



(*Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. 40 (1954), pp. 169-206) established a crucial fact: even in Egypt (where some early Greek books survive), almost all pagan texts were written on papyrus and almost all Christian texts in codices, until the fourth century AD; by

Francis Henry Sandbach 1903–1991

[He] was simple, modest and scrupulous; so scrupulous, that it gave a peculiar slowness to his delivery; he never uttered his opinion rashly, nor rashly assented to that of others. As he grudged no time, no industry, to inform himself, he thought they might bestow a little too, if they wished to know.

Horace Walpole on George Vertue

Life

HARRY SANDBACH'S LONG LIFE of unobtrusive service to classical scholarship and to his college and university was firmly rooted in middle-class English ground. His grandfather on his mother's side was Headmaster of the village school at Gomersal near Leeds; on his father's side a Wesleyan minister from a Manchester family. After a false start at the bottom of the cotton industry his father, Francis Edward Sandbach, using money left him by his mother, enrolled at the new University College at Aberystwyth. There he met Ethel Bywater, the fellow-student who was to be his wife and Harry's mother. Eventually, by way of a Ph. D. at Strasbourg and a BA by dissertation at Cambridge (where the Ph. D. was at that date unknown), he became first Lecturer and then Professor of German at the University of Birmingham.

Harry was born on 23 February 1903. For a number of reasons, one of which was the difference in age between him and his brother Wilfrid, born in August 1908, he was in his early years a somewhat solitary

child. That isolation was ended when in 1914 he won a scholarship to King Edward's School, Birmingham. There he played a full part in the academic, sporting and intellectual life of the place, finishing his school career as Librarian and Captain of the School. In the light of later developments it is interesting to note both that he was a frequent participant in debates and also that (according to one report) the effectiveness of his always clever interventions was 'invariably lessened by his poor delivery'. In sport his main contribution was on the rugby field as 'a small but plucky forward'. Years later he was to give further evidence of courage when he represented the Department of Classics at Manchester in that most dangerous of games, mixed hockey. He was a member of the OTC, but resigned, characteristically, when it appeared to him that 'its exercises bore no relation to contemporary warfare'.

The two subjects which were taken seriously at King Edward's were Classics and Mathematics. Harry dropped the latter at sixteen, 'having become bewildered'; it is evident from his comments that the teaching was geared to the production of mathematical specialists. The classical staff included 'Algy' Measures, a stimulating eccentric and alcoholic; Harry's remark that 'we were a bit afraid of him' recalls Kipling's dictum that a boy will learn more from a good scholar in a rage than from a score of lucid and laborious drudges. The Chief Master, Gilson, was also something of a character: 'a magnificent teacher of the classics, he was also a man who could set his hand to anything', including the installation of electricity in his own house 'on a 12-volt system with a generator driven by a windmill.'¹

In 1919 there began Harry's long association with Trinity College, Cambridge, when he had a trial shot at an entrance scholarship. The choice of Trinity rather than King's, where his father and two half-uncles had been, was due primarily to the presence at that college of a cousin whom he disliked. 'The decision, made on trivial grounds, was a fortunate one', comments Harry; as indeed it was, both for him and for Trinity. In 1920 he won the desired Major Scholarship and came up in the following year. His academic career is a matter of record: First Classes in both Parts of the Classical Tripos, the Browne University Scholarship in his first year and the Craven in his second, followed by the First Chancellor's Classical Medal and the Charles

¹ 'Not to mention the school or the masters of men illustrious for literature is a kind of historical fraud, by which honest fame is injuriously diminished' (Johnson).

Oldham Scholarship. A Trinity contemporary recalls that he never seemed to have to work very hard, being gifted with enviable powers of absorption and concentration. In the college he had an extensive circle of friends and belonged to a wide range of societies; though his entry in the college *Who's Who* reads simply: 'Well, it depends'. Evidently the habit of thinking before he spoke, which in later years could prove so disconcerting, was already growing on him.

After toying briefly with the idea of the Civil Service Harry determined on a career in teaching, and began with an attempt at a Trinity Fellowship. His reasons for specialising in Philosophy in Part II of the Tripos had been in the main negative. He had no taste for history or archaeology, philology was too narrow, and he was put off literature, to which he had a natural bent, by the predominance of textual criticism in the course — 'and', he adds, 'I did enjoy Plato'. Since Trinity then, as for many years thereafter, provided almost no teaching for Part II and since he had two years in which to cover the ground (Scholars being expected to take Part I after one year), he attended a variety of lectures on literary topics and, in his own words, 'read widely and without much plan, but what I enjoyed'. It is a sad commentary on what universities (and perhaps students) have come to that one would not dare to countenance such an approach today. It was to bear ample fruit when Harry began to publish.

Election to a Research Fellowship, for a dissertation on Plutarch, duly followed in 1927, the others elected that year being (Sir) Steven Runciman and Geoffrey (later Lord) Cross. Meanwhile, since a living had to be earned, there had been an interlude at Manchester, where in taking a first post as Assistant Lecturer Harry was pursuing what for not a few classicists before and after him was almost a regular *cursus honorum*.² He described his time at Manchester as 'two happy years' — not the usual verdict of those who had been through the mill of the notorious Virgil Discussions and had otherwise been subjected to professorial harassment by R. S. Conway.³ Conway, as it happened, was away during Harry's first year, perhaps fortunately. However, it was

² The other two Assistant Lecturers at that time were W. Beare and W. S. Maguinness.

³ Cf. Kenney in *La filologia greca e latina nel secolo XX*. Atti del Congresso Internazionale (Pisa, 1989), ii. 620–1. Harry describes the proceedings in a letter (1 September 1984) to the writer: 'In my second year we did *Aeneid* 1–6. A member of the staff read a paper on one book to an audience of his colleagues, who were expected to go, and the third-year undergraduates, from whom two or three remarks might be elicited, and then Conway told us the truth.'

to these Discussions (the 'V.D.s') that Harry owed his qualification (characteristically termed by him 'inadequate')⁴ to take over a course of lectures on the *Aeneid* when he returned to Cambridge; and Virgil, as will be seen, was to remain a lifelong interest.

When Harry returned to Trinity in 1928 there befell him (and the college) what he calls 'a piece of extraordinary good fortune'. This arose from the translation of D. S. Robertson to the Regius Chair of Greek. In consequence Harry was appointed to fill his place on the college teaching staff. Appointment to a University Lectureship in Classics followed in 1931. So began a residence that was broken only by absence on war service; and so also began a period of preparation for the scholarly achievements which were to come to fruition only after several decades. Inevitably from now on much of his time was to be taken up with routine teaching and college and university business. A born scholar, as I believe even Harry's less perceptive pupils sensed him to be, may not on the face of it be most profitably employed in teaching undergraduates Greek and Latin verse and prose composition. But, as Kipling's administrator says, 'if you *must* use razors to cut grindstones, why, I prefer the best cutlery.' Harry's teaching was not of the kind that generates anecdote and legend; it is ironical that all that his most intellectually distinguished pupil can find to recall of their relationship is his enduring frustration at not having been directed to Housman's lectures until his second year of residence. Nevertheless, in its own quiet way, his method worked; his silences could be as potent as speech. As one undergraduate later put it, 'Professor Sandbach has only to look at you for you to get on'. Neither in supervisions nor in lectures did he put on a performance. 'Showmanship', comments a former pupil, 'was completely alien to his manner; his lectures were . . . a lecture-room counterpart to chamber-music.' He supervised comparatively few research students; such evidence as I have been able to gather indicates that he approached this task conscientiously, but that it was not a role which he much enjoyed or in which he shone.

Though he describes these as 'leisurely years', he was not in a scholarly point of view marking time. His lectures and his reading covered a wide range of subjects which is reflected by the numerous reviews and the (mostly short) papers which he published from 1928 onwards. The point is neatly illustrated by his first three publications, on Virgil, Plutarch, and Stoicism respectively. The list of subjects on

⁴ The word that he uses also to describe his preparation for taking over Gomme's Menander.

which he lectured for both Parts of the Tripos between 1929 and 1961 is imposing: the pre-Socratics, Plato, Aristotle, the post-Aristotelians, Menander and New Comedy; Lucretius, Virgil, Propertius and other elegists; Cicero's political treatises; ancient thought and society, Greek political thought, Roman thought and society, Greek life and letters under the Roman Empire.⁵ On his reviews his comment is characteristically deprecating: 'During this time my energies had very little direction, and I spent a good many hours reviewing for the *Classical Review*, the editor⁶ entrusting me with a wide range of books mostly concerned with literature'. In fact the list also contains a good deal of philosophy, more especially Plutarch; but it is true that in the early years literature predominated, particularly Virgil, the subject of his first published article and, forty years on, of the two notable addresses to the Virgil Society discussed below. Unstructured and apparently undirected as it was, this ample and discursive preparation laid a solid foundation for the work that lay ahead.

In 1932 there took place what Harry describes as 'the most fortunate event of my life', his marriage to Mary Matthews, a friend of many years' standing, later to become a Swedish scholar of some distinction.⁷ Those were the days of comparative affluence for Cambridge dons; at the house in Hedgerley Close which they built and moved into in 1936 the Sandbaches could afford to keep a maid and a gardener, to entertain, and during vacations to travel in Scandinavia and on the Continent. As for countless others, this peaceful routine was abruptly shattered in September 1939. There began a series of disruptions, as first Mary and then Harry himself were called away to war work. It was during these upheavals that the two children in whom they took so much pleasure were born, Catherine in 1940, Martin in 1943. The early years of the war Harry spent holding the fort in Cambridge, as classical supervisor, jointly with A. S. F. Gow,⁸ for five

⁵ This course was evidently connected with one of his less well-known publications, the chapter on 'Greek literature, philosophy and science', in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, XI (1936). Cf. below, p. 496 and n. 25.

⁶ Ernest Harrison, a Trinity colleague.

⁷ She will be chiefly remembered for her work on Strindberg. Her translations from him and from other Swedish authors have played an important part in the dissemination of Swedish writing in the English-speaking world. Her status in Sweden as an authority in this field was recognised by the award of the Order of Vasa in 1974 and the Strindberg Prize in 1989. See *Swedish Book Review* (1991).

⁸ Gow's *Letters from Cambridge* (1945) is a unique evocation of the peculiar flavour of those wartime years in Cambridge.

colleges, as Air Raid Warden and Home Guard, and as Proctor. In this last capacity he became embroiled in a political row about the right of free speech, in which he seems to have behaved with characteristic firmness and equanimity. In 1943 he was accepted to do topographical work for the Admiralty, where he ended up in the Economics section of his department, which was located in Oxford. Reading between the lines of his understated account one catches echoes of Evelyn Waugh. All that Harry himself says is: 'The planners improbably assured us that our work was useful'.

In 1945 he was released to take up the post of Tutor of Side A at Trinity in succession to G. Kitson Clark. The load then carried by a Trinity Tutor, who had some 160 pupils and was responsible for conducting his own admissions, was a very heavy one. The system did have the merit that it tended to foster a close link between the pupil and the Tutor, who was not only responsible for his academic welfare but had staked his personal credit by admitting him to the college. Moreover, the period just after the war, in spite of shortages and austerity, was a good time to be up at Cambridge. Most undergraduates had done military service and were correspondingly more mature. Harry remembered it as 'a time when a Tutor's lot was a particularly happy one'. In 1953 he succeeded R. M. Rattenbury in the even more demanding office of Senior Tutor, which he held until 1956 — making a period of eleven years during which, in his own words, 'I had no time or energy for any original work and lived on my fat for my teaching'. Added to the six wartime years, this represents what would be generally accounted a catastrophic subtraction from the span of a scholar's working life. Harry was the last man to dramatise the matter: 'I did not in the least regret these years, which were full of interest.' It was cases such as his that G. M. Trevelyan clearly had in mind when in his last Commemoration speech as Master in 1951 he said that:

The welfare of the College is dependent on the men who serve it [as Tutors and Bursars] and in other administrative capacities, at the sacrifice, for a shorter or longer term of years, of their own research work . . . If the supply of men willing to make this sacrifice were to run dry, Trinity would cease to be what it is.

Harry, as a loyal Trinity man, was content to make this sacrifice, but its severity should not be underrated. Even after his retirement from full-time college teaching in 1963 he agreed to take charge

of the appeal to restore the Library and build new student accommodation.

In the 1960s there began to appear, among the resumed flow of (usually short) notes on a variety of literary and philosophical topics, substantial contributions to the multi-volume edition of Plutarch in the Loeb Classical Library, culminating in 1969 with the final volume of fragments, for which Harry was solely responsible. Public recognition of the quality of his scholarship now came in the shape of a personal Chair of Classics in 1967, followed by election to the British Academy in 1968 and to the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences of Göteborg in 1977. Its full realisation was achieved in his composite *chef d'oeuvre*, the Oxford Classical Text of Menander in 1972 and the monumental commentary in 1973. These complementary volumes form the most enduring memorial of his learning and critical penetration. For this exacting (and potentially invidious) assignment Harry was an inspired choice. Originally envisaged as the completion of a project begun by A. W. Gomme, it developed into Harry's own *magnum opus*. Who first thought of him in this connection is not precisely clear: perhaps C. H. Roberts, who in 1959, warmly seconded by the Gomme family, extended the invitation on behalf of the Clarendon Press. Harry accepted with perhaps surprising alacrity, but this was not work to be done in a hurry. When the commentary first appeared, after nearly fifteen years, the name of Sandbach stood modestly below that of Gomme on the title page; but discerning critics knew how to apportion the credit. More than one reviewer echoed the classic examiner's report: 'Nothing wanting, nothing superfluous'.

The flow of notes and articles continued, interspersed with two short books and a technical monograph. The books, *The Stoics* (1975) and *The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* (1977) were lucid, workmanlike and scholarly treatments of their subjects. The monograph was more unusual. *Aristotle and the Stoics* (1985) was almost the last thing Harry published, and not the least remarkable. In it he engaged in a long-standing controversy of much interest to students of ancient philosophy: whether or not it can be shown that Aristotle had any influence on the Stoics. Harry argued strongly and in opposition to the prevalent opinion that he had not. This short work excited so much interest that a special conference was convened in Cambridge to try the question, rather in the manner of the early Church summoning a Council to deal with a new heresy. Harry much enjoyed assisting at this unique occasion, and did not hide his gratification when by a

substantial majority of the eminent scholars assembled in his honour his view carried the day.

That was in 1986. In the meantime Harry had turned back to comedy, and at the time of his death had made considerable progress with a translation of Menander. His last years were overcast by accident, infirmity, and above all by the death of Mary in November 1990; and in these circumstances no friend would have wished his life prolonged. He died at home, in the house that he and Mary had built, on 18 September 1991.

Harry's entry in *Who's Who* lists no recreations, though his autobiographical notes contain more than one pleasurable recollection of walking holidays; and until well into his eighties he continued to travel extensively with Mary on the Continent and in Scandinavia. He liked watching sporting events, and to the last years of his life was a strong swimmer. His real enjoyments centred on his family⁹ and on the classics: his published works were, in Ovid's words, his *maior imago*. His critical standards were high and severe, the expression of them temperate. A correspondent recalls a doctoral *viva* in which the candidate revealed ignorance of a fundamental law of Greek metrics. Nothing was said, but 'ice formed on the Professor's upper slopes'.¹⁰ This philological rigour was altogether untinged with the acerbity to which all too many scholars are prone. Anything like a display of *odium philologicum* caused him real pain. His many reviews are uniformly distinguished by courtesy and moderation even when adverse judgements had to be passed; and if there was anything good to be said even about a bad book, he said it. When he wrote in the Preface to *Aristotle and the Stoics* that it gave him little pleasure to record the errors of scholars of deservedly high reputation, one knew that, being Harry, he meant it. He was always generous in sharing his learning with others: 'Few scholars in recent times have been thanked in prefaces to works of classical scholarship more often than Harry Sandbach' were the opening words of *The Times* obituary notice. He was, as a friend has written who profited from that generosity, 'wonderfully learned and wonderfully kind'. That he had a sense of humour was less immediately apparent,

⁹ The last entry of all in the autobiographical notes records with evident pleasure the progress of Catherine and Martin in their respective careers and Harry's and Mary's delight in the visits and conversations of their grandchildren.

¹⁰ With this may be compared the 'examiner's report he once made which criticized in shocked tones the ignorance he had detected in many candidates of the fact that $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ is not properly to be followed with $\delta\tau\iota$ ' (R. D. Dawe, *Gnomon*, 64 (1992), 474).

but the reporter of debates at King Edward's had noted his 'flashes of humour and sarcasm'; and no Latinate visitor to the Chapel of Trinity should omit to study his memorial brass to Gowland Hopkins.¹¹

The autobiographical notes contain no credo. A Wesleyan upbringing of the dreariest description had made an agnostic of Harry's father, and Harry, having at his own request sampled what was on offer at the local parish church when he was eight or thereabouts, 'gave up ecclesiastical longings'; and by the age of seventeen he had come to disbelieve altogether in the central tenets of Christianity. What beliefs he had he did not wear on his sleeve or allow to obtrude into his teaching and writing. It may perhaps seem naïve to draw inferences of a personal character from his particular interest in Stoicism as opposed to other ancient schools. Nevertheless it is difficult to resist the feeling that of all philosophies the Stoic, with its emphasis on the virtues of prudence, moderation, courage, and justice, and disregarding its peripheral absurdities, must have been especially congenial to a man who exemplified those virtues as Harry Sandbach did. In the words of Richard Bentley's one and only poem, and with a small emendation which I hope may be forgiven me, he lived

content, a genuine stoic he,
Great without *honours*, rich without South-Sea.

Latin poetry

As was remarked above, the relaxed course of study pursued by Sandbach for Part II of the Classical Tripos left him ample opportunity for reading and reflecting on ancient literature as well as for philosophy. His professional engagement with Latin poetry may be dated from his Manchester years and his enforced participation in Conway's Virgil Discussions. Mention of Conway in his first published paper, on a vexed passage of the *Georgics*,¹² suggests that it originated in the V. D.s. It is worth noting that of the several explanations of this crux put forward by scholars Sandbach's is that preferred by that great Virgilian Sir Roger Mynors in his commentary on the poem. On his return to Cambridge, as has also been mentioned above, he was invited

¹¹ *Inscriptions from the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge*, transcribed and translated by James Clackson (Cambridge, 1990), p. 115.

¹² 'Virgil, *Georgics* II. 277', *Classical Review*, 42 (1928), 59–60.

to lecture on Virgil, which he continued to do at intervals from 1929 to 1966. Byproducts in the shape of published work were sparse in the earlier years;¹³ but striking confirmation of the range and depth of Sandbach's involvement with the *Aeneid* is provided by two articles of the sixties and seventies which display both an impressive grasp of *Realien* and keen literary sensitivity.¹⁴ On the familiarity with Homeric arms and armour evidenced in the first of these papers Professor A. M. Snodgrass comments: 'What strikes me about it is the impression it gives of drawing on a range of long-standing knowledge and of *not* being "got up" for the occasion. The coverage is much wider than could have been got from Couissin or any other "technical" source . . . If this is how he regularly dealt with "side-lines", it is impressive indeed. And the conclusions strike me as really important.'

Sandbach also lectured and published on Propertius and Lucretius. The text of Propertius being what it is, it is a tribute to his critical powers that an appreciable number of his proposals have subsequently won acceptance.¹⁵ In one or two cases editors would have done well to attend more closely to the small print of his argument.¹⁶ Of his few Lucretian papers the most substantial is that on the chronology of the poet's life, though its (justifiably) sceptical conclusions have not been universally approved.¹⁷

As early as 1934–5 Sandbach was lecturing on selected texts from New Comedy (*Perikeiromene*, *Rudens*, *Eunuchus*; repeated 1946–7 with *Aulularia* instead of *Rudens*). The real engagement with Menander

¹³ 'Victum frustra contendere Thyrsim', *Classical Review*, 47 (1933), 216–19, argues that metrical ineptitude can be identified as one of the signs of Thyrsis' poetic inferiority to Corydon, a point not, it would seem, taken by previous interpreters. 'Virgil, *Aeneid* V. 315ff', *ibid.* NS 7 (1957), 102–3, proposes an interpretation of the passage that has in the main carried conviction (see R. D. Williams ad loc.).

¹⁴ 'Anti-antiquarianism in the *Aeneid*', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, 5 (1965–6), 26–38; 'Some translators of Virgil', *ibid.* 8 (1970–1), 24–36.

¹⁵ 'Notes on Propertius', *Classical Review*, 52 (1938), 211–15; 'Notes on Propertius II, 16 and III, 7', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 5 (1958–9), 3–5; 'Some problems in Propertius', *Classical Quarterly*, NS 12 (1962), 263–76; cf. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 166–8 (1937), 12 (résumé).

¹⁶ e.g. the alleged parallels for the postponement of *et* at Prop. 3. 10. 27 which were disabled by Sandbach ('Notes' (1938)) are still thoughtlessly deployed by defenders of the transmitted text.

¹⁷ '*Lucreti poemata* and the poet's death', *Classical Review*, 54 (1940), 72–7; see the edition of W. H. D. Rouse, rev. M. F. Smith (Loeb Classical Library, 1975), pp. x–xi. See also 'Two passages in Lucretius', *Classical Review* NS 13 (1963), 13–14. The persuasive correction of *undas* to *umbras* at *D.R.N.* 2. 152 is illuminated by one of his rare flashes of irony: '... night does not come on in successive waves, except in inefficient amateur theatricals'.

began with the invitation to take over Gomme's work; this is discussed below by Dr Austin. It has now come to light that this was a case of history repeating itself, though with a different outcome. In 1932 Sandbach mentioned in a letter to R. B. Onians that he had 'been tempted into joining Conway as collaborator and eventual heir for his edition of Virgil. It's not all settled yet, as the publishers¹⁸ have to accept me and not propose any terms I cannot accept. I'm determined not to be rushed by demands for delivery of MS. But assuming that all goes through and that RSC and I do not quarrel immediately we get down to it, I've acquired a life work — or at least 15–20 years' work — and rather regretfully start a metamorphosis from a Graeculist to a Latinist.' The metamorphosis was nipped in the bud: Conway died in the following year, and the only relic of this *magnum opus* that never was is the posthumous edition of *Aeneid* I that came out in 1935. In this, though Sandbach is thanked for help with specific parts, there is no mention of the contemplated collaboration. Though it is idle to speculate on what might have been — and Sandbach cannot have been, and evidently was not, under any illusions about the difficulties inherent in working with Conway¹⁹ — it is curious that his actual *magnum opus* was the result of a similar invitation many years later.

Stoicism (by M. Schofield)

Sandbach's autobiographical memorandum reveals that his first researches focused on 'the changes made by Chrysippus in the Stoicism he inherited from Zeno'. Feeling by the end of a year that he was getting nowhere he changed direction somewhat and 'embarked on a study of three anti-Stoic works of Plutarch'. From this there eventually emerged his successful Fellowship dissertation, subsequently cannibalised, for example, in his 1930 article on *ἐννοια* and *πρόληψις*, which was to make orthodox the view that Stoic empiricism had no room for innate

¹⁸ I do not know who they were; not the Cambridge University Press, who were to publish the posthumous edition of *Aeneid* I. J. W. Mackail, in the Preface to his edition of the *Aeneid* (Oxford, 1930) likewise refers to 'a complete edition of Virgil under the editorship of Professor Conway . . . now in course of preparation', but from the Preface to *Aeneid* I it sounds as if at the time of his death Conway had abandoned this larger plan and projected only an edition of the *Aeneid*.

¹⁹ As he commented later (letter to the writer, 1 September 1984), ' . . . I was cautious: his life didn't look good and I was sure that the publisher would drop the project without his name; also I thought we should not always agree.'

ideas,²⁰ and the 1939 paper on the use of statistics of style in addressing questions of authenticity in Plutarch's *Moralia*.²¹ The full fruit of the work that went into the thesis is to be found however not in Sandbach's own articles, but in Harold Cherniss's 1976 Loeb edition of Plutarch's anti-Stoic writings.²² As well as engaging with Sandbach's many published suggestions about the text and the disposition of the argument²³ Cherniss made special acknowledgement of his unpublished collation of the manuscripts of *de Stoicorum repugnantiis*.

Plutarch and the Stoa were to remain at the heart of Sandbach's scholarly concerns throughout his life. Although he lectured regularly across the full range of the Cambridge ancient philosophy syllabus,²⁴ it was his authority in regard to the Hellenistic and early imperial periods of thought, unparalleled among British scholars of the time, on which the editors of the *Cambridge Ancient History* and the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* relied in the 1930s, and those of the *Classical Review* for four decades.²⁵ When in 1967–8 A. A. Long organised a seminar on Stoicism in the Institute of Classical Studies he leaned heavily on Sandbach's support. The subsequent volume, *Problems in Stoicism*, gave significant impetus to the contemporary revival of interest in Hellenistic philosophy.²⁶ As well as reprinting (with its author's second thoughts) the 'now classic article' on *ennoia* and *prolepsis*, *Problems* included a new piece from Sandbach's pen. 'Phantasia kataleptike' takes up his old interest in Chrysippus' relation to Zeno in a crisp polemic against Pohlenz, written with a degree of purely philosophical subtlety and

²⁰ 'Ἐννοία and Πρόληψις in the Stoic Theory of Knowledge', *Classical Quarterly*, 24 (1930), 45–51. Only very recently has an effective challenge been mounted to Sandbach's interpretation: see D. Scott, 'Innatism and the Stoa', *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, NS 34 (1988), 123–53.

²¹ 'Rhythm and Authenticity in Plutarch's *Moralia*', *Classical Quarterly*, 33 (1939), 194–203.

²² *Plutarch's Moralia*, XIII.2, trans. H. Cherniss (Cambridge MA/London, 1976). Acknowledges Sandbach's collation: p. 407, n. c.

²³ See especially 'Plutarch on the Stoics', *Classical Quarterly*, 34 (1940), 20–5; 'Some Textual Notes on Plutarch's *Moralia*', *ibid.* 35 (1941), 110–18.

²⁴ Mirrored in the various short notes on a range of philosophical authors, usually about textual points, which Sandbach published over the years, often in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*. One particularly happy emendation has now found its way into the text of Ion of Chios' celebrated quatrain about Pythagoras in Kirk, Raven and Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1983), pp. 53, 217. Both editions of this work were dedicated to Sandbach.

²⁵ The most notable of these services to scholarship is probably his chapter 'Greek Literature, Philosophy and Science' in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, XI: The Imperial Peace, AD 70–192 (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 676–707.

²⁶ *Problems in Stoicism*, ed. A. A. Long (London, 1971). 'Now classic article': from the Editor's Introduction, p. 4.

bite not elsewhere evidenced in his published work. He defends with palpable sympathy a view of Zeno as a common-sense realist about our knowledge of the external world.

*The Stoics*²⁷ was from the first welcomed as an invaluable addition to student reading lists, and it has stayed on them ever since, despite nearly twenty years of busy publication in the field. Ethics takes centre stage. This reflects ancient preoccupations as well as Sandbach's own sense of philosophical importance, if not the priorities of current research. Logic is very briefly dealt with, but the central tenets of the physical system are sympathetically presented (although Sandbach thought the Stoic attempt to give a materialist account of the soul 'an impossible undertaking'). The book is written in two rather different registers. Expositions of classic Stoic doctrines occupy most of the first half. Like Sandbach's lectures, they are lucid, accurate, economical and dry. Sometimes objections to Stoicism are canvassed, usually followed by an attempt to meet the difficulty from the resources of its intellectual framework. Admiration or irritation is occasionally allowed to peep through, without disturbing the general tone of urbane gravity. When discussing particular Stoic authors and political figures, on the other hand, notably the great writers of the imperial period, Sandbach writes more vividly, in the eloquent descriptive style he employed in his contributions to Cambridge Histories. The book now relaxes and acquires a distinctive personal flavour, first in a rather Anglican verse translation of Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*, but above all in the long treatment of Seneca, who seems to have exerted upon Sandbach, as on many before him, a horrid fascination.

The friendly and lively controversy stirred by *Aristotle and the Stoics* was an appropriate response to a learned but readable work of measured controversy.²⁸ Everyone agreed with some of it, nobody with all of it. Some questioned Sandbach's methodology.²⁹ His declared purpose was to ask whether the best explanation of a particular view of the Stoics is reaction to a doctrine of Aristotle. But at times he seems content to suggest that it is not the *only* possible explanation — which does not settle the matter and introduces the danger of circular argument, as he himself sometimes but not always recognises. Sometimes he acknowledges the possibility that some doctrine of the school

²⁷ *The Stoics* (London, 1975).

²⁸ *Aristotle and the Stoics*, Cambridge Philological Society, Supp. 10 (Cambridge, 1985).

²⁹ See, e.g. J. Barnes, in the editorial notes in *Phronesis*, 30 (1985), 213–16.

treatises is known to the Stoics, but only via oral transmission or the exoteric works. We might then wonder how important it is to establish a thesis so strongly held, yet so narrowly defined. Of the substance of the arguments no one has yet attempted a full-scale *refutatio*. On particular issues some have argued in support of Sandbach's sceptical positions (for example, the present writer, on time), others against (for example, R. R. K. Sorabji, on void and on mixture).³⁰ What is now evident, however, is a more guarded and discriminating approach to questions of influence in the study of Hellenistic philosophy in general, and in the case of the Stoics a tendency to emphasise Presocratic or Socratic or Platonic affiliations in preference to Aristotelian. No doubt this is just the outcome Sandbach had hoped for.

Sandbach's writings on Greek philosophy do not constitute a large corpus. Yet virtually everything he published has had an impact, whether by virtue of aptly timed challenge to received opinion or because it is basic reading on its subject.

Plutarch (*by D. A. Russell*)

Whatever it was that started Harry Sandbach off on Plutarch, it became a continuing and central interest of his scholarly life. He no doubt felt a natural sympathy with the humane and erudite moralist, especially perhaps with the miscellaneous erudition that does so much for the texture of Plutarch's style. He seems not to have troubled himself much with the *Lives*, perhaps because the historical problems they raise were not to his taste. Many of his notes and reviews, over many years, are solid contributions to Plutarchan studies, but two or three can be picked out as particularly important.

1 'Rhythm and Authenticity in Plutarch's *Moralia*'³¹ has remained a standard treatment, not superseded. He kept up his interest in prose rhythm and the ways in which it can be studied, and often returned to it. He was, however, well aware how tricky a business it is and how uncertain a criterion it provides of authenticity, let alone relative chronology. There is a nice example of his caution in his treatment of

³⁰ M. Schofield, 'The Retrenchable Present', in *Matter and Metaphysics* (Naples, 1988), ed. J. Barnes and M. Mignucci; R. R. K. Sorabji, *Matter, Space & Motion* (London, 1988), pp. 80–1, 153–8.

³¹ *Classical Quarterly*, 33 (1939), 194–203.

the first of 'Tyrwhitt's fragments', *De libidine et aegritudine*, given as a contribution to the Eighth Congress of the Association Guillaume Budé in 1968,³² in which he was a prominent participant and chaired a session. He points out, rightly, that the idea that this little piece must be much later than Plutarch's time, because the author appears to observe Byzantine rules of accentual clausulae, is based on a misunderstanding of the weight of evidence which would be required to prove this. As to the actual authorship, his conclusion is a cautious *non liquet*, with an inclination to believe that, despite disconcerting features, it is a more economical and probable hypothesis to accept Plutarch as the writer rather than to imagine a faithful and imitative discipline.

2 The Loeb *Moralia*, after six volumes of mediocre work, took a turn for the better with volume VII, by Benedikt Einarson and Phillip de Lacy. Sandbach began to contribute in volume IX (1961), with an edition of *Quaestiones Convivales* 9, a book which stands apart from the rest of *QC* because the dialogues in it are all set in Plutarch's youth. Sandbach's excellent edition, well-judged text (he took a lot of trouble to attribute emendations correctly to Turnebus or Amyot, where possible), and erudite notes, form a very superior part of the volume. He did even more for *Quaestiones Naturales* in volume XI (1965), where there was much more to be done, both in text and in annotation. Sandbach liked curiosities of science and natural history (was he one of those classicists who might have been a mathematician or scientist, one wonders?), and clearly enjoyed unravelling the problems of this odd little book.³³ His carefulness, and the breadth of his scholarship, made him an ideal editor for the fragments, which he undertook for the Loeb series (vol. XV, published in 1969) and repeated for Teubner (vol. VII, published in 1967, before the Loeb came out). He took great care with all the texts, removed a large number of items which Bernardakis had wrongly included, and (in the Loeb) added many useful notes and appendices on the pseudepigrapha. His contribution to the Loeb *Moralia* was not of course confined to the portions which he edited: Cherniss's *De facie* (vol. XII) and Stoic treatises (vol. XIII) acknowledge help, though Cherniss seems to have disagreed with a good deal of Sandbach's article on the Stoic treatises.³⁴

³² 'Plutarque était-il l'auteur du *De Libidine et aegritudine*?', *Revue de Philologie*, 43 (1969), 211–16; see also Loeb *Moralia*, XV. 32.

³³ One of his first Plutarch articles was on the date of the eclipse in *De facie*, and is very impressive (*Classical Quarterly*, 23 (1929), 15–16).

³⁴ 'Plutarch on the Stoics', *Classical Quarterly*, 34 (1940), 20–5.

3 In 1982 Sandbach published a careful and characteristically sceptical article on Plutarch's knowledge of Aristotle, a preliminary to *Aristotle and the Stoics*.³⁵ This article does, unusually, embrace the *Lives*; note the detailed discussion of the use of Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία in *Solon*. The object is to show that the evidence for Plutarch's knowledge of the *Corpus Aristotelicum* is very slight, and that the 'esoteric' works were not a part of the reading expected even of a teacher of philosophy (unless, presumably, a profound Peripatetic?) in Plutarch's time. He may have overstated the case (as some think he did in *Aristotle and the Stoics*), but he showed, as in so much that he wrote, an unusually clear understanding of what it is to trace 'influences' and 'sources', and how to go about it in a rational and careful way.

Menander (by C. F. L. Austin)

'Before I had finished with Plutarch', writes Sandbach in his memoir, 'I was asked by the Clarendon Press to complete a commentary on Menander which had been started by Gomme and which he had regarded as nearly finished, except that he had been unable before his death to do anything about the newly-discovered *Dyskolos*.'³⁶ This was to occupy me for some ten years or more. My qualification for the job was that I had several times lectured on *Perikeiromene* and this was an inadequate preparation. Gomme had over half his life collected material for his edition. But what caused the delay was the appearance of a stream of papyrus finds which brought three new plays to life and extended *Samia* by 400 lines. There was a corresponding ocean of scholarly articles and books.³⁷ Almost all of Gomme's notes needed

³⁵ 'Plutarch and Aristotle', *Illinois Classical Studies*, 7 (1982), 207–32.

³⁶ Gomme died in January 1959. His posthumous paper on Menander's *Hypobolimaïos* was seen through the press by Sandbach, *Classical Quarterly*, NS 10 (1960), 103–9.

³⁷ Many of these were reviewed by Sandbach himself. For the *Dyskolos* see *Classical Review*, NS 10 (1960), 204–7 (editions by Bingen, Diano, Mette, etc.), *ibid.* 12 (1962), 23–9 (Kraus, van Groningen, Stoessl's *Personenwechsel*), 92 (Vellacott's *The Bad-Tempered Man*), 204–5 (J. Martin), *ibid.* 13 (1963), 341 (Quincey's *The Old Curmudgeon*), *ibid.* 14 (1964), 253–5 (Jacques' *Budé* and Arnott's *The Man who didn't like People*), *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 86 (1966), 195–7 (Handley), *Gnomon*, 40 (1968), 440–2 (Warren E. Blake). See also *Classical Review*, NS 13 (1963), 111–12 (De Falco's *Epitrepontes*) 340–1 (Kokolakis' Ὑποβολιμαῖος), *ibid.* 15 (1965), 112–13 (Görler's Μεγάλου Γνώματ), *Gnomon*, 39 (1967), 238–42 (Barigazzi's *La formazione spirituale di Menandro*), 766–9 (Del Corno's *Menandri Comoediae*, I), *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 87 (1967), 150–1 (Dedoussi's Σαμία), *ibid.* 99 (1979) 181 (Katsouris' *Linguistic and stylistic characterization: tragedy and Menander*).

re-writing for one reason or another, and I had to constitute a text. It came as a surprise to the Clarendon Press when they saw how Gomme's Menander had grown, but they unhesitatingly accepted it and suggested that the text should be published separately in the Oxford Classical Texts series.³⁸

My own friendship with Harry Sandbach started in the mid-sixties, when we began exchanging notes on the new Menander discoveries, which were now appearing from every corner with increasing frequency. We often met on the train to and from London, as we regularly attended together the seminars at the Institute on the latest finds from Oxyrhynchus. As the years went by our exchanges multiplied and became a treasured collaboration on both sides: Harry first helped me with the proofs of my two *Kleine Texte* on *Aspis* and *Samia* (1969–70) and then with the edition of the Comic Papyri (1973) and I in turn annotated the drafts of *Menandri reliquiae selectae* (1972) and then the magnificent Commentary (1973). Harry's sureness of touch and felicity of expression filled me with admiration and were universally acknowledged.³⁹ His emendations were often brilliant (ἐπεγίνοντ' for ἐπαιτιμοντ' at *Asp.* 65 is worthy of Porson at his best) and his illuminating remarks on Menander's diction, *inter alia*, have greatly enhanced our appreciation of the poet's subtle art.⁴⁰ His flashes of genius were not

³⁸ *Meandri reliquiae selectae* recensuit F. H. Sandbach (Oxford, 1972). *Menander: A Commentary* by A. W. Gomme and F. H. Sandbach (Oxford, 1973). A second edition of the OCT came out in 1990 with a new Appendix containing *Addenda minora* and new fragments from *Epitepontes* and *Misoumenos*.

³⁹ 'Un commentaire dont la richesse et la précision vont de pair avec la sobriété et l'élégance', J.-M. Jacques, *Ménandre. Le Dyscolos* (Paris, 1976), p. lx. See also H. Van Looy in *L'Antiquité Classique* 43 (1974), 453: 'Il est difficile de dire ce qui mérite plus d'admiration: l'érudition de l'auteur, son bon sens, son acribie, la clarté de l'exposé, le sens critique, sa connaissance approfondie de la comédie grecque ou la prudence dans les reconstitutions' and W. Luppe in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 95 (1974), 501: 'Beide Werke sind Meilensteine auf dem Wege der Menanderforschung.' Both works were fully reviewed in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 95 (1975), 210–13 (Christina Dedoussi and John S. Feneron) and *Classical Review*, NS 27 (1977), 8–12 (Geoffrey Arnett).

⁴⁰ 'Menander's Manipulation of Language for dramatic purposes', in *Ménandre* (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XVI, Geneva, 1970), pp. 113–43. His other articles on Menander are: 'Some Passages in Menander', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, NS 13 (1967), 37–47. 'Menander and the Three-Actor Rule', in *Le Monde Grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Brussels, 1975), pp. 197–204. 'Notes on the Cairo Codex of Menander', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 40 (1980), 47–52. 'Two Passages in Menander's *Dis Exapaton*', *Sileno* 11 (1985), 203–5. 'Two Notes on Menander (*Epitepontes* and *Samia*)', *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 11.9 (Nov. 1986), 156–60.

confined to Menander.⁴¹ In 1977 he wrote the *Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome* for the undergraduate and general reader in Moses Finley's series *Ancient Culture and Society* (Chatto & Windus). Though somewhat uneven in parts (especially on Aristophanes) and not as successful as his *Stoics* in the same series, the book was nevertheless warmly welcomed and contains a beautiful account of *Samia* as well as a very clear discussion of Plautus' *Bacchides* in the light of the new *Dis Exapaton* papyrus. The section on Terence is an elegant tribute to the *puri sermonis amator* and Harry later wrote another chapter on the same author for an *American History of Ancient Literature*.⁴² In range and depth he had few equals, but his modesty was disarming. A friend in Germany once received from him an article 'mit einem bösen metrischen Schnitzer, den ich in meiner Antwort auf einem lapsus calami zurückführte. Darauf schrieb er: "you kindly term it a *lapsus calami*, but I am afraid it was a *lapsus animi*."' His wise and humane words on Menander could equally well be applied to himself (*Commentary*, p. 26): 'There is a persistent current of suggestion that men would get on better if they would be tolerant, kind, and cooperative, if they would see themselves as they are, recognizing that most human beings are a mixture of virtues and faults.' Harry was already well into his eighties when he began to try to translate Menander, 'who has not been well served'.⁴³ Failing energies prevented him from completing the task to his satisfaction, but his draft was kindly handed over to me by his daughter, Catherine Sandbach-Dahlström, and it is hoped that this might one day form the basis of a new Menandrian corpus in English.

E. J. KENNEY

Fellow of the Academy

⁴¹ See, e.g. his supplements on the Old Comedy commentary *CGFP* no. 74, lines 33–4 or his notes on *Ar. Thesm.* in my article in *Dodone*, 16 (1987), 61–92. In *Classical Review*, 56 (1942), 63–5 he had published a note on ἄκρᾳ Γυρῆων in Archil. fr. 105 W. and in *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, NS 23 (1977), 71–3 a note on Soph. *El.*, 77–85.

⁴² Terence (d. 159 BC) in *Ancient Writers: Greece & Rome* (1982), pp. 541–54. See also his review of O. Rieth's *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz* in *Classical Review*, NS 16 (1966), 47–8 and his article on 'Donatus' Use of the Name Terentius and the end of Terence's *Adelphoe*' in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 25 (1978), 123–145.

⁴³ 'Menander still awaits his translator' (*The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome*, p. 160). But see now the very serviceable translation of the OCT by Norma Miller: *Menander, Plays and Fragments* (Penguin Classics, 1987).

Note. No single obituarist can hope to do justice to the full range of Sandbach's scholarly interests and publications, and I am deeply obliged to Dr Austin, Professor Russell and Dr Schofield for their expert appraisals of his work in fields outside my competence. The first part of this Memoir is a modified and slightly expanded version of the Address given at the Memorial Service in the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge, on 25 January 1992, subsequently published in the Trinity College *Annual Record* for 1992. Most of the information in it is derived from extensive autobiographical notes written by Sandbach in 1979 and supplemented by him from time to time (the last entry is dated 8 April 1987). These were kindly communicated to me by Dr Catherine Sandbach-Dahlström, to whom I am indebted for this and for much additional assistance in my task. A copy of these notes has been deposited with the British Academy, since they were partly intended to 'be of assistance to the writer of my biography for the British Academy'. I must also thank the following for information and advice: Mr A. E. B. Beck, Fr F. E. Brenk SJ, Miss N. V. Dunbar, Dr J. J. Hall, Professor H. D. Jocelyn, Mr D. Mervyn Jones, Mr P. H. S. Lambie, Dr E. S. Leedham-Green, Mr J. S. Morrison, Mrs R. B. Onians, Ms Hilary O'Shea, the Rt Hon. J. E. Powell, Mr M. J. W. Rogers, Mr T. J. Robb, Professor D. A. Russell, Professor A. M. Snodgrass, the late Professor R. P. Winnington-Ingram. Other obituaries have appeared in *The Guardian* (27 September 1991 by Professor Geoffrey Arnott), *The Independent* (27 September 1991 by Dr R. D. Dawe), *The Times* (5 October 1991), and *Gnomon* (64 (1992), 473-4 by Dr R. D. Dawe).