



F. R. D. GOODYEAR

FRANCIS RICHARD DAVID GOODYEAR

1936–1987¹

FRANCIS (FRANK) RICHARD DAVID GOODYEAR was born in Luton on 2 February 1936, the only son of Gladys Ivy Goodman and Francis Goodyear, a local tradesman, who was to become Mayor of Luton. He was educated at Luton Grammar School, where, against the advice of his teachers, he insisted on studying Latin and Greek. In Latin he was largely self-taught; in Greek entirely. He avoided all non-academic activities, and, realizing that he could do better on his own at home, avoided school itself, feigning illness and drafting letters of excuse for his mother to send. At his scholarship interview at St John's College, Cambridge, when asked how much of Sophocles he had read, he replied 'The extant plays'.

He entered St John's as Henry Arthur Thomas Scholar in 1954 and there found teachers whom he could respect, in particular J. A. Crook and A. G. Lee. He achieved First Classes in Part I and (with distinction) in Part II of the Classical Tripos. He won, among other awards, the Craven Scholarship and the Hallam Prize (these fall to the best candidate in the University Classical Scholarships Examination, the stiffest test ever devised of translation and composition, including original composition in Latin prose and verse, and now defunct), and the Chancellor's Medal for Classical Learning. He began research on the pseudo-Virgilian *Aetna* under the direction of the Kennedy Professor of Latin, C. O. Brink, and was awarded the Ph.D. in 1961. The examiners were allowed to dispense with the viva, a procedure almost without parallel.

He was elected to a Research Fellowship at St John's in 1959, but moved after a year to Queens' College, as Official Fellow and Director of Studies. He remained at Queens' for six years, and built up the strength of the Classical side, which had not thriven in recent years, and refounded the Classical Society, on the

¹ I owe thanks to Professor C. O. Brink, Professor J. A. Crook, Sedwell Diggle, Mrs F. R. D. Goodyear, Professor J. B. Hall, Professor H. D. Jocelyn, Professor E. J. Kenney, Mr A. G. Lee, Dr S. P. Oakley, Professor D. B. Saddington, Professor A. J. Woodman.

model of the Society of which he had been President at St John's. He thrived, himself, in the relaxed and convivial atmosphere and comfortable life of a bachelor don, expansive, ebullient, confident in manner and expression beyond his years. His only vices were the pleasures of food and drink and the game of poker.

His edition of *Aetna*, a text so corrupt that its author's own words, *chaos ac sine fine ruina*, aptly describe it, was published in 1965, as the second volume in the series *Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*, lately founded by Brink. 'A prudent editor will be slow to emend the text and slow to defend it, and his page will bristle with the obelus', was Housman's prescription.² In Goodyear's text the obeli fall thicker than the leaves in Vallombrosa. His commentary is an apparatus criticus writ large, with little room for exegesis and interpretation, save where these touch on the problems of the text. What he failed to supply he acknowledged much later in 'The *Aetna*: Thought, antecedents, and style'.³ For this failure he was criticized. But, to those who could see, the editor of *Aetna* was a powerful and original critic, blessed with a talent for conjectural emendation and a rare knowledge of the Latin language, and, for all his boldness, for all the biting rhetoric with which he delighted to demolish what he found unacceptable, never afraid to confess ignorance and doubt.

A revised text of *Aetna* and a new text of *Ciris* appeared the next year in the Oxford Text of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, a project which Goodyear devised with E. J. Kenney and both carried through with W. V. Clausen and J. A. Richmond in fortnightly seminars at Peterhouse, where, in the words of the senior partner, 'he was very pertinacious in holding and contesting his ground'. Later fruits of this happy partnership were papers on the interpretation of *Dirae* and *Copa*.⁴

Although he gave lectures by invitation in the Faculty of Classics, he did not gain a University appointment at Cambridge. In 1966 the Hildred Carlile Chair of Latin at Bedford College, London, became vacant by the retirement of R. B. Onians. Goodyear applied and was elected, at the age of 30. A few months earlier he had encouraged me to apply for one of the Research Fellowships which Queens' had advertised that year. My election followed within a few days of his own appointment.

² *Classical Papers*, p. 563.

³ In H. Temporini & W. Haase (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 32.1 (1984) pp. 344-63.

⁴ 'The *Dirae*', *PCPS* n.s., 20 (1971) pp. 30-43; 'The *Copa*: a text and commentary', *BICS*, 24 (1977) pp. 117-31.

A bottle of wine was opened, and we drank to our good fortunes. After a few glasses we decided to edit the *Iohannis* of Corippus.

This poem, from the sixth century, preserved in a single and very corrupt manuscript, describes the campaigns fought against the Moors in North Africa by a lieutenant of Justinian, Johannes Troglita. Its literary merit is small; its historical interest a little larger. Goodyear had published emendations in the text.⁵ We decided, that same afternoon, by the toss of a coin, who should take chief responsibility for the even-numbered books, who for the odd. Postcards, often several a week, were exchanged between Cambridge and London, announcing a new emendation. Or the telephone would ring, and a voice would announce, without preamble, 'At 4.378 read *uoce* for *iure*.' The edition, published by the Cambridge University Press in 1970, was not without faults. Neither of us had sufficiently acquainted himself with other surviving poetry of late antiquity. And we knew in our hearts that we were playing a game. But, in the years which followed, the study of Corippus has flourished, and more has been written on his text and interpretation since 1970 than in all the years between then and the discovery of the poem in 1820.⁶

His Inaugural Lecture in London (1967) was entitled 'The Future of Latin Studies in English Education'.

The spread of the comprehensive school demands great adaptation and change in what has hitherto been an élite subject . . . To establish Latin in the comprehensive schools is the most important task we face and the most invigorating challenge . . . Such is the need for good teaching materials that Latin scholars should devote less time to articles on minute questions of interest only to professionals and switch some of their energies to providing for the needs of students.

It seemed a surprising theme. We thought him the most conservative of conservatives; but here he was, in the van of the progressives. But the surprise that we register on rereading those words today, when the threat to Latin has become a reality, is that we ever allowed them to surprise us. If, in his own publications, he seldom declined from the path of pure research, the vigour with which he applied himself to the role of teacher showed him true to his word, and the reform of the Classical syllabus in the University of London owed much to him.

⁵ *Vigiliae Christianae*, 16 (1962) pp. 34-41.

⁶ For an assessment of the edition see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Gnomon*, 43 (1971) pp. 516-19. Goodyear published a few second thoughts on the text in *LCM*, 7 (1982) p. 28.

His first years in London were attended by many successes, both scholarly and administrative. He had a natural aptitude for administration. At Cambridge he had acted as Librarian of Queens' for four years and as Librarian of the Classical Faculty for three. At Bedford College, in addition to the management of the Latin Department, which under his leadership expanded in strength and numbers and achieved a pre-eminence among Departments of Latin within the University, he served on many important committees, and was Dean of the Faculty of Arts (1971-3) and Vice-Principal (1972-3). As a teacher he expected the best; he had no patience with the indolent. But those who worked hard found him an inspiring guide. He was much in demand as a supervisor of research students. They came, or were sent, not only from London but also from Cambridge and elsewhere.

These, then, were among his happiest years. The move to London, undertaken with mixed feelings, had turned out for the good. And in 1967 he married Cynthia Rosalie Attwood, who herself had read Classics at Newnham, and in the following year they had a son, Richard.

When Corippus was finished, Goodyear suggested that we should publish a complete collection of the classical papers and reviews of A. E. Housman. In his will Housman had expressly desired that no such collection should be made. In this prohibition lay vanity. Housman's earlier papers show him at his most vulnerable: ingenuity and invention are not yet under the control of that unerring instinct which puts so much of his later work beyond assail. Our justification for defying his prohibition will be found in the Preface: 'Housman's reputation is secure; and if he feared that the re-publication of earlier judgements later recanted might impair that reputation . . . then his fears were unfounded.' Further: 'In fifteen years the original copyright of Housman's papers expires, and it could not be expected that their re-publication would be delayed much beyond that time. It would be sad indeed to see them published in a hasty and slipshod manner, or otherwise than in their entirety.'

The heir to Housman's estate readily gave his permission. The three volumes were published in 1972. The papers were presented in chronological sequence.⁷ Every reference was checked

⁷ By an inherited error several papers are wrongly dated. This was pointed out by P. G. Naiditch, *American Notes and Queries*, 22 (1984) pp. 137-8, 23 (1985) p. 86.

and where necessary corrected; and, where Housman had referred to an edition no longer in use, a reference was added to the standard modern edition. The final volume contains indexes of all passages and topics discussed. For the quality of book-production the Cambridge University Press was awarded the Silver Medal at the exhibition 'Schönste Bücher Aus Aller Welt' at Leipzig in 1973.

The editions of Corippus and of Housman's papers were diversions from the ambitious task which Goodyear had set himself as soon as work on *Aetna* and *Ciris* was finished: an edition, with commentary, of the first six books of the *Annals* of Tacitus, which cover the reign of the emperor Tiberius. The edition was to occupy four volumes, and these were to be published within a space of ten years. The first, comprising the opening 54 chapters of *Annals* 1, was published in 1972 as volume 15 of *Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*, and the second, which reached the end of *Annals* 2, was published nine years later as volume 23. Earlier articles had offered a foretaste: two on the Leiden manuscript, whose claim to independent authority he demolished,⁸ one on the language and style of the *Annals*, in which he refuted the view that the later books regress towards normality,⁹ and one on Tacitus' attitude to social and moral change.¹⁰ And the pamphlet *Tacitus* offered what remains the most convenient introduction to the author.¹¹

The commentary was designed to supersede both that of H. Furneaux, then still standard among English readers, yet meagre on language and style, and on history showing its eighty years, and the more recent and ampler commentary in German of E. Koestermann, in exegesis breaking little new ground, on text and language derivative and fallible. 'Since Nipperdey no critic even of the second rank has edited Tacitus.'¹² But an edition on the scale which he envisaged called for a combination of talents which his other publications had not yet displayed. Novelty in emendation was not the foremost requirement, for the text of the *Annals* is much less corrupt than any on which he had worked hitherto. The requirement here is for just discrimination between what is tolerable and what is not in this most idiosyncratic of

⁸ *CQ* n.s., 15 (1965) pp. 299–322, and 20 (1970) pp. 365–70.

⁹ *JRS*, 58 (1968) pp. 22–31.

¹⁰ *BICS*, 17 (1970) pp. 101–6.

¹¹ *Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics* Vol. 4 (1970) (2nd edn with addenda 1979).

¹² *Annals*, 1.20.

stylists, and, when the transmitted text is judged not to be tolerable, between the conjectures of earlier scholars.

The constitution of the text played only one part in the whole design. Language, style, and historical content were of equal importance. He aimed to be comprehensive. And if, in the first volume, he falls short of that aim, he does so for a reason to which he confesses: 'In general I have written at length only of those historical questions which are closely associated with the interpretation of Tacitus' text. Being no historian, I still fear reproach for trespassing even thus far upon alien territory.'¹³ But he had a clear view of the nature of Tacitean history: of the ways in which Tacitus used and misused his sources, of the personal prejudices and artistic motives which coloured his choice of material and the manner of its presentation. These views found lucid expression in a section of his Introduction entitled 'Aspects of Tacitean Historiography'.

In the second volume, 'more attention is . . . accorded to historical matters'. Here, indeed, a better balance is found, and a firmer grasp is shown of the issues which are of interest to historians. Yet the heart of this volume, as of the first, lies in the handling of language and style, not least in the rigorous analysis of the tone and antecedents of Tacitus' vocabulary. In one of his earliest reviews Goodyear had complained of a critic who 'shows little understanding of the complications and subtleties of a literary language, of what, for instance, is poetical, what prosaic. He seems to live in a world of black and white, with no shades and nuances.'¹⁴ Countless notes assign to words and phrases their true colours and their proper place in the historical development of the Latin language: for example, on 1.1.2 *gliscente*, 1.38.2 *intumescete*, 1.56.2 *properauerat*, 2.1.2 *prolis*, 2.5.2 *celerandae*, 2.10.1 *hostiliter haberi*, 2.13.3 *matrimonia*, 2.16.1 *pone tergum*, 2.26.1 *patrari*.

Of his stylistic sense, his sureness of discrimination between alternatives, where rational choice appears not to be easy, a single example. At 1.62.1 the transmitted text is *Igitur † romanis † qui aderat exercitus*. . . . The choice is between *Romanus* (Beroaldus) and *omnis* (Andresen). Goodyear describes the latter as 'appreciably better', and lists his reasons:

igitur, resumptive as often, marks the moment when the feelings described at 61.1 [*permoto ad miserationem omni qui aderat exercitu*] are

¹³ *Annals*, 1.vii.

¹⁴ A review of G. B. A. Fletcher's *Annotations on Tacitus* (*Gnomon*, 36 [1964] pp. 586–9).

translated into action. The repetition effects both emphasis and pathos, heightening the emotion of an already intense scene, and works the more strongly if carried through fully by *omnis*. Further, the point that all participate, from Germanicus downwards, is aptly stressed. On the other hand, *Romanus* seems vacuous, since the Roman army is not contrasted with any other . . .

The virtues of such a note can escape the perception of minds less finely tuned.¹⁵

In the assembly and disposition of a remarkable range of material, linguistic, stylistic, and historical, and in the clarity and firmness and honesty of his handling of it, he laid, throughout the 850 pages of these two volumes, the cornerstone of his monument.

To the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II: Latin Literature* (1982) he contributed the chapter on Sallust and a large part of the section on the early principate (Minor Poetry, Prose Satire, History and Biography, Technical Writing, Rhetoric and Scholarship). He became increasingly interested in the historian M. Junianus Justinus, whose work, probably written in the third century, is our only source for the 44 books of the *Historiae Philippicae* of the Augustan historian Pompeius Trogus. 'The relationship of Justin's epitome to the lost work of Trogus is far from clear', he had written.¹⁶ In a paper which followed he threw much fresh light on that relationship and demonstrated that 'the proportion of virtually unchanged Trogan material which survives in Justin is much higher than seems commonly to be supposed'.¹⁷

He published over sixty reviews. He handled not only those authors on whom he had worked himself but authors embracing virtually the whole span of Latin literature: Ennius, Lucilius, Lucretius, Cicero, Livy, Ovid, Velleius Paterculus, Pomponius Mela, Phaedrus, Columella, Petronius, Calpurnius Siculus, Lucan, the elder Seneca, Quintilian, Juvenal, Florus, Aulus Gellius, Avienus, Martianus Capella, the *Ilias Latina*. Pride of place goes to the series of seven reviews of D. R. Shackleton Bailey's editions of the Letters of Cicero, reviews which, over a period of sixteen years, occupied nearly forty pages of *Gnomon*.

¹⁵ Full marks to C. E. Murgia, *CP*, 79 (1984) p. 31 ('the analysis is exactly right'). None to the reviewers in *CR* n.s., 32 (1982) p. 179 and *Gnomon*, 54 (1982) p. 347.

¹⁶ *Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, p. 735.

¹⁷ 'On the character and text of Justin's compilation of Trogus', *PACA*, 16 (1982) pp. 1-24.

Another notable review was of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968–82), whose deficiencies he saw more clearly than most.¹⁸ He offered abundant illustration of its unreliability in the classification of the meanings of individual words.¹⁹ His most telling criticism was directed against the decision to exclude all authors later than the second century AD, which has robbed us of many important words which must have been in common use for centuries earlier but which happen not to be attested in texts surviving before this time.²⁰

The reviews are remarkable no less for the trenchancy and confidence of their expression than for their range. The tone which he often adopted discomfited many, and not only the authors of the books reviewed. Some will complain that he had learned too much from Housman. Housman was his model and his ideal, the standard of intellectual rigour against which he judged himself and others. We may, indeed, regret that he was prone to clothe his thoughts in garments he had borrowed from Housman: 'If quality of emendations were the only criterion of scholarly excellence, Rhenanus might vie with Pichena and Nipperdey for the second place amongst Tacitean scholars.'²¹ Goodyear, like Housman, struck hard, when the blow was deserved. But he looked for merit, and when he found it he said so. 'This is a strange and rather exasperating book, of questionable value . . . On the credit side there are a few notes of real merit.'²² 'His book illustrates all too clearly the grotesque miscarriages which must ensue when a scholar of indifferent learning and unsteady judgement is plagued by a bee in his bonnet . . . Yet Böhm has a little of value to offer.'²³ His undiluted scorn was reserved for those whose name had outstripped their merits or had escaped scot-free too long. 'Many promising young scholars find it hard to get their work into print, and many older scholars, after a lifetime's labour and substantial contributions to their subject, will go to the grave without a *Festschrift*. M. Herrmann has never lacked recognition, and there are few indeed who

¹⁸ *PACA*, 17 (1983) pp. 124–36.

¹⁹ For earlier instances of this criticism in his commentary on the *Annals*, see his notes on 2.6.2 *pontibus*, 2.8.3 *insultant*, 2.15.1 *onusta*.

²⁰ His earliest outburst against this failing is to be found in his note on *Annals* 2.24.3. See also his paper 'Pompeius Trogus and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*', *LCM*, 7 (1982) pp. 13–14.

²¹ *Annals*, 1.7.

²² *Gnomon*, 36 (1964) p. 586, p. 588.

²³ *CR* n.s., 31 (1981) p. 294.

would deny that he has earned a footnote in the history of scholarship and left a mark on Latin studies in Belgium which will long endure.²⁴

His strength as a textual critic came in large part from the concentration of mind which he was able to apply to any problem and the speed with which he was able to grasp and recover the author's train of thought. In penetration of mind, in ability to detect corruption, in fineness of discrimination between the probable solution and the merely plausible, and finally in the ability to make conjectures of his own which mend the text with a high degree of probability, throughout a wide range of authors, he has few equals among Latin scholars of this century. If he lacked, or did not possess in great measure, one gift, it was a gift which very few possess: 'the textual critic's greatest gift, that power of divination which turned *δόρυκ' ἀνημέρω* into *δορυκανεῖ μόρωι* at Aesch. *Suppl.* 987, *κρατεῖς* into *κάτει* at *Medea* 1015;²⁵ or which turned *iura piasses* into *peiiurasses* or *stellarum sidere uidi* into *stellarunt sidere diui* (Housman at *Ciris* 155 and 534). But, as he observed of Shackleton Bailey, 'The most cogent of his corrections are seldom spectacular. And why should they be? The real virtue of a conjecture . . . is rightness, not superficial brilliance.'²⁶ In *Ciris* we can scarcely doubt the rightness of his *furtiue* for *furtim* (*at*)*que* at 186. And numerous conjectures in Corippus, if they fall short of the spectacular, have the compensating virtues of simplicity, straightforwardness, and certainty (such as 2.339 *pacare* for *placare*, 4.346 *quosque* for *postque*, 5.182 *fatis* for *natis*, 5.306 *tremetem* for *tremendum*, 6.73 *perfidus* for *feruidus*). In Tacitus, where conjecture was rarely called for, few will quibble with his *ei* for *et* at 2.43.4; and his *nullis inquirent <ti res> tium* at 2.61.1, though far from certain, restores what is needed with remarkable neatness and economy.²⁷ Perhaps others before long would have restored *appello* for *Apollo* in line 3 of the poem on Alcestis in the newly discovered palimpsest from Barcelona.²⁸ But how long

²⁴ *CR* n.s., 20 (1970) p. 104.

²⁵ Denys Page, 'Richard Porson (1759-1808)', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 45 (1959) p. 231.

²⁶ *Gnomon*, 51 (1979) p. 534.

²⁷ This conjecture illustrates his belief, undoubtedly right, that accidental omission, sometimes caused by parablepsy, is often a more plausible diagnosis in prose authors than deliberate interpolation or other types of corruption. See his remarks in *Gnomon*, 42 (1970) p. 374, *CR* n.s., 23 (1973) p. 39. As further illustration of his success in applying this remedy one might quote *qu <em fin> em* at Vell. Pat. 2.86.2 (published in A. J. Woodman's edition, 1983).

²⁸ *LCM*, 9 (1984) p. 28.

should we have had to wait for a scholar to restore *siciliamus* for *sigillamus* (or *si uellamus* or the like) at Columella 2.17.1?²⁹ And if to change *defendite* to *dependite* at Claudian 15.462 should appear to be a feat of facile brilliance, let us remember that five centuries of scholars, Scaliger and Heinsius among them, had acquiesced in the transmitted reading, and that the glory here is not the solution but the perception that a problem exists.³⁰

His strength came also in part from his absolute mastery of the critic's trade. As he wrote, in reviewing a critic who did not know his trade: 'There are, in order of importance, three main considerations which a critic will bear in mind: (i) the requirements of the sense, (ii) Latin usage, established either by parallel or analogy, and (iii) the likelihood of any particular corruption.'³¹ He was adept at classifying corruptions, in knowing what was likely and what was not. And he was supremely well equipped to weigh the merits of rival conjectures against each other. Hence the excellence of many of his reviews. And this excellence is never more apparent than when he was given the opportunity to accord praise rather than blame. The reviews of Ogilvie's commentary on Livy 1-5,³² Winterbottom's Quintilian,³³ Ranstrand's Pomponius Mela,³⁴ Hine's Seneca, *Nat. Qu.* 2,³⁵ Watt's Cicero, *Ad familiares*,³⁶ as well as the reviews of Shackleton Bailey, are notable for the sureness with which he assesses the difficulty of the editor's task and the discrimination with which he recognizes how successfully each editor has discharged it.

Among his greatest virtues, and one which the world at large did not see, but which his friends and pupils saw, and which bound them to him with a loyalty and affection which the world perhaps did not understand, was the selfless help which he gave to younger scholars. Some testimony may be found in the publications of scholars whose research he directed.³⁷ I quote not

²⁹ *LCM*, 3 (1978) pp. 191-2.

³⁰ The conjecture was published in J. B. Hall's Teubner edition (1985).

³¹ *Gnomon*, 45 (1973) p. 566.

³² *CR* n.s., 16 (1966) pp. 60-3. All three of the conjectures which Goodyear proposed in this review were accepted by Ogilvie in his later Oxford Text (1974).

³³ *CR* n.s., 23 (1973) pp. 37-40.

³⁴ *CR* n.s., 25 (1975) pp. 45-6.

³⁵ *CR* n.s., 34 (1984) pp. 44-5.

³⁶ *CR* n.s., 36 (1986) pp. 241-3.

³⁷ D. B. Gain, *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar* (1976); A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative* (1977) and *The Caesarian*

from one of these pupils but from a more recent pupil, whose research awaits publication:

I thought him a truly outstanding supervisor. It did not take me long to realise that he could help me in a way no other English scholar could. As a student of the text, syntax and vocabulary of post-Ciceronian prose authors, he had I believe no equal. But more important than this was the manner in which he taught. I found that he treated my work with just the same attitude as those books which he reviewed. The effect of this was to spur me on to produce work that was above criticism, if I possibly could.

In 1974 he had been elected a Member of the Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana of Mantua. He was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1984. Another honour which he valued highly was his appointment as an Advisory Editor of *Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries*, a role in which he served from 1974 to 1987.

Φιλέει ὁ θεός, said Herodotus, τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν. In the early 1980s Bedford College was placed in severe financial difficulties. Plans were announced for its amalgamation with Royal Holloway College and for the abandonment of its buildings in Regent's Park. Goodyear was foremost among those who opposed these plans. He threatened to resign his Chair if they went through. His friends tried to urge caution, or knew better than to try. For a time he hoped that he might be appointed to a Chair at another College in London. This hope was thwarted. The amalgamation was agreed. In 1984 he resigned and accepted an appointment as Visiting Professor at the University of the Witwatersrand.

His connection with Southern Africa was of long standing. The University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland had formerly enjoyed the status of a College of London University; and in his early years at Bedford College he had accepted responsibility for overseeing its examinations in Classics and had visited Rhodesia several times. He went far beyond what his official duties required. He stimulated research and publication, and refounded the journal *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations*, which for more than ten years, with him as joint editor, was to publish important work, some of it solicited from British scholars. When, shortly before the country gained independence,

and Augustan Narrative (1983); R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris: A Poem attributed to Virgil* (1978); R. A. Harvey, *A Commentary on Persius* (1981); J. Booth, *Ovid, Amores ii* (1989).

the University severed its links with London, he continued to act as external examiner, and was often invited, during his visits, to lecture in South Africa.

At Witwatersrand, where his appointment was for a limited but renewable period, he was soon made Chairman of the Governing Committee of the Department of Classics, and effectively became Head of the Department. Here again, as in Rhodesia, he played an important administrative role, reorganizing a Department which had lost its way, encouraging young scholars, and promoting hitherto unimagined contacts between his own Department and those in other Afrikaans-speaking Universities in the country. But there was a heavy price to pay. Burdened with administration, and isolated from the books which he needed and from the stimulus of equal minds, he wrote little. Work on the remaining volumes of his commentary on the *Annals* ceased. The climate impaired his health; and he impaired it further by heavy drinking. His declared intention was to return to Britain, or to seek an appointment in America or Australia. But the combative spirit which found expression in his writings had been seen all too often in public and private relations too. And the state of his health was well known.

He returned to England on sabbatical leave in 1986–7, and helped to organize a Colloquium in Gonville and Caius College, to celebrate the 80th birthday of Charles Brink, in March 1987. He delivered the speech in his old teacher's honour after the banquet which concluded the festivities. It was to be the last glimpse of the generosity and loyalty which he never withheld where he felt them due. He returned to South Africa soon afterwards, and on the night of 24 July 1987 he died in his sleep, after a heart attack.

He is survived by his wife Rosalie, and by his son Richard, who came up to St John's in 1986 to read Classics, and who scattered his father's ashes in the Fellows' garden.

JAMES DIGGLE