whose youth the schools still made their students write essays in Latin and the universities still required doctoral dissertations to be written entirely in that language, thought the quality of the obligatory Latin chapter quite mediocre considering the talent the author had displayed in the dissertation as a whole. On 21 April 1932 the philosophy faculty consented to the holding of an oral examination. For some reason the dissertation could not appear in *Neue Philologische Untersuchungen*, but a heavily abbreviated and economically printed form came in May 1933 from a small firm in Ohlau, Silesia (see bibliography, no. 3). By this time Arnim was dead. B.'s idea that the author of the *Magna Moralia* modelled its structure on that of the *Ethica Nicomachea*, inserting elements of the *Ethica Eudemia* in no very well thought-out way, has frequently been rejected. On the other hand his analyses of the style of Aristotle's *πραγματεῖα* and that of the treatise in question remain definitive.

The result of his oral examination of 9 June 1932 must have disappointed B. Norden rated his performance in Latin as 'sehr gut' but Jaeger that in Greek as only 'recht gut'. With Spranger in philosophy and with Wilcken in ancient history the rating came down to 'befriedigend'. B. consequently graduated *cum laude*, i.e. better than *rite*, not as well as *summa cum laude* or *magna cum laude*. He did not abandon his ambition. The centre of his interests had never been in classical or archaic Greece; it had perhaps already moved from Greece itself to Rome, and from philosophy to literature. The *Deutsche Forschungsnotgemeinschaft* gave him a scholarship to pursue a general study of Tacitus' account of the Roman emperors in the *Annals* and the *Histories*, and in particular to compare this account with those extant in Greek and bring out its specifically Roman elements. Towards the end of the winter semester of 1932–3, B. decided to transfer his residence to Bavarian Munich. He was attracted by the fame of the *ThLL* and the presence in the Ludwig Maximilian University of Johannes Stroux (1886–1954), one of the few classical philologists of his generation with an orientation towards Latin and long a friend of Jaeger's. Norden was ageing and visibly tiring.

## Munich

The appointment of the leader of the revolutionary Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter-Partei (NSDAP) Adolf Hitler as Federal Chancellor on 30 January 1933 did not alarm any of B.'s teachers. Some even welcomed it. They thought that the Army, the bureaucracy, and the men of the DNVP and the Deutsche Volkspartei (DVP) would tame the wild demagogue, and he in turn his followers. B. seems to have taken the same view. The implications of the 'Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums' promulgated on 7 April were not as clear then as they are now. Nor were those of the threats uttered against Jews practising medicine and law privately. B. did not consider himself Jewish in any rational sense of the term and believed that men in government were rational beings amenable to rational suasion. He expected the anti-Semitic storm to pass.

Arthur Levy lost his notaryship at the end of May, despite vigorous support from Christian friends and colleagues, but was allowed to continue practising law. His other son remained a student of English philology at the Friedrich Wilhelm University. Jaeger and Norden had the previous month secured for B. a post as an assistant editor at the *ThLL*. This freed him from financial dependence on his father.

The period 1933–9 was an extremely productive one for the *ThLL*, twenty-four fascicles appearing as against the six of the previous seven years. A large grant made at the beginning of 1933 by the Rockefeller Foundation of New York and guaranteed for five years paid the salaries of seven extra assistant editors and enabled the executive committee to avoid questions about the racial origins of appointees. B. worked on articles in H under Georg Dittmann (1871–1956) and Heinz Haffter (b. 1905), in I under Johann Baptist Hofmann (1886–1954), in M under Hans Rubenbauer (1885–1963). He was put in charge of the institute's library on 1 June 1934, being already regarded as a lexicographer of unusual ability. At some point late in 1936 he was entrusted with the important group *homo*, *humanus*, *humanitas*. Clearly those in authority then thought his services could be retained indefinitely. As things turned out, Wilhelm Ehlers (1908–88) had to write up *humanus* and *humanitas*. Looking back on his life, B. frequently said he had learned more about philological research as an assistant editor at the *ThLL* than as a doctoral candidate in Berlin.

Those members of the NSDAP who moved in academic circles in Munich behaved affably towards Jewish colleagues. B. did not seek out

their company, and he showed no curiosity about the regime's paramilitary parades. He talked freely to uncommitted colleagues, some of whom were surprised that a man of such elegant taste should seem to admire Hitler's ability to stir a crowd with his oratory. He kept a watchful eye on his family in Berlin and did what he could to aid his brother's plans to seek a career outside Germany after graduation. He was observed to be devoting an unusual amount of effort towards improving his English. He did not abandon the hope of eventually being able to take up a normal career in classical philology in Germany. Less ambitious fellow assistant editors smiled at his efforts to set up a group to read together Apollonius' Ἀργοναυτικά and his cultivation of professors at the university. In his free time in 1935 and 1936 he drafted for the *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* a number of articles including an account of the Athenian philosophical school founded by Aristotle (see bibliography, no. 5). This essay, still even today fundamental on the history of modern study of the school, was sent to the press, like others by 'non-Aryan' scholars, by the defiant Wilhelm Kroll (1869–1939). The editors of *Philologus* suppressed a contribution to the fourth series of the 'Beiträge aus der Thesaurusarbeit'.

At some point early in 1937 B. was informed that the *ThLL* could not continue his employment past the end of the year. Bernhard Rehm (1909–42), editor-in-chief since September of the previous year, nevertheless put on paper on 29 April, with the agreement of his predecessor Dittmann and all the senior editors, a statement about B.'s 'gründliche Kenntnis der Sprache, Fähigkeit zu einführender Interpretation, klare Erfassung der gegebenen Probleme, und größte Sorgfalt und Zuverlässigkeit'.

B. set about looking for posts in Switzerland, the USA, and Britain. Manu Leumann (1889–1977), once an assistant editor at the *ThLL* and since 1927 a *Fahnenleser*, could do nothing for him in Zürich, nor could Werner Jaeger, now a professor of classics in Chicago. W. D. Ross, now Provost of Oriel College, a Delegate of the Clarendon Press, and President of the British Academy, was aware of B.'s plight by 20 September. He told the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning (SPSL), from whom B. had also sought assistance, that he thought he could pay B. for contributions to the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*), which he was helping to edit on behalf of the Clarendon Press, but not enough to allow him to live in Britain. The SPSL, by now regarded with great suspicion by the German authorities,

did what it could to help and put money at Ross's disposal on 18 January 1938. At this point it came to Ross's attention that Kenneth Sisam (1887–1971), Assistant Secretary to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, wanted to make an additional appointment to the staff of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (*OLD*), then under the editorship of Alexander Souter (1873–1949) with J. M. Wyllie (1907–71) as his deputy.

Ross wrote to B. on 20 January 1938, inviting him to compose articles under his direction for the *OCD* and suggesting that a full-time post with the *OLD* might soon become available. Sisam himself wrote on 28 February inviting B. to come to Oxford 'to join in consultation about the preparation of the *OLD*'. B. left Germany somewhat unsure of what awaited him in Britain. He arrived on 31 March.

### Oxford

Ross and others looked after B.'s material welfare, while Walter Adams (1906–75), the General Secretary of the SPSL, conducted negotiations with the Home Office and the Ministry of Labour about permission for him to stay in the country indefinitely. Sisam was finally able to write to B. on 25 May 1938 asking him to report forthwith for work under Wyllie's supervision. B. remained in the employ of the Clarendon Press until October 1941.

Souter and Wyllie did not long conceal their hostility to the newcomer. Nor did B. his shock at the simple-minded ideas about lexicography informing the enterprise. However, exile did not prove a total misery; the musical life of Oxford could not compare with that of Munich or Berlin but was not negligible, and B. was soon able to acquire for himself an upright piano. There existed too in the city a disinterested enthusiasm for philological enquiry shared by a number of those teaching classics in the university and some very distinguished refugees from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. As early as 3 June, B. was proposed for membership of the Oxford Philological Society.

The pogrom of the night of 9–10 November made it clear that all sections of German Jewry were now in the direst physical danger. B.'s parents lived in the *Rosenthalerstraße*, i.e. in the heart of Berlin's Jewish quarter. Already in the summer of the previous year B. had helped to get his brother out of Germany to complete his degree in Basle. The intention of the regime to bar Jewish lawyers from practice must have been known before the official announcement

of 27 September. Switzerland had taken steps to block further Jewish immigration on 10 August, and temporary residents were left with no illusions about the possibility of being permitted to stay. Sometime between 3 June and 9 November, clearly with the idea of being able to accommodate his father, mother, and brother, B. moved to a larger residence in north Oxford, where he had first settled. After much effort he succeeded in getting his parents into Britain in April of 1939, his brother two months later. B. always liked to think that he himself came to Britain of his own volition. Ross and the SPSL concealed their charity. Until 1941 he seems to have expected his British sojourn to be a temporary one.

A rumour that B. had been invited to address the Philological Society on the subject of lexicography alarmed Souter and Wyllie. A formal letter came from Sisam on 10 November 1938 forbidding B. to discuss the *OLD* in public. When Souter retired under pressure from the editorship in June 1939, Cyril Bailey (1871–1957) was made senior co-editor with B. and E. A. Parker, a new appointee, directly under him, and Wyllie junior co-editor. Work on the dictionary officially stopped in October 1941. When Wyllie returned in 1945 as editor-in-charge he set the assistants he had been given to rewrite those articles which B. had drafted, eliminating everything *thesaurisch*. B. attended the party held to celebrate the issue of the final fascicle of the dictionary in 1982 and rarely betrayed his view of any aspect of the enterprise. What had upset him in 1938, apart from the arbitrariness of the chronological boundaries chosen and the failure to gather in an adequate amount of the relevant material, would have been the unwillingness of Souter and Wyllie to relate in any organic scheme the multifarious meanings they claimed to find in particular words.

B. already had a good command of English by 1938, but nevertheless continued an effort to perfect his pronunciation and to eliminate faults of grammar and idiom. He read with care English books and journals of every type, and studied closely the manners of the British people with whom he associated and made them his own. This did not always endear him to fellow immigrants highly critical of their new land or to Britons unsure of where they stood in a complex society.

In June 1940 the 26,000 enemy aliens 'about whom there might be some doubts' were rounded up. B. and his male relatives were held in the camp at Peel on the Isle of Man until 23 October. He gave lessons in Latin and Greek to fellow internees and assisted in the organisation of

other activities. After his release he served as a part-time member of the Oxford Auxiliary Fire Service.

At the end of the Trinity term of 1941 C. G. Hardie (b. 1906), fellow and tutor of Magdalen College, a frequent attender of meetings of the Philological Society, ceased teaching in order to enter government service and arranged that B. should take over his college duties after the long vacation. By 1943 there were few undergraduates in residence, and B. also became senior classics master at Magdalen College School, where he remained until 1948. The position at Magdalen brought him membership of the university's faculty board of *literae humaniores*. In 1942–3 he took over from E. A. Barber (1888–1965), soon to become Rector of Exeter College, a course on Tacitus' *Historiae*, one of the 'fully prepared books' of the Mods. syllabus, and repeated it every year until 1947–8.

Dons of the old Oxford type did not hesitate to farm out pupils to B., noting how resolutely he strove to overcome 'the handicaps of his German education' where both verse and prose composition were concerned. Auditors of his university lectures complained to each other about their 'dryness' but reported well to their tutors. He and R. S. Stanier (1907–80), the head of Magdalen College School, had a good opinion of each other. His relations with the younger boys were often turbulent, but those who passed through the upper forms remembered him with affection despite his proneness to talk over their heads on out-of-the-way subjects.

In April 1942, B. joined the Anglican church and married in Exeter College chapel Daphne Hope Harvey, whom he had first met in Oxford in the spring of 1940. Daphne was then a student of physiotherapy on leave from Guy's Hospital. Her father G. E. Harvey (1888–1962), who had been a member of the India Civil Service and was the author of a much-admired history of Burma, feared the possibility she might lose her British citizenship and for a time opposed the marriage. Daphne was as persistent as B. The marriage brought happiness to both, and they had three children: Adrian Charles (1944), Denis Hope (1946), and Stephen Arthur Godfrey (1950).

In 1941, while still at the *OLD*, B. began to review books for the *Classical Review*; in 1944 for the *Oxford Magazine*. Most were books on Greek philosophy. He handled quite coolly the second and third volumes of Jaeger's *Paideia: Die Formung des griechischen Menschen*, which appeared in English translation long before they did in the original German (see bibliography, nos. 10 and 12). The first volume

had caused much private controversy when it appeared in 1934, and B. is said to have often defended its approach vigorously. He now declared the methods of *Geistesgeschichte* subjective and the results vague. None of Jaeger's broad historical concepts seemed quite to fit the actual historical figures to whom they were applied.

An article in the 1943 *Classical Review* touched on the interpretation of Tacitus, *Hist.* 1. 79. 3 (57, 67–9). This caused B. to offer the journal the next year a collection of examples of a variety of the figure of speech known as syllepsis which he had made while preparing his course of lectures on the *Histories* (see bibliography, no. 8). Two years later the *Classical Quarterly* published B.'s first substantial essay in English. In this essay he put together nine testimonia to and eleven fragments of the works of Praxiphanes 'Peripateticus' and demolished Rostagni's theory that Callimachus' views on epic poetry corresponded with Aristotle's (see bibliography, no. 11).

### St Andrews

In 1948, T. E. Wright (1902–85), senior tutor at the Queen's College, accepted the chair of humanity at the University of St Andrews in his native Scotland. A Mods. don of the old Oxford style, he had been disappointed in his ambition of becoming Provost of Queen's. B. accompanied him to St Andrews as a 'lecturer in humanity'.

St Andrews was in many ways the most English of the Scottish universities. A large proportion of the teachers of its faculty of arts came from outside Scotland, while those who were Scots tended to have done at least part of their studies in England. It recruited its students from a wide area, from England as well as from Scotland. In organisation, however, it had a character very different from Oxford's.

B. assisted in the teaching of the three Latin classes. One contained all the first-year students of the faculty of arts, a captive but far from docile audience who stamped their feet if they disapproved of any feature of a lecture. Tacitus' *Annals* and *Histories* and Cicero's correspondence were the texts B. had to expound to the Honours class. Pupils recall a slight diffidence of manner. Wright found him an effective teacher, a discriminating examiner, and a businesslike administrator, and spoke with some awe of his 'knowledge of books and bibliography'.

There was in St Andrews an intellectual life of some vigour.

B. established relations with a number of younger colleagues which lasted long after his departure, in particular with A. C. Lloyd (1916–94), who had been the lecturer in logic since 1946 and was to become professor of philosophy at Liverpool in 1957, with P. A. Brunt (b. 1917), who had been the lecturer in ancient history since 1947 and was to become the Camden professor of ancient history at Oxford in 1970, and with I. G. Kidd (b. 1922), who returned to St Andrews to become a lecturer in Greek in 1949 and was to be awarded a personal chair in 1987. From his time in St Andrews came three important contributions to the study of Tacitus: a detailed review of a book on the way Lipsius handled the text of the *Annals* (see bibliography, no. 17), a substantial article challenging the widely accepted notion that the text of *Annals* I–VI offered by cod. Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. plut. 68. 1 required little correction from a modern editor (see bibliography, no. 20), and a shorter article affirming that *Visurgin* was a gloss at *Ann.* 1. 70. 5 and not the only one that had entered the text presented by the Medicean codex (see bibliography, no. 21). It was also in St Andrews that B. began to think of making an edition of Cicero's *De officiis*, *De amicitia*, *De senectute*, and fragmentary works like the *Hortensius*, and of writing a general book on the Roman statesman's philosophical output.

## Liverpool

In the course of the academic year 1950–1 the chair of Latin in the University of Liverpool became vacant. After Otto Skutsch (1906–90), a former colleague of B.'s at the *ThLL* who had left Germany in 1934, rejected the appointments committee's offer in favour of one from University College London, the committee turned to B.

Liverpool differed more from St Andrews than St Andrews had differed from Oxford. The faculty of arts had a very lowly standing in the university. Students came by and large from the local region, a region served by good grammar schools which sent their better products to Oxford or Cambridge. Many still took up Latin in the first year of an arts course, but for the most part only because of faculty or subject regulations and only so far as such regulations actually required. Few took up Greek. Rarely did anyone so distinguish himself as to be thought capable of continuing his studies elsewhere. The professoriate enjoyed an easy intercourse with the leaders of a still prosperous and self-confident commercial community.

Most of B.'s elder and contemporary colleagues had satisfied their academic ambitions or accepted their fate. The young were on the whole happy enough with what Liverpool had to offer. The choice of Cicero's *De officiis* as a text upon which to lecture to the senior Latin class was proof for at least one colleague that B. could not appreciate the nature of a Latin department of an English civic university. An observer from outside the classical area noted in him an energy for which Liverpool would never be able to provide a sufficient outlet.

Liverpool professors were expected to deliver an inaugural lecture to the university community soon after arrival. B. chose to treat not Tacitus or Cicero, Latin authors in regard to whom he could now claim a personal authority, but the classical poets, the centre in conventional thinking of Latin studies. In a lecture delivered on 11 February 1952 (see bibliography, no. 23), he affirmed the existence of an objective standard of excellence valid for all literatures and argued that a professor of Latin ought to concern himself not only with the Latin language and the culture from which Latin poetry sprang but also with the question of what made a particular 'great' Latin poem 'great'. Housman's notorious refusals of 1911 and 1933 to do in Cambridge what B. was now advocating in Liverpool he explained away as due to an unreconstructed romanticism arising from Housman's own practice of English verse and thus to a view of poetry which was too partial to apply to Manilius or Lucan or poets 'greater' than these. How he proposed to train students of Latin literature so that they might be able to judge what they read as literature he did not make clear. He touched gingerly on the composition of prose and verse, which in 1952 still dominated the British classical curriculum, suggesting that the practice did not suffice to prevent the student's judgement of any particular work from being dissociated from his sensibility.

The three years in Liverpool saw a winding down of B.'s concern with Tacitus. After penning a severe censure of an 849-page Italian volume on the historian (see bibliography, no. 24) he fell silent about him for more than thirty years. He continued on the other hand to occupy himself not only with the ethics of the Hellenistic philosophers, as his work on Cicero demanded, but also with other departments of their thinking. He and F. W. Walbank (b. 1909) found a common interest. In an article published in 1943 ('Polybius on the Roman Constitution', *Classical Quarterly*, 37, 79–113) the latter had divided the sixth book of Polybius' Ἱστορίαι into two layers, arguing that the bottom layer came from a first draft and the top one from a rethinking undertaken after the

sack of Corinth and the *coups d'état* attempted by the Gracchi. Around that time he had begun work on the commentary on the substance of the Ἱστορίαι which was to appear between 1957 and 1979. The analysis of the Roman constitution which Polybius offered in the sixth book clearly had a background in the theorising of the late third-century Greek schools, and B. was able to persuade Walbank that what had come down, while in certain respects incoherent, possessed a unity of plan, and that the notion of two chronologically distinct layers was otiose. A joint article by the two men appeared after B. had left Liverpool.

### Cambridge

In the course of B.'s second year in Liverpool it became clear that Eduard Fraenkel would have to vacate Oxford's Corpus Christi chair and that R. A. B. Mynors (1903–89), Cambridge's not very happy Kennedy professor, would then be able to return to his maternal university. Classical teaching operated on a much larger scale in Cambridge than in Liverpool or St Andrews. The faculty rivalled Oxford's in size. Students were numerous and serious. Many looked towards a career of teaching classics in a school or a university. The subject possessed a certain prestige despite the mathematical and scientific bent of the university.

Applications for the vacant chair were called for 22 September 1953. B. was among the four applicants. Others did not conceal their interest. The Board of Electors was divided between those advocating 'a real Latinist' and those looking for a man of 'variety and breadth of experience and openness of thinking'. A national newspaper reported: 'there is no suitable candidate available'. Unanimity was eventually reached on the election of B., who took up the post on 1 July 1954.

When chairs of Latin were established in England around the middle of the nineteenth century, no agreement existed as to what a professor's function ought to be. Housman told the University of Cambridge in 1911 very bluntly what he thought his duties were not. His two predecessors had said nothing of a general kind. Neither did his two successors. B. had no doubt about where an area of academic study definable as 'Latin' lay. In an inaugural lecture delivered on 1 February 1956 (see bibliography, no. 27) he marked out the area, surveyed what had been done since Munro's time, and stated what he thought needed to be done in the future. He called for more investigation of the

Renaissance codices of Cicero, Livy, Ovid, Juvenal, and others, for closer attendance to the lessons taught by Housman about textual criticism, for the making of large editions both textual and exegetical of both the major and the minor authors, for the collecting afresh of the fragments of authors admired in Antiquity but lost in the Dark Ages, for the cultivation of the history of Latin literature as a whole, with attention to Ovid, Cicero, Livy, and Seneca, as well as to Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, and Juvenal, and for the granting of more respect to methodological developments in the other humane disciplines. None of this was controversial, however little had been achieved in the Cambridge of the previous two decades. Pregnant with future trouble on the other hand was a repetition of the demand he had made four years previously in Liverpool for the study of Latin poetry as 'poetry'. B.'s remark that 'Housman developed a kind of specialisation whose effect on Latin studies was not perhaps wholly beneficial' caused dismay among potential allies and brought joy to many who would prove in the long term to be enemies.

In his later years B. occasionally expressed a regret that Trinity, the college of his philological heroes Bentley, Porson, and Housman, had not elected him a professorial fellow. Gonville and Caius elected him on 18 February 1955 and gave him rooms. He brought in an already substantial personal library and spent his working day there. He threw himself into the life of the college in a manner unusual for a professorial fellow. The ancient rituals of the high table and the character of the company gave him genuine pleasure.

Caius was a rich college which had husbanded its riches well and maintained old ways more tenaciously than many Cambridge houses. Nevertheless some of the older fellows who had experienced the world outside Cambridge between 1939 and 1945 and most of those who joined the fellowship after 1945 thought a number of changes desirable. Not all wanted the same sort or the same degree of change. Discontent manifested itself first in 1950 in a move to reduce the status of the tutors and to enhance that of the research fellows. The demand for greater respect for, and greater expenditure on, research found an articulate supporter in B. More strongly than anyone else he took the view that the most important thing for an undergraduate was to be exposed to minds at work on the frontiers of knowledge. He did not know every detail of the recent history of Caius, but he had thought long and hard about what a college ought to be. He was elected to the Council of the college in October 1956 and remained there except for three brief intervals until

1977. He was a member of the Investments Committee from 23 November 1956 until the day of his death. When in 1958 the master, James Chadwick (1891–1974), appeared to be acting in a high-handed, if not totally unconstitutional, way, B. was vocal in his opposition. The mastership became vacant, and B. allowed his name to go forward. In one of the many ballots he missed election by four votes in an electorate of forty-nine. Some of the things said in the course of a bitter struggle surprised and hurt him. When the mastership became vacant again in 1965, B.'s name was much touted, but he perceived that he did not have sufficient support and backed the election of Joseph Needham (1900–95), a man with a very different outlook on the world from his own. He continued to be active in the internal politics of the college until the sudden death in 1975 of the economist M. J. Farrell (b. 1926), his constant friend and ally since 1958. The college made him a supernumerary fellow for life in 1974 and supported generously the publication in 1989 of a volume of essays written in his honour (J. Diggle *et al.* (eds), *Studies in Latin Literature and its Tradition*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, supp. vol. XV).

B.'s refusal to slip into the background after the repulse of 1958 and his association with a group of members of council which planned its strategies and organised support throughout the college during the masterships of Nevill Mott (1906–96) and Joseph Needham gave a degree of offence which gossiping outsiders magnified. Reports that he had found himself at odds with the college's two senior classicists confirmed the hostility which many members of the faculty of classics early began to feel towards him.

When B. arrived in Cambridge, instruction in classics took place largely in the colleges. There were about sixty instructors forming a 'faculty'. Less than half of these held university appointments bestowed for scholarly distinction or promise. The overwhelming majority had come to Cambridge from a remarkably small number of English public schools and stayed there. The kind of instruction given had not varied significantly in over fifty years, and practical arrangements were made by mutual agreement among the instructors. The faculty possessed little geographical space of its own and had not developed anything of the corporate spirit to be found in the colleges or those faculties which operated from laboratories or taught large numbers in groups.

The university appointed professors in what were seen as the chief areas of advanced instruction and research and made lesser appointments in classics as a whole. It was usually through a professorship that

an outsider entered the system. The readers and lecturers owed no allegiance to professors, as similarly titled instructors did in St Andrews and Liverpool. Only three of them could have been called professional Latinists, and they themselves would not have used such a term. Every member of the faculty, whether or not a university office-holder, felt a great confidence in his or her ability to write Latin prose and verse.

Between 1954 and 1974 much changed. More outsiders joined, and the faculty acquired a corporate spirit and even looked forward to having a building of its own. The spirit was a levelling one with which B. did not feel comfortable. He never gained the personal dominance that D. L. Page (1908–78) and M. I. Finley (1908–86) exercised in turn and perhaps never really wanted it. Two matters much debated by the faculty, the balance of university appointments in classics and the classical curriculum itself, aroused his special concern.

The body of university office-holders had not grown according to any conscious plan. B. made no secret of his feelings that the area of Latin as he defined it was under-represented, that the under-representation affected the health of the subject as a whole, both in the kind of original work coming out of Cambridge and in the kind of picture of the classical world students were being shown, and that in some other areas of central importance persons of insufficient scholarship and unsound educational aims were gaining preferment. When open hostilities began over particular cases many urged that for any vacancy the balance of specialisms should continue to be ignored and the best classical scholar available chosen. Some took the point about imbalance but demanded priority for the faculty's immediate teaching needs over the long-term interests of scholarship. B. and his colleagues rarely saw eye to eye over a particular case.

The curriculum was already at issue in 1954. Two newcomers from Oxford, D. L. Page and P. H. J. Lloyd-Jones (b. 1922) found fault with the pattern of teaching and examining which had formed their colleagues. Page got his way in 1956, when more general study of ancient literature, history, and philosophy was brought into the programme of the first part of the classical tripos and the specialist element of the second part was augmented. He resisted two further changes reducing the level of the knowledge of Greek required, but in vain. B.'s hostility to the traditional heavy emphasis on the practice of prose and verse composition and his advocacy of the 'critical appreciation of literature' helped to form the programmes in place by the time he retired. Many of the

changes made he disapproved of, but he never broke rank publicly with his colleagues.

On one matter B. was able to persuade his colleagues with consequences universally recognised as fruitful. In 1963 at his instance the faculty board and the university press established a series of 'Classical Texts and Commentaries', each volume to contain 'an introduction, a text with apparatus, and a full commentary which discussed in detail textual and other problems'. B. remained the driving force among the editors until 1987. Over twenty-four years thirty volumes appeared, and a number which appeared after he left the editorial board owed much to his early guiding and goading.

It had grieved B.'s predecessor to find himself barred from the personal supervision of undergraduates. B. felt no such sense of deprivation. The kind of skill at which the best teachers of prose and verse composition aimed did not impress him as worth having. Neither of the lecturing tasks which had come to devolve on the Kennedy professor in connection with the second part of the tripos, the criticism of a Latin text—always since well before Housman's day one of a small number of poetic texts thought appropriate for students previously well drilled in verse composition and then being trained to read the scripts of the major witnesses of the text in question—and the general exposition of the work of the chief Roman representatives of one of the genres of classical poetry, enthused him. He never performed the latter task; the former he sometimes passed on to a junior colleague he knew to be working on a particular text. He believed firmly that what university students should be shown was wherever possible the thinking of a person actually concerned with a set of problems. His choice of a prose text for 1958–9 and 1959–60, Cicero's *De officiis*, a work which at that time he was still planning to edit himself, brought howls of protest from directors of studies. His initial scepticism about the value of palaeographical study at first degree level abated over the years.

B. rarely lectured on particular books to candidates for the first part of the tripos. He repeated a course on the philosophical content of Cicero's dialogues four times between 1956 and 1959. One on the metres of Latin poetry lasted in different shapes and sizes down to 1964. It owed much to the writings of Maas, Wilamowitz, and Hermann Fraenkel (1887–1977) on those of Greek poetry. Undergraduates schooled in verse composition found the approach more than a little off-putting. Between 1964 and 1973 B. took classes, sometimes alone, sometimes together with sympathetic colleagues, on both the theory and

the practice of literary criticism. A class he ran in 1965–6 and 1966–7 in company with members of the faculty of medieval and modern languages as well as of that of classics on ‘Senecan drama and its influence’ reflected an increasing desire to free Latin studies from the stranglehold of classics. He had succeeded the previous year in persuading a number of Latinists to offer teaching orientated towards the late medieval, renaissance and early modern interests of students reading for other triposes.

Research students began to multiply in the late 1950s. B.’s undergraduate lectures attracted men and women of scholarly bent. He did not, however, go in for positive recruitment. Nor did he attempt to erect a seminar of either the German or the North American kind. His idea of what made a proper subject for initial research was an austere one: ‘if critical scholarship aims at clearing up what is unclear there is only one kind of training which will serve that aim: that is concentration on a severely limited subject in a severely limited field’ (see bibliography, no. 35, 776). He put up only with the kind of student who was capable of choosing such a field and doing the clearing up himself.

In 1954 both Britain’s ancient universities demanded a knowledge of Latin from all matriculants. That demand helped to maintain a large role for the language in the curriculum of the better secondary schools and sheltered the study of Greek. By the end of 1958 plans were being made to create new universities and increase the size of all the old ones. No one seriously believed that the pool of outstandingly good students would increase, and there were fears among Oxford and Cambridge scientists that too many such students would be enticed to universities which did not require any previous study of Latin. Formal debate began in Cambridge with a discussion at a meeting of the senate on 24 February 1959 of ‘the best method of retaining Latin and Greek among the subjects for university entrance, while at the same time terminating their compulsory character’.

Some members of the faculty of classics threw themselves into the debate from the beginning. B. inclined for a time to the view that what went on in the lower and middle school did not concern the university. Eventually he committed the prestige of his chair on the side of those who wanted Latin retained as a requirement for matriculation. On several occasions he argued that Latin was not yet in England a specialist preserve but, like mathematics, an important part of general education, having an educative power which other humane subjects lacked, and that it was in the interest of the whole university to keep

an intellectually solid general form of education intact in the middle school. Some scientists were surprised at the way B. promoted Latin as an intellectual discipline rather than as a vehicle 'for studying the human condition'. A vote of the senate on 10 May 1960 left the abolitionists victorious.

The profile B. assumed in the struggle over Cambridge's matriculation requirements caused him to be invited to address the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching in April 1960 about the debates in Cambridge (see bibliography, no. 31), and the Classical Association in the same month about those charges brought against the teaching of Latin in the schools which seemed to him to have some validity, namely an excessive concentration on the art of translating English into Latin and a neglect of the general educational interests of those who did not intend to carry their studies past the ordinary level examination.

B.'s enthusiasm for general education in the schools was genuine enough. It was, however, for the general education of those whose talent and rearing made them capable of pursuing intellectual activities at a higher than ordinary level. The needs of the humane disciplines, above all Latin, in the universities remained his chief concern. He took a deeply pessimistic view of the future of Greek and thought Latin itself could only survive if it lowered its formal standards and shifted its emphases. Advances in the humane disciplines could, in his view, be exploited by the schools to their advantage. On the other hand advances in pedagogical techniques, if there were any, or in those of communication did not seem to him likely to be of service in the universities.

B.'s chief ally in the Cambridge struggle, M. I. Finley, had a very different basic view of secondary and tertiary education. For him there were no deep trenches between the academic, the schoolmaster, and the publicist. He soon formulated a very different programme for the future. The *Sunday Times* published in March 1963 under the heading 'Crisis in the Classics' the substance of a lecture he gave several times in Cambridge and elsewhere in the course of 1962. Greek seemed to him to be finished in England's schools; Latin could be left, for those who wanted it, as a tool of instruction in the use of English, as a 'disciplinary grind'. In the universities on the other hand the traditional kind of course in classics with its heavy linguistic and literary base should, he recommended, be replaced by one which made use of English translations of the written record and historical interpretations of other kinds of record.

Already in 1961 B. had been enticed along with two academic Greekists, T. B. L. Webster (1905–74), and D. M. Balme (1912–85),

by a number of practising teachers, administrators, and educational theorists, in particular C. W. Baty (1900–79, Her Majesty's Staff Inspector for Classics, then approaching retirement), and J. E. Sharwood Smith (b. 1921, since April 1959 lecturer in classics at the University of London's Institute of Education), to join with them in an effort to reform classical curricula. Webster, who had many contacts in the universities of the USA and the old Empire, and Balme, who had just returned to Britain after a spell as vice-chancellor of a West African university, shared B.'s alarm about the future, if not his kind of thinking about it. A new organisation, the Joint Association of Classical Teachers (JACT) and a theoretical journal, *Didaskalos*, emerged at the beginning of 1963. The place of ancient history in the school programme had been for some time a subject of debate, and B. drew the attention of his fellow reformers to the talent and zeal of Finley.

JACT occupied for some years a notable part of B.'s energies. He was president of the Association in 1969–71. By 1994 classics had become a very different sort of thing in the schools and universities of England from what it had been in 1963, and the Association had changed accordingly. B.'s first obituarists had to be reminded of the connection he had had with the Association.

As remarkable as the occupation with JACT was B.'s chairmanship of the Classics Committee of the Schools Council from when it was set up in October 1965 by the new Government of Harold Wilson until October 1969. B. had no sympathy with the general aims of this Government, least of all with those of its chief spokesmen on education, but he perceived the presence in it of dissension on fundamental issues and day-to-day priorities and believed, as he always had done, that the details of any policy whose implementation was actually attempted could be modified through patient argument.

B.'s association with the Cambridge Latin Course (CUP 1970–80), an elementary manual of instruction which received for a time a wide use in the nation's schools, was another example of his willingness to involve himself in any activity whose long-term contribution to the survival of the subject seemed likely to outweigh its immediately visible shortcomings. C. W. Baty, one of the architects of JACT, hankered after some new kind of course in classics which would receive general acceptance in the schools and the community at large, and the management of the Nuffield Foundation was willing to help finance the design of such a course. It was thought important that a university department of classics should foster the project. B. helped to design

the proposal which the Cambridge faculty board eventually agreed to back, namely to 'investigate the problem of teaching Latin in the light of recent developments in linguistics and consider how a course on classical civilisation related to texts read in Latin might be constructed'.

In the years of his occupancy of the Kennedy chair, B. was not as much engrossed by the hurly-burly of administration and politics as many of his colleagues thought. He had the gift of being able, when he wanted, to abstract himself from secular concerns. There flowed from him a steady stream of scholarly publications, none of them ill-considered.

B. arrived in Cambridge still interested in the Hellenistic schools of philosophy but intent in the main on what the Roman statesman Cicero made of the teachings of these schools and on the textual problems of those of his dialogues which concerned ethics. A 1956 article (see bibliography, no. 26) argued that Zeno's ethical theory owed more to the Academic Polemon than to the Peripatetic Theophrastus. In a 1958 article on Plato (see bibliography, no. 28), however, B. called himself a 'student of Latin' and apologised for 'making bold to pronounce on Greek subjects'. When the *OCD* underwent revision between 1964 and 1966 he declined to amend the articles he wrote for Ross on Theophrastus and others (see bibliography, no. 16) or to permit them to be reprinted as they stood. On the other hand he continued to give encouragement and advice to the young men and women in Cambridge and elsewhere who started to interest themselves around this time in the philosophers between Aristotle and Plotinus, as he had done a decade earlier to I. G. Kidd in St Andrews.

The lectures which B. delivered for the benefit of candidates for the first and second parts of the tripos four times between 1956 and 1959 on Cicero's philosophical writing attracted only small audiences. The course he gave in 1958 and 1959 on the text of the *De officiis* for those taking the literature specialty of the second part involved him in unpleasantness with some of the college directors of studies. He abandoned the two projects he had begun in St Andrews. A review of a 1958 book (see bibliography, no. 32) shows how he would have himself gone about editing the remains of Cicero's *Hortensius*.

Other large projects came into mind and went. He found he shared some general ideas about the rhythms of the Latin language and its poetry with W. S. Allen (b. 1918) and proposed that they write a book

together on the subject. He touched on these ideas often in the lectures he gave on metre between 1956 and 1964. Philological friends proved hard to convince, and he let Allen go his own way. An old plan to edit the first six books of Tacitus' *Annals* he was pleased to pass over to his talented pupil F. R. D. Goodyear (1936–87) in 1960. The defects he perceived in Mynors's 1958 edition of Catullus' poems tempted him from time to time to think of investigating the relations of the Renaissance manuscripts of these poems. D. S. McKie (b. 1952) was to take up the thought with B.'s encouragement in 1973.

In the course of 1959 B. decided to edit in the generous way advocated in his 1956 inaugural lecture those epistles in which Horace discussed literature. His study of the history of the Peripatos had familiarised him with the way the ancient schools of grammar and rhetoric as well as those of philosophy treated literature. Fraenkel's 1957 book on Horace said little about the epistles in question and yet suggested that there was much that could be said. A paper read to the Oxford Philological Society on 28 November 1958 on the old question of whether the *Epistle to the Pisos* possessed a coherent structure seemed to B. to have been received well.

B. consciously emulated a number of famous commentaries of the past: Bentley's on the whole of Horace (1706–11), Wilamowitz's on Euripides' *Herakles* (1889), Housman's on Manilius' *Astronomica* (1903–30), Norden's on the sixth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* (1903; a second edition of 1915 was much extended with material from the *ThLL*), and Fraenkel's on Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (1950). The subject matter of the Horatian epistles had therefore to be explicated in every detail. Likewise the historical circumstances in which they were composed. The notion long fashionable among students of the modern literatures, that everything needed for the understanding and evaluation of a literary work is in the work itself, B. dismissed as obscurantist, although Fraenkel had occasionally paid it lip service. The text of the epistles had also to be established and its sense determined. Like Bentley and Housman, and unlike Wilamowitz, Norden, and Fraenkel, B. eschewed translation into a modern language. The progress of the *ThLL* made it possible, and indeed obligatory, in B.'s view, to give even more attention to the verbal style of the epistles than Norden had done to that of *Aeneid* VI. The epistles themselves had finally to be analysed and evaluated as whole poetic entities at least as far as the confines of the commentary form allowed. Here Bentley and Housman offered no guidance at all, Wilamowitz, Norden, and Fraenkel only a little. The

doctrine of the 'new' critics, that the substance, organisation, and verbal style of a literary work could not be separated in the process of judgement received total adherence and contributed not a little to the frequent obscurity of B.'s exposition.

B. set himself to produce three volumes over fifteen years. Although he pursued the task with extraordinary single-mindedness it took him twenty-three. The structuralist theorising which began to sap the energies of the students of the modern literatures in the late 1960s and those of the classicists in the next decade did not bother him. The distractions of other areas of scholarship he resisted as far as friendship and courtesy allowed. Apart from two volumes of the planned trilogy, nothing appeared between 1963 and the day of his retirement which was unconnected with Horace or the genre to which the three epistles belonged. The essays on the theory that some of the argument of *Epist.* 2. 1 was with Varro (see bibliography, no. 36), on the literary quality of *Serm.* 2. 6 (see bibliography, no. 40), on the neglect of manuscript evidence in the discussion of various passages of the *Odes* (see bibliography, nos. 42, 44), and on the background to the comparison between Ennius and Homer alluded to in *Epist.* 2. 1. 51 (see bibliography, no. 49) made a strong impression.

The first volume of the trilogy appeared in 1963 (see bibliography, no. 37). It succeeded in illuminating the dark history of theoretical and practical literary criticism between the end of the fourth century BC and the last quarter of the first; likewise that of engagement with the *Epistle to the Pisos* from the late Middle Ages down to recent times. Not everyone, however, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon countries, was willing to find so much systematising in the *Epistle* as B. had found. G. W. Williams (b. 1926) affirmed a view of the poem's structure, or lack of structure, akin to the one urged by Antonio Riccoboni at the end of the sixteenth century. Others looked for sources either further away or nearer at hand than a treatise by Neoptolemus of Parium, the third-century BC poet and theorist referred to by Porphyrio and brought to life by B.

Twelve months after the volume was published, B. was elected to the Fellowship of the British Academy.

The second volume appeared in 1971 (see bibliography, no. 45). B.'s treatment of the relationship of the Horatian manuscripts and the history of the text in the introduction won general assent. The text he presented of the *Epistle to the Pisos* set the vulgate to one side and placed obeli against everything he felt he could not understand. It

breathed much of the spirit of Bentley and little of that of Friedrich Klingner (1894–1968), the Teubner editor. Opinions were inevitably divided.

Two years after the volume was published, at the instigation of Carl Becker (1925–73), the Bavarian Academy of Sciences made B. a corresponding member.

### Retirement

Retirement from the Kennedy chair in June 1974 meant only that B. ceased giving lectures on behalf of the university and attending meetings of the faculty board. He continued to live in the centre of Cambridge, as he had done since 1958, and retained his rooms in Caius College. He listened to what still-active members of the faculty of classics had to tell him about current controversies and offered advice freely. He stayed in effective control of the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series until 1987.

The passion for music which preceded that for philology had never completely disappeared. Musical imagery appeared from time to time in B.'s scholarly writing. 'A poem', he declared in a lecture of 1965 (see bibliography, no. 40, p. 8), 'does not add up to anything that can be stated as a sum total in conceptual terms. In this regard a poem is like a piece of music—it evolves in time, as a time sequence'. Bach and Mozart were ever his favourites. He was nevertheless open to new experience: at a late age he took to Ravel and Shostakovich. In 1975 he began to practice daily at the keyboard of a grand piano and to perform chamber pieces regularly with friends and acquaintances. The newly created office of chairman permitted him to impose some order on the Caius Music Society.

B. remained after retirement from his chair one of the trustees of the £10 million which David Robinson (1904–87), a successful Cambridge businessman, had offered the university for the foundation of a new college. Robinson had perceived in B. during an earlier but in the end unsuccessful negotiation with Caius a rare combination of realism and integrity. On the sudden death of J. W. Linnett (1913–75), the University's Vice-Chancellor, B. became Chairman of the Board of Trustees. He kept this office until Robinson College received a royal charter of incorporation in October 1985. He is credited with a large role in solving the main problems which beset the nascent college. When the

period of the trusteeship came to an end he was made an honorary fellow. He remained an influential member of the Investment Committee, as in Caius, until his death.

1974 was B.'s seventh year as the British Academy's delegate on the International Commission in charge of the *ThLL*. At every meeting he had warned of the dangers which faced the enterprise, particularly those which continuing slowness of production would bring. He advocated improvement of the working conditions of the senior editors of the dictionary, more contact with those studying Latin in the schools and universities, and an increased recruitment of assistant editors from outside Germany. A stream of helpful criticism of current methods and procedures poured from him. He worked untiringly to persuade the British Academy to support a British presence at the Munich institute and sought out young scholars willing to spend some time there. In 1978 he was elected a member of the Commission's Steering Committee, in 1979 Vice-President of the Commission, in 1985 President. As President he proved to be much more than a figure-head. A crisis in relations among those working in the institute in 1989 and 1990 was handled by him with firmness and a tact which calmed passions on both sides of a bitter conflict. Just before he died he accepted a further term of presidential office.

As B.'s visits to Munich grew more frequent they became as much a pleasure as a duty. Longer than most of those who left Germany in the 1930s he had avoided going back. The first time he did so was in December 1966 when he journeyed to Munich to consult the archive of the *ThLL* in connection with his work on Horace. He renewed an old friendship with Wilhelm Ehlers (1908–88), then editor-in-chief, and made a new one with Peter Flury (b. 1938), later to be Ehlers's successor. From 1978 many other old friendships were renewed and many new ones made. Talking about and making music provided a powerful social glue. B. came to use the German language again both for private and for public purposes, although he insisted time and again that he had come to think better in English.

The years of retirement brought to completion the scholarly enterprise of B.'s time as the Kennedy professor in a way that made clear the virtues of every part of the whole. The third volume of the Horatian trilogy appeared in 1982 (see bibliography, no. 57). Aspects of the enterprise rekindled an old interest in the history of scholarship. A much-discussed book and several articles resulted. Death caught him in the middle of yet another enterprise large in its ambition.

Essays about the theory that Cicero's *De oratore* influenced the formulation of some of the arguments of the *Epistle to the Pisos* (see bibliography, no. 50), about the role given to reason and ethics in ancient theories of the nature of poetry (see bibliography, no. 54), and about the textual and literary criticism of Horace from the Renaissance to recent times (see bibliography, no. 56) preceded the appearance of the third volume of the trilogy. A further three, about the neglect of manuscript evidence in the discussion of various passages of the *Epodes* and *Satires I* (see bibliography, nos. 58, 63), and about an aspect of the reading of the *Epistle to the Pisos* in eighteenth-century England (see bibliography, no. 60) followed. The commentary on *Epist.* 2. 1 and 2 presented in the third volume showed no falling-off in quality from that on the *Epistle to the Pisos*. In an appendix entitled 'Horace's Literary Epistles and their Chronology; Augustanism in the Augustan Poets' B. grappled with the problem of how an artist could accommodate himself to the ideological pretensions of an authoritarian regime without sacrificing his inner independence. A draft version of the essay which B. kept seems to go back to 1975. At all events there remained with this draft a cutting of a newspaper obituary which described how the composer Shostakovitch had maintained a degree of intellectual liberty for himself under the Soviet regime. It is hard to read the published essay without sensing an unusually engaged mood. Rereading on the other hand will uncover an intense effort to avoid the influence of facile analogies from the world of recent experience.

Well before B. finished publishing all he had to say about Horace, signs of a reawakening interest in the history of scholarship began to appear. The grasp he showed in one of the chapters of the first volume of his trilogy of the five centuries of modern debate about the *Epistle to the Pisos* (see bibliography, no. 37, pp. 15–40) impressed even those who rejected the volume's principal theses. The surpassing quality of the critical work done on the text of Horace by Bentley and Housman—the latter's lecture notes were available in the Cambridge University Library to supplement the published essays—struck B. again and again as his own work proceeded, and he was ready to think more deeply about the historical circumstances in which the two great scholars went about their labours when an invitation came from the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa to deliver a series of lectures on the history of classical studies and textual criticism in England.

Three of the eight lectures delivered in Pisa in 1977 centred on Bentley and two on Housman. These sprang out of the reading and

pondering of several years. The other three, on the scholars who preceded Bentley and those who came between the latter and Housman, B. devised for the occasion (see bibliography, no. 51). As soon as the Horatian trilogy was complete he set about revising the substance of the lectures for a book in English addressing both fellow practitioners of critical scholarship and educated laymen interested in general questions about the schools and the universities (see bibliography, no. 62). He replaced the account of Housman with one more suited to an Anglo-Saxon readership and, in order to clarify the context of the stance adopted by Housman towards the record of Antiquity, added one on how the educational use of the classics in the schools of the Victorian period influenced the character of classical studies in the universities. He broadened the base of his high estimate of Richard Porson and continued to treat W. M. Lindsay as unworthy of mention in the company of the likes of Housman. He maintained his refusal to discuss the English scholars of his own time or the current state of critical studies. An important change of view between 1977 and 1986 may be noted: he withdrew his earlier niggling at Housman's refusal to mix textual and literary criticism and even found in this refusal one of the springs of Housman's success in achieving what he set out to do (see bibliography: compare no. 51, 1222–8, and no. 62, pp. 160–7).

Unwillingness to speak about contemporaries eventually relaxed, at least where those who had predeceased B. were concerned. A lecture given in 1987 in Germany and in 1989 in the USA on the history of the relationship between classical scholarship and humanistic culture included in its purview the 'new humanist movement' led by Werner Jaeger in the 1920s. This he judged to have failed, as would, he predicted, any further effort in that direction. Humanistic culture could only thrive if there were in society and the body politic a similar potential to which it could appeal, and the industrial and technological society of Germany and the Anglo-Saxon countries showed little of that potential. Classics had, in his view, to restrict itself henceforth to what is scholarly, to seek to recognise what is the case, to attend to things as they are, and not mistake them for what they are not or for what we should like them to be.

An idea of making a modest edition of Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* for the use of undergraduates soon turned into something grander. Somewhere about 1982 B. decided he had enough life left in which to complete a general book on oratory at Rome in the first century AD and an edition of the *Dialogus* fit for his own Cambridge Classical Texts

and Commentaries series. The lines along which he was thinking came out first in a review of a 1982 book on ancient theories about the rise and fall of oratorical skill (see bibliography, no. 61).

A paper completed towards the end of 1988 found in the *Dialogus*, with the help of Quintilian's *Institutiones oratoriae*, a number of exploitations of the substance of the Flavian rhetorician's *De causis corruptae eloquentiae* (see bibliography, no. 64). B.'s attempt to relate three works, one of which is lost and restorable only through consideration of the other two, and to base upon the hypothesised relationship a judgement about the third bears a certain similarity to his treatment of the *Magna Moralia* in relation to the *Eudemian* and the *Nicomachean Ethics* and to that of the *Epistle to the Pisos* in relation to Aristotle's *Poetics* and the treatise of Neoptolemus of Parium.

A lecture given several times between 1988 and 19 November 1991 argued that the *Dialogus* treated aspects of Vespasian's time necessarily ignored by the *Historiae* and revealed on a proper reading much more of Tacitus' own attitude to the moral and political issues an individual of that time had to face than the *Historiae* did. It neither proposed nor used any sophisticated model of the authoritarian regime as such and had to be published in a German periodical (see bibliography, no. 66). In the course of 1992 B. completed a collation of codices V, E, B, C, and Q of the *Dialogus*. This confirmed his view that the stemma divided two ways rather than three and that some of the variants could be regarded as transmitted rather than created through contamination. A paper on the issue was rejected by an American journal and ended up in the German *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (see bibliography, no. 68). The final version of a paper dating the composition of the *Dialogus* to the reign of Trajan rather than to that of Nerva came from the typist on 24 January 1994. This one an American journal accepted (see bibliography, no. 72).

An element of great importance in B.'s scholarly life was the putting together of a philological library. He collected with great discrimination, and much could be inferred about the character of his scholarship from the items he had assembled by the time of his death. He wanted these to form the base of a distinct section of the library of Robinson College where they might aid the researches of serious scholars, but the college was prepared to take only such as might be of interest to

undergraduates. The entire collection is now housed in the department of classics in the University of Tokyo.

H. D. JOCELYN

*Fellow of the Academy*

*Note.* For speaking or writing to me about Charles Brink I am grateful to: W. S. Allen; W. G. Arnott, Colin Austin; D. R. Shackleton Bailey; J. R. Bambrough; William Barr; Ralph Brauhnoltz; A. C. Brink; D. H. Brink; Christopher Brooke; P. A. Brunt; M. L. Burnyeat; Winfried Bühler; Francis Cairns; Sir Henry Chadwick; John Chadwick; R. G. G. Coleman; R. M. Cook; J. A. Crook; J. C. Dancy; R. D. Dawe; Josef Delz; James Diggle; Sir Kenneth Dover; Peter Dronke; Alison Duke; R. P. Duncan-Jones; Sir Sam Edwards; Mary Faris; Peter Flury; D. P. Fowler; W. H. C. Frend; W.-H. Friedrich; G. P. Goold; H. B. Gottschalk; A. S. Gratwick; Philip Grierson; J. B. Hall; E. W. Handley; Pauline Hire; Robin Holloway; P. M. Huby; A. G. Hunt; Rudolf Kassel; E. J. Kenney; I. G. Kidd; G. S. Kirk; Masaaki Kubo; A. G. Lee; Wolfgang von Leyden; A. C. Lloyd; Sir Geoffrey Lloyd; Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones; A. A. Long; Ian McFarlane; D. S. McKie; J. S. Morrison; Kenneth Muir; R. G. M. Nisbet; Denis O'Brien; Sir Edward Parkes; John Pinsent; Jeremy Prynne; J. M. Reynolds; W. J. N. Rudd; D. A. Russell; J. E. Sharwood Smith; Wilfried Stroh; Gavin Townend; Ernst Vogt; F. W. Walbank; W. S. Watt; David West; M. M. Willcock; G. W. Williams; A. J. Woodman; J. R. G. Wright; and Sir Christopher Zeeman. Much help on general matters came from: Ernst Badian; M. St J. Forrest; Ian Kershaw; Dietfried Krömer; D. S. McKie; Eckart Mensching; and Arnold Paucker. Access to archival material was granted to me by: the Library of the University of Aberdeen; the Bodleian Library; Corpus Christi College, Oxford; Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; the Humboldt University, Berlin; the Lessing Gymnasium, Berlin; the University of Liverpool; Magdalen College, Oxford; the Oxford Philological Society; the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning; the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*; the Warburg Institute; and the Widener Library.

## Bibliography

- 1 'Bibliographische Beilage I der Zeitschrift *Die Antike*' '1: Griechische und römische Autoren, Philosophie und Kulturgeschichte des Altertums'; '2: Archäologie', *Die Antike* 7 (1931), \*1–\*7, \*7–\*14.
- 2 'Bibliographische Beilage der Zeitschrift *Die Antike*' '3: Wirkungsgeschichte des Altertums, Humanismus', *Die Antike* 8 (1932), \*1–\*20.
- 3 *Stil und Form der pseudaristotelischen 'Magna Moralia'* (Ohlau, 1933).
- 4 'habrotonum', 'habus–haedus', 'hanappus–hardulatio', 'harenulces–harundulatio', 'hasena–hasse', 'haurio–haustus', 'homo', 'ignora–ignoratus', 'ileaticus–iliaria', 'ilicetum–ilicis', 'iligneus–ilisirica', 'illocabilis–illocalitas', 'immobilis–immorsus',

- 'maledulcis–malefio', 'malifatus', *ThLL* VI 3, fasc. 13, 14, 16; VII 1, fasc. 2, 3, 4; VIII, fasc. 2 (Leipzig, 1935–40).
- 5 'Peripatos', in W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, neue Bearbeitung begonnen von G. Wissowa, suppl. VII (Stuttgart, 1940), 899–949; articles on various members of the Peripatos in vols. XVIII 3–XXI 1 (1938–49).
  - 6 Review of L. A. A. Jouai, *De magistraat Ausonius* (1938), *Classical Review*, 55 (1941), 103.
  - 7 Review of F. J. C. J. Nuyens, *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de Zielkunde van Aristoteles* (1939), *Classical Review*, 56 (1942), 31–2.
  - 8 'A Forgotten Figure of Style in Tacitus', *Classical Review*, 58 (1944), 43–5.
  - 9 Review of Aristotle, 'Generation of Animals', ed. A. L. Peck (1943), *Oxford Magazine*, 63 (9 November 1944), 51–2.
  - 10 Review of W. Jaeger, *Paedeia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. Vol. 2. The Secrets of the Divine Centre* (1944), *Oxford Magazine*, 63 (8 March 1945), 195–6.
  - 11 'Callimachus and Aristotle: An Inquiry into Callimachus' Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην *Classical Quarterly*, 40 (1946), 11–26.
  - 12 Review of W. Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. Vol. 3. The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato* (1945), *Oxford Magazine*, 64 (7 February 1946), 171.
  - 13 Review of H. J. Drossaert Lulofs, *Aristotelis De Somno et Vigilia liber, adiectis ueteribus translationibus et Theodori Metochitae commentario* (1943), *Classical Review*, 61 (1947), 54–5.
  - 14 Review of R. Hackforth, *Plato's Examination of Pleasure. A Translation of the Philebus with Introduction and Commentary* (1946), *Oxford Magazine*, 66 (29 January 1948), 246.
  - 15 Review of V. Ehrenberg, *Aspects of the Ancient World* (1946), *Oxford Magazine*, 66 (20 May 1948), 466.
  - 16 'Anacharsis', 'Arcesilaus', 'Bolus', 'Carneades', 'Clitomachus', 'Crateuas', 'Critolaus', 'Dio (1) Cocceianus', 'Diogenes (5)', 'Diogenes (6) Laertius', 'Eclecticism', 'Epicurus', 'Eudemos', 'Favorinus', 'Gromatici', 'Heraclides (1) Ponticus', 'Lycon', 'Menedemus (1)', 'Peripatetic School', 'Philon (3)', 'Philosophy, History of', 'Praxiphanes', 'Protrepticus', 'Pyrrhon', 'Sceptics', 'Sextus (2) Empiricus', 'Straton (1)', 'Theophrastus', 'Timon (2)', in M. Cary, J. D. Denniston, J. Wight Duff, A. D. Nock, W. D. Ross, and H. H. Scullard (eds), *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949).
  - 17 Review of J. Ruyschaert, *Juste Lipse et les Annales de Tacite. Une méthode de critique textuelle en XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (1949), *Classical Review*, 64 (1950), 120–2.
  - 18 Review of César, *Guerre d'Afrique*. Texte établi et traduit par A. Bouvet (1949), *Classical Review*, NS 1 (1951), 183–5.
  - 19 Review of Marcus Tullius Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods. On Divination. On Duties*, by H. M. Poteat, intro. by R. McKeon (1950), *Philosophical Quarterly*, 2 (1952), 269–70.
  - 20 'Justus Lipsius and the Text of Tacitus', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 41 (1951), 32–51.
  - 21 'Tacitus and the Visurgis: A Gloss in the First Book of the *Annals*', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 42 (1952), 39–42.

- 22 Review of D. de Montmollin, *La poétique d' Aristote. Texte primitif et additions ultérieures* (1951), *Gnomon*, 24 (1952), 379–81.
- 23 *Imagination and Imitation. An Inaugural Lecture* (Liverpool, 1953).
- 24 Review of E. Paratore, *Tacito* (n.d. [1951]), *Journal of Roman Studies*, 43 (1953), 145–8.
- 25 (With F. W. Walbank), 'The Construction of the Sixth Book of Polybius', *Classical Quarterly*, NS 4 (1954), 97–122.
- 26 'Οἰκειῶσις and οἰκειότης. Theophrastus and Zeno on Nature in Moral Theory', *Phronesis*, 1. 2 (1956), 123–45.
- 27 *Latin Studies and the Humanities. An Inaugural Lecture* (Cambridge, 1957).
- 28 'Plato on the Natural Character of Goodness', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 63 (1958), 193–8.
- 29 Notice of Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. by Stephen MacKenna, rev. by B. S. Page, Pref. by E. R. Dodds, Intro. by Paul Henry (1956), *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS 9 (1958), 217.
- 30 'Tragic History and Aristotle's School', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 6 (1960), 14–19.
- 31 'Small Latin and the University', *Latin Teaching*, 30. 7 (June 1960), 194–201.
- 32 Review of M. Ruch, *L'Hortensius de Cicéron: histoire et reconstruction* (1958), *Journal of Roman Studies*, 51 (1961), 215–22.
- 33 Review of M. Ruch, *Le préambule dans les oeuvres philosophiques de Cicéron. Essai sur la genèse et l'art du dialogue* (1958), *Gnomon*, 33 (1961), 159–62.
- 34 'Small Latin and the Classics', in *Re-appraisal: Some New Thoughts on the Teaching of the Classics*, suppl. *Greece and Rome*, II 9 (1962), 6–9.
- 35 Review of A. Michel, *Rhétorique et philosophie chez Cicéron. Essai sur les fondements de l'art de persuader* (1960), *Gnomon*, 35 (1963), 776–9.
- 36 'Horace and Varro', in *Varron, Entretiens. Tome IX, Fond. Hardt, Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1963*, 173–206.
- 37 *Horace on Poetry: \* Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (Cambridge, 1963).
- 38 'Scansion: The Eye and the Ear. An Experiment', *Didaskalos*, 1. 1 (1963), 55–61.
- 39 Review of W. Wimmel, *Zur Form der horazischen Diatribensatire* (1962), *Classical Review*, NS 14 (1964), 161–3.
- 40 *On Reading a Horatian Satire. An Interpretation of 'Sermones' II 6* (Sydney, 1965).
- 41 'Horace and Empedocles' Temperature: A Rejected Fragment of Empedocles', *Phoenix*, 23 (1969), 138–42.
- 42 'Horatian Notes: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the *Odes*', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 15 (1969), 1–6.
- 43 'Interpretation and the History of Ideas', in W. Schmid, *Die Interpretation in der Altertumswissenschaft. Ansprachen zur Eröffnung des 5. Kongresses der Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques (FIEC) Bonn 1.–6. September 1969* (Bonn, 1971), 75–82.
- 44 'Horatian Notes II: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the *Odes* Book II', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 17 (1971), 17–29.
- 45 *Horace on Poetry: \*\* The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971).

- 46 'A postscript to "Scansion: The Eye and the Ear"', *Didaskalos*, 3. 3 (1971), 485–91.
- 47 'Limaturae', *Rheinisches Museum*, nF 115 (1972), 28–42.
- 48 'Philodemus, Περὶ ποιημάτων, Book IV', *Maia*, NS 24 (1972), 342–4.
- 49 'Ennius and the Hellenistic Worship of Homer', *American Journal of Philology*, 93 (1972), 547–67.
- 50 'Cicero's *Orator* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*', *Atti del II Colloquium Tullianum, Roma 30 sett.–2 ott. 1974* (Rome, 1975), 1–12.
- 51 'Studi classici e critica testuale in Inghilterra', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, III 8. 3 (1978), 1071–228.
- 52 Review of J. V. Cody, *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics* (1976), *Gnomon*, 51 (1979), 60–2.
- 53 (With W. S. Allen), 'The Old Order and the New: A Case History', *Lingua*, 50 (1980), 61–100.
- 54 'The Impact of Rationality on Ancient Poetry', in *Proceedings of the fourth International Humanistic Symposium Athens 1978* (Athens, 1981), 105–16.
- 55 Review of W. Hering, *Die Dialektik von Inhalt und Form bei Horaz*, *Gnomon*, 53 (1981), 231–5.
- 56 'Horatian Poetry. Thoughts on the Development of Textual Criticism and Interpretation', in W. Killy (ed.), *Geschichte des Textverständnisses am Beispiel von Pindar und Horaz* (Munich, 1981, Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 12), 7–17.
- 57 *Horace on Poetry: \*\*\* Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus* (Cambridge, 1982).
- 58 'Horatian Notes III: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the *Epodes* and a Passage of *Odes* Book 3', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 28 (1982), 30–56.
- 59 (With F. W. Walbank [translation of no. 25]) 'Der Aufbau des sechsten Buches des Polybios', in K. Stiewe and N. Holzberg (eds.), *Polybios* (Darmstadt, 1982 [Wege der Forschung 347]), 211–58.
- 60 "'A great genius of our own" and Horace's *Ars Poetica* in the Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 8 (1985), 67–78.
- 61 Review of K. Heldmann, *Antike Theorien über Entwicklung und Verfall der Redekunst* (1982), *Gnomon*, 57 (1985), 141–4.
- 62 *English Classical Scholarship: Historical Reflections on Bentley, Porson, and Housman* (Cambridge, 1986).
- 63 'Horatian Notes IV: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of *Satires* Book I', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 33 (1987), 16–37.
- 64 'Quintilian's *De causis corruptae eloquentiae* and Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*', *Classical Quarterly*, NS 39 (1989), 472–503.
- 65 Review of P. G. Naiditch, *A. E. Housman at University College, London: the Election of 1892* (1988), *Classical Review*, NS 41 (1991), 217–18.
- 66 'History in the *Dialogus de oratoribus* and Tacitus the Historian': A New Approach to an Old Source', *Hermes*, 121 (1993), 335–49.
- 67 'Paul Maas (1880–1964)', *Eikasmos* 4 (1993), 252.
- 68 'A Bipartite Stemma of Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* and some transmitted variants', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 102 (1994), 131–52.

- 69 'Second Thoughts on Three Horatian Puzzles', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration* (Oxford, 1995), 267–78.
- 70 '“Historical Reflections on Bentley, Porson, and Housman”: Controversy and Reconsideration', in H. D. Jocelyn (ed.), *Aspects of Nineteenth-Century British Classical Scholarship* (Liverpool, 1996), 1–12.
- 71 'Rudolf Pfeiffer's History of Classical Scholarship', in M. Lausberg (ed.), *Philologia perennis: Colloquium zu Ehren von Rudolf Pfeiffer* (Augsburg, 1996), 46–56.
- 72 'Can Tacitus' *Dialogus* be dated? Evidence and Historical Conclusions', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 96 (1994 [issued 1997]), 251–80.