HARRY JOCELYN

# Henry David Jocelyn
# 1933–2000

HENRY DAVID JOCELYN, the distinguished Australian Latinist, died on 22 October 2000 in Oxford. He was born on 22 August 1933 at Bega, a small town in southern New South Wales known for dairy farming, the first of four children of John Daniel Jocelyn and Phyllis Irene Jocelyn (née Burton), both native-born Australians. John Jocelyn was a police constable of the NSW Police Force, and Harry was born at home in a police residence attached to the court house and jail, where his father supervised low-risk prisoners. His mother was the daughter of another country policeman.

The family had colourful origins of a sort highly prized these days in Australia. John Jocelyn came from the Araluen and Majors Creek goldfields, where his family had settled in about 1860 after arriving from England in 1856. John's father too was Australian-born. From his mother's line Harry inherited a good deal of convict blood. Fifteen members of this side of the family, of both Irish and English origin, were convicts, traceable as far back as the First Fleet. They included a highway robber and a machine breaker, and several Irish patriots and petty thieves.

Harry (as he was always known) began school in Bega, but in the late war years his father became involved in an incident which was to work to his son's educational advantage. Bega, like many country towns of the time, was split on sectarian lines. The Jocelyn family were Protestants (despite Phyllis's strong Catholic links). Harry indeed had been admitted to the children's choir of St John's Church of England at a particularly early age because of his precocious reading ability. John Jocelyn accused

*Proceedings of the British Academy,* **120**, 277–299. 

the local Catholic priest of running a crooked gambling establishment in his spare time, and refused to allocate him petrol coupons on the grounds that he was 'not performing an essential service'. Members of the Catholic Church organised a petition to have Jocelyn removed from Bega, and the Protestants for their part got up a petition to have him retained. The affair was investigated by the police authorities, and it was decided in the interests of local harmony that Jocelyn should be transferred to Sydney.

So it was that in late 1944 Harry found himself in Earlwood, in the western suburbs of Sydney. He briefly attended the Earlwood Primary School, and from there had the good fortune to move on to Canterbury Boys' High School in 1946. Canterbury, like various other state maintained high schools scattered about Sydney at the time, was a selective school which drew bright boys from a wide catchment area. The school produced numerous academics, including classicists, as well as the odd politician. Its *alumni* include a Corresponding Fellow of the Academy (the late R. E. Emmerick). According to family tradition, Harry had since early childhood declared his intention of becoming a professor of Latin, after hearing of the exploits of a local worthy, Sir John Peden (1871–1946), who had gone on from Bega to take first-class honours in Latin at the University of Sydney (1892) and had taught briefly in the Department of Latin before becoming Challis Professor of Law. Peden was still active as President of the New South Wales Legislative Council when Harry was a boy in Bega, and was often spoken of locally. Anecdotes about Harry at this time stress his studiousness, and certainly later he paraded a lofty indifference to more typical Australian pursuits. Nevertheless, his brother Bill recalls being taken as a young boy by the fourteen-year old Harry to the Sydney Cricket Ground on the day in November 1947 when Bradman scored his hundredth hundred. At Canterbury Harry fell under the influence of Jack Gibbes, a Classics teacher of much learning and great enthusiasm. A man with prominent teeth and a craggy visage, Gibbes exuded eccentricity and enjoyed a reputation for a little stirring, qualities which appealed to the young Jocelyn. Harry was *dux* of the year throughout his time at Canterbury.

Jocelyn entered the University of Sydney in 1951, and graduated Bachelor of Arts in 1955, with first class honours and the University Medal in Greek and first class honours and the University Medal in Latin. University Medals are only rarely awarded, and it was a highly exceptional, perhaps unique, achievement that Jocelyn should have gained two in the same year.

The start of Jocelyn's long and eventful career as a controversialist can be traced back to his undergraduate days at Sydney. The pages of the student newspaper, *Honi Soit*, in this period are full of combative letters and articles under his name on a range of issues of the day, such as National Service training, religion, and the anti-communist hysteria during the McCarthy era.

In his first year as an undergraduate Jocelyn involved himself in a controversy which followed a public lecture on 'The University and religion' given by the Professor of Philosophy, John Anderson (1893–1962). Anderson was a notorious controversialist himself and several times the subject of questions in the state parliament after his public lectures, one of which began with an assertion that religion had no more place in education than a snake in Iceland. Anderson's criticism of the philosopher Whitehead for his theistic views provoked a furious response in *Honi Soit*. On 20 September 1951 Jocelyn entered the fray in an article entitled 'Belief in unbelief', in which he attacked one of Anderson's critics (a second-year student, Roderick Meagher, later to be a Judge of Appeal) and delivered some trenchant views on 'faith' and on the student Evangelical Union. The language reminds one of some of his later reviews, with one or two favourite words already in use. Typical attitudes are already apparent. 'Faith', he wrote, 'in the infallibility of one's beliefs betrays the doubt lurking beneath the theological verbiage and is merely a cover-up for the lack of evidence for them.' There is also a characteristic deployment of the outrageous: he admitted 'the possibility that unrepentant atheists, agnostics, and modernists roast in hell, while repentant murderers and thieves feast in heaven'. The affair rumbled on in the paper, with Jocelyn getting as good as he gave (a letter of 27 September refers to 'Mr Jocelyn's display of mental befuddlement') but constantly returning to the attack. Anderson seems to have been content to allow Jocelyn to speak on his behalf. The entry on Anderson in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* (vol. 7) describes a character in many ways similar to Jocelyn himself.

Two years later, when a prominent Methodist clergyman, the Revd Alan Walker, brought the so-called Methodist 'Mission to the Nation' to Sydney University, Jocelyn was again moved to denounce Christian faith and to promote his own faith (in 'evidence'), in a piece entitled 'A rationalist looks at the Mission to the Nation' (17 September 1953). 'Perhaps the most objectionable feature of Mr Walker's apologetic', he said, 'is his emphasis on the need for faith. . . . We laugh at the faith of the gambler, but is it not for this very reason, that his hopes are not grounded on rational evidence?' 'The findings of astronomy', he went on, employing a

clash of registers of a sort to which he often later resorted, 'would suggest that man is nothing more than a speck of sentient dung clinging to a recess of eternal and infinite space.' Alan Walker remained a sparring partner of Jocelyn's for a considerable time. A decade later, in the early 1960s when Jocelyn had returned from England, the pair took part in a public debate in the university on the subject of the historical Jesus. Walker's impassioned, faith-invoking peroration was countered by Jocelyn's parting shot, 'There is not enough evidence of the doings of Jesus to fill a respectable BA thesis.'

Australia was felt to be imperilled in the early 1950s, and National Service was compulsory. Students were drafted into the Sydney University Regiment and received training of a sort (described by Jocelyn in an article of the time as 'farcical') at Ingleburn, NSW. On 30 July 1953 we find Jocelyn publishing an attack (under the heading 'Does Army produce citizens or zombies?'), not so much on the institution of National Service itself, as on the notion that military training made one a good citizen. 'The army', he wrote, 'is incapable of teaching even civic morality, for murder and robbery are the chief subjects of the military curriculum. . . . Such a life is plainly the negation of citizenship and it is small wonder that the chief amusements of the soldier are the brothel and the tavern.' During the visit by the Queen soon after the Coronation, Jocelyn was deemed to be a 'security risk' because of his outspoken views on such matters, and he was accordingly placed in the back row of the guard of honour mounted by the Sydney University Regiment. Like several professors of Latin, he never learned to drive a car, and that failing he put down to his experiences as a trainee tank driver during National Service. A tank in his charge ran out of control, and he was henceforth classified as unfit for driving.

Jocelyn was not particularly political in later years,[1] though always ready to argue against someone else's position. He never voted in a British election, asserting that it was 'none of his business'. The writings of his in *Honi Soit* to which I have had access are for the most part not on political themes. An article of 26 March 1953, however, headed 'A Stalinoid speaks', objects in typical manner to another correspondent's 'belief in the possibility of defining clearly the black from the white in the present ideological confusion', and moves on to condemn the error of becoming 'hysterical and intolerant of everything savouring of communism' simply

[1] It was widely believed for some reason in Manchester University that he was a communist.

because of the crimes committed by individual communist officials. The article must have seemed outrageous at the time. It questions the methods adopted by the Western powers in the Cold War, appears to exonerate the traitor Fuchs, and suggests that the destruction wrought on innocent women and children in Korea 'gives us no ground for pride'.

Reading the pages of *Honi Soit* some fifty years on one is struck by the readiness of a student (Anderson's critic and Jocelyn's opponent) to take issue in direct terms with the Professor of Philosophy in print, by the strong language of the debate, and by Jocelyn's command at the age of eighteen of a form of invective which was to remain characteristic of him throughout his academic career. It has sometimes been said that in his reviews he was merely imitating Housman, but the style of his writings decades later is indistinguishable from that which he was already using in 1951.

When Jocelyn entered the University of Sydney the Professor of Latin was the Roman historian R. E. Smith (1910–78), who held the chair from 1946–53, before returning to England to the Chair of Ancient History at the University of Manchester (1953–74). Smith's influence on the course of Jocelyn's career was, many years later, to be profound. Smith was replaced by A. J. Dunston (1922–2000), who arrived from Reading in 1953 and maintained a lifelong connection with Jocelyn. A. H. McDonald (1908–79), Professor of 'Ancient World History', overlapped briefly with Jocelyn, who took History I in his first year. McDonald was in Sydney until 1951. It was probably G. P. Shipp (1900–80) who had the greatest influence on Jocelyn. Though he became Professor of Greek in 1954 and is known mainly for his writings on Greek language, Shipp was a member of the Latin department for half of the forty years he spent in the University. He had published (with A. B. Powe) a commentary on Livy book 22 in 1932, and, more significantly, a commentary on Terence's *Andria* in 1938 (second edition 1960), a work of modest scale which has many valuable observations on the language of comedy and on Latin usage in general. During Jocelyn's undergraduate years Shipp also published two important papers on the language of Plautus ('Greek in Plautus', *Wiener Studien*, 66 (1953), 'Plautine terms for Greek and Roman things', *Glotta,* 34, 1954–5). Jocelyn attended Shipp's class on Plautus, and decades later often spoke of Shipp's elucidation of this or that Plautine problem, including his decisive explanation of the odd expression *Athenis Atticis*. Neither Jocelyn nor this obituarist could remember what that explanation was, but agreed that it was decisive. Jocelyn had an abiding interest in Plautus, though unfortunately his commentary on the

*Pseudolus* was never completed. His edition of the tragedies of Ennius (see below) throughout displays the influence of Shipp's approach to the study of early Latin vocabulary. As recently as 1999 Jocelyn reverted to the subject of Shipp's first Plautine paper, in 'Code-switching in the Comoedia Palliata' (in *Rezeption und Identität*, ed. G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel).

After graduating Jocelyn was awarded the Cooper Travelling Scholarship in Classics by the University of Sydney, and he went in October 1955 to St John's College, Cambridge as an affiliated student. He graduated Bachelor of Arts in 1957, with starred first class honours in the second part of the Classical Tripos. At St John's he was a contemporary of F. R. D. Goodyear (1936–87). The pair saw eye to eye on most things, and shared certain characteristics. A long friendship ensued. Jocelyn was awarded the Sandys Studentship by the University of Cambridge in 1957 and the Craven Studentship in 1958. From 1957 to 1959 he was a scholar at the British School in Rome.

In the summer of 1957 Jocelyn began his Cambridge doctoral dissertation under the supervision of the Kennedy Professor of Latin, C. O. Brink (1907–94). He was to have a long and close friendship with Brink, whose obituary he wrote in this journal. In an obituary (in the Sicilian journal *Sileno*) of the Italian scholar Scevola Mariotti (1920–2000) which he completed shortly before his death, Jocelyn wrote revealingly of his early days as a research student. He was by late 1957 in Italy. As he puts it, 'what I wanted to do long remained unclear'. Otto Skutsch (1906–90), Professor of Latin at University College London, had advised him to read Mariotti's *Lezioni su Ennio* (1951), and he acquired a copy in a Roman bookshop. Soon afterwards he wrote to Mariotti and was invited to Urbino to meet him. The obituary contrasts the distaste Jocelyn felt for the attitudes he had encountered in Cambridge and at the British School with the appeal of Mariotti's approach to classical scholarship. 'Literary critics', he states, 'seemed to do no more than analyse their own feeling.' At the British School the prevailing atmosphere was 'odd', and marked by 'a certain hostility to letters, a wariness of history, . . . and a totally uncritical belief in the power of archaeology to answer serious questions about classical antiquity'. Mariotti, by contrast, in his first meeting with Jocelyn, 'made very clear his distaste for large judgement-laden literary syntheses and his fascination with apparently small problems capable of being defined and perhaps even solved. He emphasised . . . the need to study the authors who cite what we have of Ennius and the other early tragedians and to pay attention to the work of scholars who preceded Ribbeck and Vahlen.' Such talk, Jocelyn went on,

gave special joy to 'one who had attended out of curiosity lectures by members of the Cambridge Faculty of English and listened with appalled disbelief to advocacy, sober and unsober, of the introduction of their approach to the Faculty of Classics'. The attitudes apparent here were those that governed the whole of Jocelyn's scholarly career. Literary criticism of the type which he felt to be 'judgement-laden', particularly if it were written in English and presented itself as a modern advance, he despised. His fine library contains few modern works written in English. His taste was for problems of detail, or, in a wider sense, for what he would call 'literary history'. He complied with Mariotti's exhortation to consult earlier scholarship when investigating any problem, and his articles are heavily burdened with citations of early editions. In conversation he would often pour scorn on modern scholars who were merely rediscovering what had been discovered long ago. His own work on fragments and his reviews of others' editions of fragmentary authors show a mastery of ancient grammatical writers and their methods of citation. Above all, Jocelyn's regard for Continental, including Italian, classical scholarship goes back to his days in Italy, though Brink and Skutsch were also influential. Jocelyn rarely attended conferences in England (though he made an exception of the Liverpool/Leeds Latin Seminar, which attracted numerous scholars from abroad), but was constantly performing at gatherings on the Continent. Between 1989 and 1995, for instance, he delivered a total of fifty-one papers, thirty-four in Italy and only four in Britain. He reserved his fiercest reviews for works written in English, whether by British or American scholars, and was usually somewhat milder when dealing with Italian works. Throughout his career Jocelyn visited Italy frequently, and maintained friendships with a number of Italian scholars in addition to Mariotti, including S. Timpanaro, A. La Penna, M. Geymonat, P. Gatti, G. Salanitro, and S. Prete. In Germany he was on friendly terms with E. Lefèvre at Freiburg, who published a tribute to him after his death,[2] G. Vogt-Spira at Greifswald, the ancient medical historian K.-D. Fischer in Mainz, and various scholars at the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich (see below).

Jocelyn's doctoral dissertation was submitted in 1961 and he took the degree in 1963. The revised dissertation was published in 1967 by Cambridge University Press as *The Tragedies of Ennius*, a work which has achieved the status of a classic and is cited as the standard edition of the

[2] In U. Auhagen (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus*' Epidicus (Tübingen, 2001), pp. 11–12 (with photograph).

fragments. The edition displays a formidable knowledge of the Greek sources of Ennius and a close attention to the contexts in which the fragments are cited by ancient authors. Each of the major fragments is introduced by a discursive essay which analyses the form of the citation and the metrical features of the fragment, and reviews in magisterial fashion earlier interpretations of the passage. Jocelyn then proceeds to a discussion of the phraseology of each of the verses. A marked feature of these linguistic discussions is the constant attempt to distinguish within the category 'Republican drama' between the language of comedy and that of contemporary tragic fragments. Some notable distinctions emerge. Jocelyn always sought if he could to elucidate the language of Republican authors by restricting himself to illustrative material from the Republic itself. This method is to be seen clearly in one of his latest papers, on Catullus ('The arrangement and the language of Catullus' so-called *polymetra*', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (1999) (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 93)).

Jocelyn was not a writer of books. The edition of Ennius was the only book he wrote, though an annotated translation done in collaboration with B. P. Setchell of two seventeenth-century medical treatises, *Regnier de Graaf on the Human Reproductive Organs* (Supplement xvii, *Journal of Reproduction and Fertility* (1972)), is of book length (on which see below). Apart from these works, his publications comprise on a rough count fifty-six papers in books, conference proceedings and *Festschriften*, eighty-six articles in journals, and 131 reviews, many of them of article length. He also edited jointly with various others a collection of essays in honour of C. O. Brink (1989), selected papers of F. R. D. Goodyear (1992), and a notable volume in honour of John Pinsent (*Tria Lustra*, 1993). It is noticeable that, after the first decade or so of his writing career, during which he regularly contributed to the standard anglophone refereed journals, he turned increasingly to less prestigious journals run by his friends. After 1979 he contributed more than forty items to the *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, which had been founded by his friend Pinsent, and from the late 1980s more than a dozen papers to the Sicilian journal *Sileno*, which was edited by another friend, Salanitro. He fell into the habit of denouncing Anglo-Saxon refereed journals, asserting that the opinion of a learned editor (particularly if he were German or Italian) was worth more than the collective opinion of a committee of 'referees'. In the obituary of Mariotti referred to earlier Jocelyn noted with approval Mariotti's willingness to 'honour with a textual note the humble [journal] as much as the mighty'.

In 1960 Jocelyn was appointed to a lectureship in Latin at the University of Sydney. He was rapidly promoted, to a senior lectureship in 1964, a readership in 1966, and to a personal chair in 1970. In 1970 he was elected a Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities, and he became a member of the council in 1972. He was not infrequently away from Sydney, and in the winter semester of 1967 he went as a visiting professor to the Department of Classics, Yale University.

In 1965 Jocelyn was back in Cambridge, on sabbatical leave from Sydney. He launched himself into controversy again, this time by means of a review published in *The Cambridge Review* (20 February 1965) of the Greek play of the year, Sophocles' *Oedipus tyrannus*. The review was signed only with the initials 'HDJ'. Jocelyn began with some strong remarks about the wooden acting ('The actors were clearly not told that they had some duty to give the audience their money's worth in entertainment . . . They achieved the gentility of a public school recitation'), then turned his attention to a favourite theme, the defective pronunciation of the ancient languages perpetrated by some products of the British public school system. A. H Robinson, a lecturer in Latin at Sydney during Jocelyn's student days, had been a notorious stickler for the reformed pronunciation of Latin, and his attitudes had rubbed off on Jocelyn. 'The enunciation of the Greek', Jocelyn wrote in his review, 'was a disgrace to a great centre of classical learning . . . the ludicrous practice of accenting Greek words as if they were Latin ones and shifting the accent when necessary to suit an imagined "ictus" of the verse offends both the philological conscience and the sensitive ear. . . . The actors of the Cambridge *Oidipous* emitted a meaningless gabble pausing for the most part only when they needed breath.'

The review greatly offended the Regius Professor of Greek, D. L. Page (1908–78), who wrote an irate letter to the magazine on 27 February, in which he affected not to know the identity of 'HDJ' (though he had taught Jocelyn a few years earlier). He described the reviewer's style as 'arrogant' and his spirit as 'uncharitable', and asserted that his 'statements [were] a mixture of the shallow and the ill-informed'. He exhorted the reader not to pay 'serious attention' to HDJ's 'diatribe on the pronunciation of Greek', claiming that 'none of us knows the answers'.

That was not the end of the affair. On 6 March there appeared a long letter from R. D. Dawe taking the side of Jocelyn against Page in no uncertain terms. Dawe defended a good deal of Jocelyn's invective, not least in the matter of pronunciation of Greek. 'The strange bleating noises', Dawe wrote, 'and the frequent stress on words corresponding neither with any

metrical nor any accentual principle made the greater part of the play incomprehensible for many of us.' Jocelyn had his final say in a letter of the same day, in which, having noted the reactions to his review, he opined that the audiences of the play had 'got what they deserved'.

Jocelyn was not to remain long in the University of Sydney after his remarkably early elevation to a personal chair. By the end of 1973 he had moved to the Hulme Chair of Latin in the University of Manchester, a move which was to initiate a colourful period in the history of the subject in that institution. The circumstances of his appointment are somewhat obscure. At the time the Professor of Latin was G. B. Kerferd (1915–98), another Australian, but (perhaps significantly) a native of Melbourne. Kerferd, a Greek philosopher and not a Latinist, had held a senior lectureship in Manchester in the 1950s and from there had moved on to the Chair of Classics in Swansea. In 1967, following the retirement of the Hulme Professor of Latin, W. H. Semple (1900–81), he returned to Manchester as Professor of Latin. His professorial colleague was H. D. Westlake (1906–92), who held the Hulme Chair of Greek until his retirement in 1972. Kerferd's appointment, despite his lack of credentials in Latin, was justified on the grounds of administrative need, as the Department in Manchester was not flourishing and Kerferd had built up a reputation as a good organiser at Swansea. When Westlake retired, Kerferd (perhaps against his will) was moved sideways to the Chair of Greek, and the University set about finding a new Professor of Latin. At the time the University of Manchester did not advertise chairs. It was believed, in the words of the Vice-Chancellor, Sir William Mansfield Cooper (1903–92), as recorded in the Council Minutes for 15 July 1964, 'that in many cases it would be to the disadvantage of the University to advertise vacant chairs'. It is not known whether Jocelyn was the first person approached, but when he was it was undoubtedly through the influence of his old Sydney professor, R. E. Smith. Remarkably, Jocelyn was appointed from Australia without being summoned for interview.

At the time of his appointment Jocelyn's output numbered some fifteen articles, several reviews and the book on Ennius, and there were as well some items in press, including the translation of de Graaf. There was little sign in print at this time of the remarkable breadth of his interests. In this early period his research lay mainly in early Republican poetry and its reception and citation in the late Republic and beyond. Some of his best work dates from this period. I refer to two articles on 'Ancient scholarship and Virgil's use of Republican Latin poetry' (*Classical Quarterly*, 14 (1964), 15 (1965)), the 'The quotations of Republican drama in Priscian's treatise

*De metris fabularum Terentii*' (*Antichthon*, 1 (1967)), and particularly to weighty pieces on 'The poems of Quintus Ennius', in *Aufstieg und Niedegang der römischen Welt*, I. 2, and on 'Greek poetry in Cicero's prose writings' (*Yale Classical Studies*, 23 (1973)). Jocelyn always had an interest in the state religion of Rome, and his early article 'The Roman nobility and the religion of the Republican state' (*Journal of Religious History*, 4 (1966)) is something of a classic, though he himself was wont to disown it in later years.

The edition of de Graaf is little known among classicists, but regarded as important in some scientific circles. At the 190th meeting of the Society for Endocrinology held at the Royal College of Physicians in London in November 1999 a speaker singled the work out for high praise. As a piece of classical scholarship it is a minor masterpiece. The annotations comprise in part material of a physiological kind written by Setchell, and in part notes by Jocelyn on the Greek and Latin sexual terminology of de Graaf. Though Jocelyn's notes are short, he ranged widely, and always traced the terminology back to antiquity. The appearance of the work just at the time when Jocelyn arrived in Manchester was a foreshadowing of things to come.

Jocelyn fell out with Kerferd right from the start, and at the same time conceived a loathing for the University of Manchester which was never to fade. Local opinion had it that the old rivalry between Sydney and Melbourne was merely surfacing in another place, but that is no explanation of the prolonged discord that was about to begin. Jocelyn was put off by what he regarded as the pomposity and self importance of Manchester at that time. Scarcely had he arrived when he was summoned by his predecessor but one, Semple (a pupil of A. E. Housman), and advised that, as a 'Manchester Professor', he should equip himself at once with a hat and waistcoat. Jocelyn in return offered Semple an offprint of his magisterial paper on Ennius, but was rebuffed with the remark that there 'would be no time for that sort of thing henceforth'. Jocelyn alleged that Kerferd would stand about at street corners in Didsbury in the early morning, hoping to intercept him en route to the bus stop so that trifling matters of departmental administration could be discussed on the bus. He was forced to vary his route and time of departure. He would be dragged out of the library, he claimed, to settle some insignificant question to do with who should lecture in what room, and was being driven to distraction by the relentless persistence of his colleague. Virtually everything about the University annoyed him. There was, for example, the affair of the bells, in which he happened to score a minor success. Throughout the day and night during both term and vacation preset electric bells reverberated

around the Faculty of Arts on the hour marking the theoretical start and finish of lectures. Visiting seminar speakers, unaware of the system, were often disconcerted. Many came to a full stop in mid-sentence, thinking that their time was up, though one outsider, 'speaking on Libanius at Libanian length',[3] soldiered on through several pealings to deliver the longest paper on record to the Manchester branch of the Classical Association. Jocelyn tabled a motion at the Faculty of Arts that 'the Dean should dismantle the bells and buzzers'. At a Faculty meeting an earnest debate took place, the matter went to a vote, and it was resolved that the bells should be silenced, with the Dean nevertheless insisting that he would not climb a ladder to do it himself.

Jocelyn's main complaint (surely a reasonable one) was that Kerferd, his immediate predecessor as Professor of Latin, was, against all academic precedent, still in post and taking an obtrusive interest in the teaching of Latin and in the administration of the Latin department. When Jocelyn arrived in Manchester he found a departmental structure in Classics which was somewhat confused, to say the least. On the surface before 1973 there had been a single Department of Latin and Greek. In the annual reports of Council to Court, to which departments were required to submit a statement of their activities for the year, Greek and Latin appear to have been treated as a unity until 1973, whereas the University Calendars fail to make the structure clear. The reality was probably somewhat different from the impression conveyed by the reports to Court. Senior Lecturers and Readers were permitted to lecture on one language only, and the Professors of Greek and Latin equally did not intrude into each other's territory. The consequence (on one interpretation) was that de facto there were two departments of Greek and Latin; and ancient history for its part was taught in the Department of History. This arrangement was formalised after February 1973, when the University's *Supplemental Charter and Statutes* came into force. The Senate minutes for 1 March 1973 reported that Senate would recommend that separate departments for Greek and Latin be created under Statute XIV (1) of the new Charter, and this recommendation was in due course implemented.

There were, though, complicating factors. First, Kerferd, noting, as others have noted before and since, that classicists were scattered across numerous departments of the University without ever coming into contact, had attempted to set up a 'School of Classical Studies' to embrace

[3] So David Bain, who was present.

in an informal union all the classicists in the University. The 'School' never became a concrete reality, except in the heading of the notepaper on which Kerferd wrote all his letters. Jocelyn took immediate exception to the word 'School', and soon after his arrival he circulated a statement that 'the Department of Latin has withdrawn from the School of Classical Studies, and the headmaster has been informed'. Secondly, there was an expectation on the ground that, though there were now formally two departments, the group of classicists would for the most part act as a unity. Jocelyn was having none of that. At the University of Sydney Greek and Latin had by long tradition been completely distinct, and Jocelyn set about replicating that arrangement in Manchester in line with the Senate's recommendation referred to above. He insisted that there should be two Departmental Boards (another creation of the new Charter), one for Latin and one for Greek, each with its own chairman and secretary, and that the Boards should meet separately. The result was that a meeting of the Greek Board would be followed on the same afternoon by a meeting of the Latin Board, the two meetings having much the same agenda and with much the same personnel present. Jocelyn quite properly took no interest in the Greek board, but Kerferd had a keen desire to be added to the Latin board.

A proposal to this effect was put to the Faculty of Arts by the secretary of the Latin board. Jocelyn heatedly opposed the motion at a faculty meeting, arguing that Kerferd had no right to inclusion, not because he had ceased to be Professor of Latin, but because there were doubts about his Latinity. The argument did not go down well with the embarrassed gathering sitting in the presence of the University's previous Professor of Latin, and the motion was carried by a large majority. This decision by the Faculty, which formalised an arrangement whereby a professor was virtually overseen by his predecessor, was to keep Jocelyn and Kerferd in close combat for the rest of Kerferd's tenure of the Greek chair. The Dean was urged by the meeting to use his 'good offices' to attempt to reconcile the pair, but it was to no avail.

As one of the authors of the edition of de Graaf referred to above and the sole author of the notes on sexual terminology therein Jocelyn could justly claim to have been the founder of the 'Manchester school' dedicated to the study of ancient obscenity which flourished particularly in the 1980s and eventually came to the attention of the national press.[4]

[4] See 'This England', *The New Statesman*, 7 Jan. 1983.

Again the influence of his old teacher G. P. Shipp can be detected. Shipp had long had an informal interest in such matters, and in 1977 had published (in *Antichthon*, 11) a short note in which he drew attention to several examples of the verb λαικάζω in Greek magical papyri from which the meaning of the word could be deduced. Jocelyn took the matter up himself in a long paper ('A Greek indecency and its students. λαικάζειν' (*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 206 (1980)) often described as 'magisterial', in which he produced some new evidence and offered a comprehensive discussion of ancient and later interpretations of the verb. Between 1980 and 1985 he published some eight papers on ancient sexual terminology, the majority of them in *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, of which one ('Eupla laxa landicosa', *LCM*, 5 (1980), 153), in homage to Housman's 'Praefanda', was written in Latin. Jocelyn was usually sceptical about the attempts of some literary critics to find sexual puns in unlikely places, and this scepticism is nicely exemplified in 'On some unnecessarily indecent interpretations of Catullus 2 and 3', in *American Journal of Philology*, 101 (1980). *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, as its title suggests, gave contributors the chance to publish their thoughts without the reflection imposed by more conventional forms of publication. Jocelyn, typically, welcomed this opportunity for instant controversy. He also managed at this time to cross swords with the editors of *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* on a matter to do with obscenities, accusing them of 'prissiness' in not indexing examples of βινεῖν and πυγίζειν. An indignant response by the editors in *SEG*, 31 (1981), no. 362 asserted that the words had been omitted 'through carelessness and not because of the "prissiness of professional epigraphists"'. Thereafter *SEG* always indexed such words. Jocelyn's use of the quaint word 'indecency' for four-letter words and their equivalents in other languages was, incidentally, a typical stylistic quirk, of which there were numerous. He was, for example, unwilling in later years to call the poems of Catullus 'poems', but preferred to see them as 'items'. The plays of Plautus were always 'scripts', and the characters in them 'personages'. Another favourite was 'windbag', which was reserved for literary critics and anyone in a position of authority at Manchester.

Jocelyn made a big impact, for the good, in his long stay in Manchester. He managed to generate a scholarly atmosphere in unpromising surroundings (on one occasion he wrote of the 'Boeotian gloom' of the University, and on another declared that the place 'stank of Methodism') and, years before the Research Assessment Exercise was devised, to encourage with a marked generosity of spirit the research of

those of his colleagues who were interested in such things. Long before every department in the country had to have its 'seminar', Jocelyn introduced at Manchester a remarkable seminar series which he entitled 'Topics in current research'. The series ran from January 1974 until the end of 1982. Speakers were required to submit a detailed summary of their papers, with bibliography, two weeks in advance, and then to endure a grilling, particularly from Jocelyn himself, at the end of the paper. Numerous memorable papers were delivered by a nice mixture of senior figures from various parts of the world, and younger scholars. Jocelyn had an eye for those who would make a name for themselves. Many papers foreshadowed significant publications. The second paper, for example, was delivered by A. K. Bowman on 14 March 1974, on the subject 'Latin writing tablets from Vindolanda'. Bowman's summary begins: 'The site of Vindolanda, a mile and a half south of Hadrian's Wall, has yielded . . . a collection of wooden writing-tablets far more extensive and important than any hitherto discovered'; twenty-eight years later a third volume of Vindolanda tablets is about to appear. Jocelyn himself read a number of papers over the years, starting with 'Interpolation and misattribution of parts in Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1052–1245' (1974), which dates from a time when he was actively writing the commentary on the *Pseudolus*. The seminar was wide-ranging. Notable contributors included G. Zuntz on the text and interpretation of a gold leaf from Valentia in southern Italy (1975), F. R. D. Goodyear on Tacitus and Virgil (1976), O. Skutsch on some problems in the *Annales* of Ennius (1976), C. R. Dodwell on the illustrated copies of Terence (1978), R. L. Hunter on the *Ecclesiazusai* and fourth century comedy (1978), K. M. Coleman on Statius, *Siluae*, IV. 7 (1978), J. A. Crook and J. G. Wolf on the Murecine tablets (1980) and D. C. Feeney on the speeches of the Virgilian Aeneas (1982). The winding up of the seminar in 1982 seems in retrospect to have marked a decline in Jocelyn's interest in the department, and he was in any case soon to fall ill (see below).

Many who participated in the seminar would probably agree that, long after the memories of their paper had receded, they retained a clear recollection of the hospitality that followed. Harry had married Margaret Jill Morton, herself a graduate in Latin of Sydney University, in Rome on 22 October 1958 while he was a scholar at the British School. Seminar speakers were splendidly entertained in the evening at the Jocelyn household in Didsbury along with a few members of the audience. The heated discussions of the paper were quickly forgotten, as Harry and Margaret were extremely hospitable. A choice Australian wine or two usually came

forth, along with an Italian. Towards the end of the evening, however, Jocelyn would almost inevitably get worked up on some scholarly point.[5] Margaret, who appeared never to notice such outbursts, would withdraw unobtrusively to make the coffee as he pulled volume after volume from the bookshelves to demonstrate his point.

Jocelyn gave considerable attention to undergraduate teaching, and to the planning of the Latin courses. His own lectures on a wide range of Latin authors were always individually described in some detail beforehand and advertised on the notice board. He oversaw the construction of a Latin literature course which compelled students during their three years to read in the original language something of all the major literary genres (prose as well as verse), and introduced them to texts spanning the period from Plautus to the fourth century AD. Jocelyn firmly believed that students should be given what he called 'coverage' and he viewed as grossly self-indulgent those departments whose members taught only their 'research interests'. He showed a kindness towards and tolerance of students which contrasted with the more rigorous standards which he applied when dealing with academics. He was always much liked by the young.

Jocelyn was never as influential in Manchester academic politics as he might have been if he had acquired, at least in a metaphorical sense, the hat and waistcoat recommended by Semple. He was, however, a figure of standing in the eyes of several Vice-Chancellors, not least after he was elected to the Academy in 1982. His uncompromising public snipings on this or that matter of principle several times scored a direct hit. Perhaps most notably, he made his views felt about the University's decision to sell at auction in 1988 some alleged duplicate volumes from the John Rylands collection. The University house magazine *This Week* carried an article on 25 April 1988 under the tasteless heading 'Sale of the Century', which gloated over the fact that the sale had raised £1.6 m for a new 'research institute', and that a first edition of *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* of 1499, which had belonged to a distinguished sixteenth-century collector, Jean Grolier, had sold for £170,000. Jocelyn wrote as follows on 9 May to the magazine: 'Your readers might have been given the names and the appointments of those who "made public protests against the sale and stirred up a brief flurry in the press". More importantly, they might have been told something about the controversy that surrounds the word

[5] According to David Bain, he would regularly thump the table in annoyance for the first time on the stroke of 11 p.m.

"duplicate" where early printed books are concerned. . . . The vulgar triumphalism of language like "sale of the century" must embarrass even some of those who think the sale justified.' The article in *This Week* had failed to point out that the opponents of the sale included the former librarian, the editor of the *Book Collector*, and probably one of the former Vice-Chancellors, who regarded the sale as a breach of faith.

Most of Jocelyn's voluminous publications were written in Manchester, and I here select a few significant items to bring out the diversity of his interests and the nature of his achievements.

Jocelyn was always at his most assured when dealing with questions to do with the editing of fragments, and some of his articles and reviews will be essential reading for any future editor of the texts in question. I single out here from many the formidable paper 'On editing the remains of Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Diuinarum*' (*Rivista di filologia e de istruzione classica*, 108 (1980)), which is in fact a (largely favourable) review article.

He had a profound knowledge of Republican literature, and within that field his papers on Plautus, many of which foreshadow the edition of the *Pseudolus* which was never completed, bulk large. The paper 'Anti-Greek elements in Plautus' *Menaechmi*' (*Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Fourth Volume*, 1984) has some typical elements. A mass of material to do with attitudes to Greeks in Roman comedy is assembled which is important on any count. There is also a general thesis, that the anti-Greek elements in the play do not merely reflect general Roman attitudes imported into the play by Plautus, but are meant to replace an Athenian attitude to western Greeks which had supposedly been present in the (lost) Greek original that Plautus was rendering into Latin. The thesis is somewhat speculative. It was a direct reaction against the arguments of a paper which had recently appeared, and in that it was not untypical. Jocelyn found it difficult to accept even the most convincing solution to a problem, and he would constantly come up with an alternative view of his own. In the process he would often deploy a vast range of evidence which was interesting in its own right, even if it did not establish decisively the alternative that he was advancing. Some other significant Plautine pieces include a series of three on the indirect tradition of the *Pseudolus*, a paper on language and characterisation ('Sprache, Schriftlichkeit und Charakterisierung in der römischen Komödie (Plautus *Pseudolus*, 41–73, 998–1014)', in G. Vogt-Spira, ed. *Beiträge zur mündlichen Kultur der Römer* (1993)) and, perhaps most importantly, 'The unpretty boy of Plautus' *Pseudolus* (767–789)', in E. Stärk and G. Vogt-Spira, eds *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre*

*zum 65. Geburtstag* (2000). This last uses material taken from the unfinished commentary.

Two further interests of Jocelyn's were varieties of literary and non-literary language in Latin, and the history of scholarship. Both came together in an article which is arguably one of his finest, 'The new chapters of the ninth book of Celsus' *Artes*', in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar Fifth Volume* (1985). The article starts by describing the favourable reaction of the fifteenth-century humanists to the Latin of Celsus after part of the *Artes* had come to light in that century, and moves on to contrast the mild disparagement of the writer, which Jocelyn saw as uninformed, by Anglo-Saxon Latinists of the twentieth century. Next, using material taken particularly from a Toledo manuscript which had recently been examined for the first time and found to fill a lacuna in the text, he proceeded to offer one of the best characterisations that there is of the Latin medical register and of its relation to other educated varieties of the language. The article is only twenty pages long. In the 208 footnotes that follow the text there is contained a masterly description of the medical lexicon. Jocelyn wrote numerous papers and reviews to do with humanism (there were frequent papers at the conferences of the *Istituto di studi umanistici F. Petrarca*), and in recent years in particular some obituaries of distinguished scholars of his acquaintance, such as Mariotti and C. O. Brink (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 94 (1997)). On ancient scholarship, worthy of special mention are the three papers, rich in documentation, entitled 'The annotations of M. Valerius Probus', in *Classical Quarterly*, 34 (1984–5). Jocelyn's observations on language are scattered throughout his *oeuvre*. I single out the discussion of the word *cinaedus* embedded in an article on Catullus ('Catullus, Mamurra and Romulus cinaedus', *Sileno*, 25 (1999)). Here he used his knowledge of nineteenth-century scholarship to good effect. Important stylistic discussions are to be found, in articles and reviews, of writers as diverse as Plautus, Catullus, Varro, and Pelagonius. Jocelyn also had an interest in metre and prose rhythm. His articles on metre in the third edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* are remarkably clear. His lectures on prose rhythm were a compulsory part of the second-year Latin course in Manchester. He lectured too on palaeography, and would often travel to look at a manuscript or two before writing an article which turned on a matter of transmission. A notable paper in this respect is that on 'The fate of Varius' *Thyestes*' (*Classical Quarterly*, 30 (1980)).

Jocelyn's writings are marked by scepticism and influenced by his distinctive views on what constituted scholarly rigour. He would always cite

primary sources, and was never content simply to use the most recent edition of or commentary on a writer. Problems were traced back over time and long lists of opinions set out, a practice which did not always illuminate the issue. Few works in English were treated as authoritative, and then only if written by one of a very small group of approved scholars. Jocelyn made a point of attempting to determine the meaning and tone (a favourite term of Shipp's) of every word in an ancient work, but hardly ever offered translations of a continuous piece of text. Quite often he made judgements of a kind which might be called 'sociolinguistic', but never used that word (or indeed any fashionable technical term) except in a tone of derision. He was particularly influenced by his reading of German scholarship of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Jocelyn was a devoted supporter of various academic enterprises which he regarded as worthwhile, but disdainful of others which he regarded as pointless. He first visited the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich in 1957 from Italy, and made the acquaintance of the Director, W. Ehlers. He often went back, and after the death of C. O. Brink became the British Academy's representative on the International Thesaurus Commission. He was on close terms with a later director, P. Flury. For many years he read the proofs of every fascicule and made copious comments which often led to the modification of articles. In more recent years he also became a member of the Academy's committee overseeing the *Medieval Latin Dictionary from British Sources*, and several of his interventions at meetings will not readily be forgotten. He was too an editor for some time of the series Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries. Less happy were his relations with the Council of University Classics Departments (CUCD), a body which he often said should be renamed by the replacement of 'Council' with 'Federation'. He refused to pay the Manchester department's annual subscription, and the department was eventually formally expelled.

In 1985 Jocelyn had a severe setback when he suffered heart failure and required major surgery. He was out of action for almost a full academic year, but his spirits seemed never to flag. I visited him in hospital just a day or two after the operation. He was sitting propped up in bed attached to various pieces of high-tech equipment reading a recent work of classical scholarship. Foolishly I asked him what he thought of the book. He flew at once into a tirade of abuse, and his heart rate as displayed on a bedside monitor shot up alarmingly, setting off a loud bleeping. A nurse rushed in and I was ordered from the room.

From the 1980s Jocelyn was increasingly annoyed by two developments which he saw as detrimental to scholarship, the establishment of the Research Assessment Exercise and the spread of courses in 'classical civilisation' with little or no language component. He was a vehement critic of the RAE, not least, as he never ceased pointing out, because of the unedifying effect that it had on the demeanour of those who agreed to act as 'assessors'. He made his views apparent in the submissions he was forced to make. In the exercise of 1988 departments were asked what 'strategies' they had in place to foster the research of their members. Jocelyn wrote just three words in the ample space available, 'Backsliding is castigated.' He was constantly denouncing as 'collaborators' those who took on the job of assessment, and would darkly hint that a grim fate awaited them in the long run, likening them to members of the Italian Academy under Mussolini.

Jocelyn's hostility to 'classical civilisation' was to usher in a new and final stage in his Manchester career. By the late 1980s the annual intake of students rarely exceeded by much the number of members of staff. In 1988 a faculty committee to investigate the future of Classics in Manchester was set up under the chairmanship of a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, C. B. Cox, Professor of English Literature. At a heated meeting in 1989, on the last occasion that the committee was to assemble, Jocelyn declared that 'as long as there was breath in his body' there would be no classical civilisation courses in Manchester. Cox closed the meeting with a statement that, by his attitude, Jocelyn 'was killing Classics in this University'. Soon afterwards Jocelyn went as previously arranged on research leave, and never returned in a formal sense to the department. Under circumstances which were not made clear Cox had negotiated with the Vice-Chancellor Jocelyn's transfer to a sort of 'research professorship' (though that term was never used), and he was removed symbolically from the department to a border zone between the Departments of Philosophy and Linguistics. In the University Calendar he henceforth appeared in a category of his own, under the heading 'Staff not assigned to a department'.[6] His new status excited considerable envy elsewhere in the faculty, and others hoped that they might be so punished. He himself soon settled into his new role with resignation, if not relish.

[6] During this period Professor G. Zuntz, FBA (1902–92), Emeritus Professor of Hellenistic Greek at Manchester, a good friend of Jocelyn's and long since in retirement, once telephoned the department because he 'could not find' Jocelyn in the Calendar. When told where to look he remarked cryptically 'very interesting'.

On 27 October 1995 Jocelyn was awarded an Honorary Doctorate of Letters by his *alma mater*, the University of Sydney. He travelled to Sydney to receive the degree in person, and used the opportunity of his public address to offer up yet more of his controversial views, this time, among other things, on the 'roughness' of Sydney society and on its 'mob rule'. The address was given prominent coverage in *The Australian* under the heading 'Sydney gets a scholarly scolding'. Jocelyn chose to dwell on decline, as represented by new developments in the organisation of higher education in Sydney and of the university itself. He stated: 'When I contemplate the present university I see its old faculties no longer able to think in a straight way about the studies proper to them, fussing about mere survival and bundling their departments together in defiance of all principle of intellectual cohesion. I see institutions of training with aims completely antithetical to those of an academy of science and learning . . . swallowed by a managerial monster—a monster which sprawls over the conurbation, exploiting the University of Sydney's name, the more convenient aspects of its history and the architectural splendour of its older buildings and ignoring the ethos this university inherited from those of Europe. I see persons in high places positively anxious to collaborate with the leaders of the Australian mob.' The old university, he argued, had 'preferred to maintain the good opinion of the academic communities of more civilised lands, rather than to cultivate the affections of the local mob and its cheer-leaders. It did much to soften the roughness of its social environment.' 'Sydney,' he concluded, 'is still a pretty rough place.'

An obituary of Jocelyn would not be complete without mention of his activities as a reviewer. He devoted an immense amount of time to reviews, of which he published more than 130 between 1965 and 1988. Some are short notices, but many are review articles of ten pages or more. If published together they would fill several volumes. Many are of books on or editions of Republican Latin authors, particularly Plautus. There are notable pieces on a range of fragmentary texts, such as Atellane farce and the *fabula togata*, Lucilius, Ennius, and Accius. Some are important. Others, particularly in recent years, are in the form of summaries of books, though no less useful for that. Scholars venturing into the territory of Republican literature had to face the probability that their books would be reviewed by Jocelyn, and few could have viewed the prospect with equanimity, for in many a review he indulged his taste for invective and deployed his learning to harsh effect. It is possible that controversialism came so naturally to him that he was unaware of the effect his

words had. I once accused him of being overcritical of a distinguished book which he had reviewed, and he replied with just a trace of discomfort that his review had been 'favourable'. Some of his reviews were downright unfair, and on occasions he seemed to get it into his head against all reason that a book was bad. Several reviews prompted responses, either from the victim or from a supporter, and I have heard the odd rumour of threats of legal action.

In Manchester Jocelyn (like most of the rest of his colleagues) never had a research student in the conventional sense. Few undergraduates carried on, and in those days those who did were encouraged to move on to the superior facilities of Oxford or Cambridge. Nevertheless a number of younger scholars, such as Kathleen Coleman, Danuta Shanzer, Anna Chahoud, and Peter Kruschwitz, sought him out or came his way, and with these, as with his colleagues in Manchester, John Briscoe, David Bain, and myself, he was immensely generous both of his time and learning. It was an experience to submit a piece of work to him. The manuscript would come back defaced by abusive comments and expostulations, often written in bold black ink. Some of these comments would turn out to be irrelevant, but all were thought-provoking, and the paper inevitably had to be revised.

An obituary of Jocelyn by Frances Muecke which appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 28 November 2000 states that he 'believed that controversy was part of the life-blood of philology'. Perusing his articles and reviews one might indeed be tempted to come to such a conclusion, but I would not put it quite that way. He was incorrigibly provocative and counter-suggestible. Certainly the sentence with which he began a paper at a conference held in Manchester in 1993 on the development of Latin syntax reflected schoolboyish mischief-making rather than a philological method. Jocelyn, who spoke last at the two-day gathering, began with the words, 'I have listened without enlightenment to the papers so far delivered at this conference.' But the sentence had been composed and typed up three weeks before the conference took place. The secretary who typed it had left the paper lying in an out-tray exposed to public view, and there was not a member of the audience who was not anticipating the opening words. They brought the house down, much to Jocelyn's bewilderment.

Jocelyn was a character larger than life. He was warm hearted and amusing and extremely loyal to his friends, of whom there were many, and equally he inspired great affection and loyalty in those with whom he came into close contact. His savage reviews give a false impression of the

man, and no one who knew him could ever take his outbursts very seriously. He was in fact easy to get on with. Whatever might have been thought of him in Manchester, he enjoyed and still enjoys a high reputation in classical circles in Italy and Germany. It may be some time before his achievements as one of the foremost Latin scholars of his time can be properly assessed, as his articles are scattered far and wide and in many cases difficult of access. A collection of some of his major pieces would reveal important contributions to the study of a very wide range of Latin authors, particularly but not exclusively of the Republic, and particularly in some of the less fashionable genres. If a text was in Latin, he was interested in it, whatever its content. Virgil perhaps alone of the major writers of verse did not elicit much interest from him, and that was because he was scornful of the deferential attitude of some British scholars to the poet. It is to be regretted that he did not finish the commentary on the *Pseudolus*, because hardly anyone is competent as he was to write a serious commentary on a play of Plautus. But he was well aware of what he was doing in confining himself to reviews and articles. About fifteen years ago he told me one day that Charles Brink had been urging him recently to stop doing reviews and articles and to get on with the commentary. He had replied that he intended to go on doing what interested him.

Jocelyn is survived by his widow, Margaret, and two sons, Luke and Edmund.

J. N. ADAMS,
*Fellow of the Academy*

*Note*. I am grateful to the following for help of one sort or another: David Bain, John Briscoe, Anna Chahoud, Kathleen Coleman, John Crook, John Croyston, Roger Dawe, Cynthia Dean, Lyle Eveille, Mario Geymonat, Bernard Gredley, Ellen Gredley, Nicholas Horsfall, Celia Jenkinson, Bill Jocelyn, Margaret Jocelyn, Vincent Knowles, Peter Kurschwitz, Guy Lee, Christopher Lowe, Joan Mackie, Bruce Marshall, Frances Muecke, Alanna Nobbs, Suzy Nunes (Reference Archivist, University of Sydney), James Peters (University/Medical Archivist, University of Manchester), Brian Pullan, Bob Sinclair, Christopher Stray.