Proceedings of the British Academy, **80**, 221–231

Antony Andrewes
1910–1990

ANTONY ANDREWES was the eldest son of Percy Lancelot Andrewes and Ursula Andrewes (*née* Freeman), and was born in Tavistock on 12 June 1910. His father was an art dealer who subsequently became a teacher of mathematics. Although they soon moved to Brighton, his affection for Dartmoor remained throughout his life. Much of his mother's family life was based on the area, and it was the centre to which they all returned for walking holidays even before his father took a post at Kelly College, Tavistock. It was a musical family, and he played duets, both on the cello and on the piano, with his father and brother; the range was wide, though Schumann was a particular favourite, and the piano at least remained important for him. It was in the home too that he laid the foundations of his wide reading in English and European literature. Later he regularly acquired more languages by starting from their major classics; Dante was particularly important.

He was educated first at Horris Hill, outside Newbury (where his younger brother Richard subsequently became a headmaster) and then at Winchester to which he won the top scholarship in 1923. At Winchester, he came under the influence of the 'eager, even uproarious,' teaching of Alan Blakeway, who, there and at Oxford, first fertilised traditional Oxford approaches to archaic Greek history with strong archaeological interests.

The tutors he found at New College could not live up to this standard, and he did not later talk much about them, even about Stanley Casson, the most obviously relevant; he made exceptions for Eric Yorke for Mods and Alick Smith for philosophy. He has given his own account of Greek History at Oxford in the 1930s in his memoir of Wade-Gery,[1] to whose iconoclasm and vivid historical imagination he owed as much as to Blakeway. This was

[1] *PBA* 59, 1973, 419–26.

A. ANDREWES

one field of Oxford classics which was already bubbling at the arrival of the German professionals who did so much to toughen them. What he does not recount there are the disasters, the deaths of Humfrey Payne in 1936, Alan Blakeway in 1937, the promising Robert Beaumont in 1938. The coda to these premature losses was the death of Tom Dunbabin, a professional in both history and archaeology, in 1955. Finding ways of keeping archaeology in Oxford Greek History alive, particularly at undergraduate level, is still a struggle.

Elected soon after Greats in 1933 to a Fellowship at Pembroke, he went off for a year in Athens. The year gave him the foundation for a wide knowledge of Greek topography, particularly of the Peloponnese, and to have lived through the procession of the seasons was a radical enlightenment about Greek life. He made many new friendships, most of which terminated prematurely, but Martin Robertson at least remained an important source of artistic and archaeological counsel throughout his life.

In 1934 he got into harness, and rapidly made his mark as a don who, despite doing serious work, had time to drink with and talk to undergraduates. Though his University Lecturership, then in short supply, did not come through until 1939, young tutors were expected to lecture. For his first two years, he could very much please himself and, both in 1935 and in 1936, he offered luxury courses on 'The Greeks in Egypt' and 'Argos', the first at least surprising in relation to his later interests. 1937 produced sterner stuff, two double courses on 'The Seventh Century B.C.' and 'Athenian Democracy'. He threw away all his pre-war lecture notes, and knowledge of his development can only be deduced from his articles.

Two papers present totally pre-war work. He could hardly have avoided an early interest in archaic Sparta, dominant in British minds since the *Artemis Orthia* publication in 1929 had revealed normality, even luxury, in seventh-century Sparta. Blakeway had taken a position in a review (*CR* 49, 1935, 184–5), which his own first paper (*CQ* 32, 1938, 89–102) developed more widely, reassessing the word *eunomia* and the accounts of archaic Sparta in Herodotus and Thucydides in the light of what now seemed the most likely sequence of events.[2] A similar operation on an apparently disjointed Herodotean narrative (*BSA* 37, 1936–7 [1940], 1–7) started well and ended fairly wildly.

Besides trying to see whether Herodotus and Thucydides were telling the truth about archaic history, his interest in Argos led him, not only to

[2] There are strong connexions with Wade-Gery's more developed position (*CQ* 37, 1943, 57–78; 38, 1944, 1–9, 115–26).

further exploration on the ground in 1937, but to the question of what could be said about later historical tradition on mainland Greece. The most profitable approach was to try to explore the work of the lost, but influential, Ephorus. Two papers related to Argos which did not appear until well after the war[3] represent this line of work.

The war gave him access to wider fields of human experience. Dropped into the north-west Peloponnese, he had ample opportunity to contemplate Greeks, Italians and Germans under pressure and the gap between ideas in Cairo offices and realities on the ground. 'He immediately made himself at home with people of all ranks and social levels, knew everybody's story and was immediately loved and revered by all who were capable of such feelings. To the Greeks he was simply Toni—a name very properly considered to be Greek from the start.'[4] 'Research has revealed glimpses of the recruit to the Special Operations Executive attending a demolitions course at Arisaig and practising the art of sticking limpet mines on ships in Mallaig harbour; of his acquiring the art of subversive living in the depths of the New Forest, riding a motor bicycle through the battered streets of Southampton and shadowing presumed secret agents in crowded saloon bars; of his travelling from Freetown to Lagos in a Norwegian merchant vessel manned by a Chinese crew and eating birdsnest soup with undiminished bonhomie; of his showing the skills of a contortionist while undergoing parachute training on the summit of Mount Carmel; of his arriving in the Peloponnese and gathering a band of "faithfuls" to act as his runners, guides and suppliers; of his accepting the surrender of two German battalions at Patras and passing on by jeep to liberate Monemvasia; and, last but not least, of his ability to relax *à la grecque* when the appropriate time came. "When God sent a cheerful hour", it is said, "he did not refrain".'[5] About all this he seldom spoke later, except on the odd occasion when a wartime thought was relevant to classical campaigning.

In 1946 he came back from the war with an M.B.E. to a Tutorial Fellowship of New College, with which, with a switch from tutorship to professorship, he stayed in a close bond of affection, tempered by amusement, till his death. He was not an ideal tutor, though he inspired great personal loyalty. If a pupil bored him, he had no hesitation in saying so, and this was not always an effective technique. But he responded to those who worked and, even after becoming professor, enjoyed small doses of tutorial work.

[3] 'The Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos', *CQ* 43, 1949, 70–8; 'Ephorus Book I and the Kings of Argos', *CQ* N.S. 1, 1951, 39–45.

[4] *The Times*, 15 June 1990.

[5] *New College Record for 1976–77*, 1–2, but he himself attributed the Patras coup to Eric Gray.

The first large-scale task which he took on in 1946, together with Russell Meiggs, was a revision of G.F. Hill's *Sources for Greek History B.C. 478–431*, long out of print, somewhat wastefully organised, and totally out of date epigraphically. Progress was slow, and publication did not come until 1951. It is long out of print, but still useful, not so much for its collection of the texts as for the meticulous arrangement of the indices, which make it easy to establish rapidly the primary evidence for any particular topic. This was the great age of Attic fifth-century epigraphy, the years of the creation of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Andrewes was never as deeply involved as Wade-Gery or Meiggs in these matters and never worked on actual stones, but, with reinforcement from a stay with Meritt in Princeton in the winter of 1949–50, he could cope easily and constructively with epigraphic argument.

In 1953, he was elected Wykeham Professor of Ancient History in succession to Wade-Gery. Though Meiggs was the senior man, he had more devotion to college and tutorial life, and everyone was happy. Andrewes' lectures, ingeniously constructed, had probably always been more effective than his tutorial work, and he now gave more of them, rewriting them in full virtually every year and hardly ever refusing a request, though managing to avoid any course later than the battle of Leuctra. He took a great deal of trouble with his graduate students, with patchy results, chiefly because he had a tendency to pass on those who were both good and efficient and keep the problems; his best were particularly prone to prolixity and have still not established their full stature. The most memorable features of his tenure of the chair are various major seminars, in which careful planning broke open new fields, and in which he did most of the work himself or with a single colleague; the current fashion is rather different. Administration he faced without fuss, and could be relied upon to find a way out of trouble, by diplomacy or, on occasion, by decisive and unconstitutional action.[6]

A lecture-course on 'Aristocracy and Tyranny', which had been developing and changing at least since 1946, eventually resulted in *The Greek Tyrants* (1956).[7] This book will have been many people's first introduction to serious work on Greek History, and can still be read with profit at all levels. It was still very much in the tradition of Blakeway, tempering the scattered and unsatisfactory literary evidence with injections from the archaeological picture and a sense of realism. It was thus a substantial contrast to its predecessor, P. N. Ure's *The*

[6] In one *cause celèbre* the examiners had disagreed about a thesis. He short-circuited discussion and months of further red-tape by telling the Faculty Board that he had voluntarily worked through the thesis himself and that it would become a standard work; the prediction was amply justified.

[7] His election to a Fellowship of the Academy in 1957 followed on this.

Origin of Tyranny which had pressed (and sometimes tortured) every scrap of evidence into arguing for an origin of tyranny in capitalists who had profited from the expansion of trade in the early archaic period. There was no attempt to destroy this picture except by substituting another; it is even a shade surprising that there is no reference to Hasebroek's anti-modernist operations on archaic trade.[8] The problem of why Greek tyranny started in the north-east Peloponnese received a very different answer. Aristotle's information about Pheidon of Argos, the king who went beyond his inherited rights, was linked to recent work by Miss Lorimer (*BSA* 42, 1947, 76–138) on the origins of the hoplite phalanx. Tyranny and hoplites seemed very close in date, and, since Lorimer insisted that all elements of hoplite warfare must have come into use simultaneously, it was attractive to link its introduction with the powerful military figure of Pheidon[9] and its spread with the spread of tyrannies elsewhere, particularly at Corinth. Suggestive though the thesis was, it did not survive long in this form, except in examination scripts; there was too much evidence for the employment of individual items of the hoplite's repertoire before the introduction of the phalanx.[10] It remains possible, even likely, that a larger supply of metals brought by trade was broadening the social groups which had a part to play in war, but, as Andrewes admitted from the first, there was no necessary connection between that and tyranny; Sparta was a counter-example. Spartan avoidance of tyranny had been the theme of his mature and wide-ranging inaugural lecture of 1954, *Probouleusis: Sparta's Contribution to the Technique of Government*, arguing that it had been achieved by a controlled recognition of the rights of the popular assembly, from which other Greek states had eventually learned.

Discontent with working from literary and archaeological scraps in the archaic period had been setting in for some time. For choice, he ceased to lecture on the early period, except on Athens; further work on Sparta was purely classical. By the early 1950s the interest in Ephorus had turned to a later period, where there were at least coherent stretches of Diodorus to represent him; the appearance of a new papyrus of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, a work related to Ephorus and Diodorus, encouraged exploration and revaluation. Notes and repeated drafts started to accumulate on Diodorus and the historiography of the Peloponnesian

[8] Lecture-notes of 1946 and 1947 show that he then thought that Blakeway's refutations of Hasebroek's travelling potters constituted all that there was any need to say about Hasebroek.

[9] He had already tidied the various ancient datings of Pheidon in *CQ* 43, 1949, 70–8. Not everybody has been satisfied with his solution, and the questions remain open.

[10] *The Greeks* (1967), 149, 277 represents a fairly rapid capitulation in the face of Snodgrass, *JHS* 85, 1965, 110–22.

War after the end of Thucydides's narrative; real history of the period got into print in a paper of 1953, particularly satisfying, because a problem was actually solved and stayed solved.[11]

The American visit of 1949–50 had given him an affection for America, its institutions and individual Americans which never left him; he repeated it several times. In the early 1950s the affection could only be tempered by concern about political and intellectual developments there. One result of these was to bring to England in 1954 Moses Finley, then virtually unknown and out of a job; after a term in Oxford and one in Cambridge he had the choice of two. They struck up an immediate rapport, and correspondence and frequent meetings lasted until Finley's death. Finley was fascinated with the formidable technical equipment of British Greek historians, much though he disapproved of their total lack of theoretical baggage and their tendency to speculate on inadequate evidence. For Andrewes, the attraction of Finley was not so much his theoretical interests as the liveliness which he brought into all discussion and his determination to cut through the sources to reality. The author of *The World of Odysseus* had much to offer to someone who had been approaching the archaic period in rather different ways. His exposure to non-Oxford ways was enhanced by the arrival of Geoffrey de Ste Croix at New College to succeed him in his tutorship; there was fruitful interaction here too.

He had, we have already seen, become discontented with his way of doing early Greek history. He now moved into work on archaic social institutions based on survivals and anthropological consultation, and two key papers[12] cleared away much dead wood and pointed the way to much later work. His later work on archaic history was more or less confined to Athens, in two superb chapters of synthesis in the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

The work on social institutions formed one of the most substantial contributions in *The Greeks* (1967; *Greek Society* as a Penguin, 1971), perhaps the best general introduction to Greek society ever written, free of the idealisation of Greek life prevalent in such works up till then, and again widely read. He himself was liable to refer to it as 'the plumbing'. Good though it is, he hated the job; the prescription suggested by Finley, to write first and think afterwards, was not always helpful. He came near giving it up on grounds of conscience and was only kept going by 'a moral talk from Meiggs'; fortunately, by July 1966, 'Plumb's reply suggests that, if I can only keep Moses under

[11] 'The Generals in the Hellespont, 410–407 B.C.', *JHS* 73, 1953, 2–9.

[12] 'Phratries in Homer', *Hermes* 89, 1961, 129–40; 'Philochoros on Phratries', *JHS* 81, 1961, 1–15.

reasonable control, I may be almost at the end of that awful enterprise, to the relief of everyone except those unguarded enough to read the result'.

The sequence just described overlapped with one even more substantial. Between 1959 and 1962, he published four major papers[13] which reshaped the debate on the development of Thucydides' thinking. The first of these recast with great power the thesis of Eduard Schwartz that Thucydides had changed his mind about the causes of the Peloponnesian War and had modified the original structure of Book I. Jacqueline de Romilly had in 1951 made a very strong and enticing case for an unitary Book I and there are still few questions which divide Thucydidean scholars more. Even among analysts other approaches are possible, but Andrewes' case remains compulsory reading. The third paper took up the inequalities of Thucydides' treatment of Persia, and drew the inevitable but then unfashionable conclusion that Books VI and VII had reached virtual 'completeness' at a very early stage. The two others are more speculative in their attempts to fit major set-pieces in the History into relatively late stages of Thucydides' thought. The purpose of the Melian Dialogue is a problem for all except the most simple-minded, and continued wrestling with it led Andrewes in his latest work for the *Cambridge Ancient History* to even more unpalatable conclusions. That the Mytilene Debate is a late work has never been particularly easy to believe, but the article on it has become a classic, since it also contains particularly sensible doctrine on Thucydides' practice in speech-writing and substantive discussion on the Athenian demagogues (Finley simultaneously produced a complementary paper on this).

He was thus well prepared to join Kenneth Dover in the completion of Gomme's *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* when Gomme died in 1959. With subsidiary studies, this took fifteen years or so, and is his most substantial achievement. Dealing with Gomme's extensive but incomplete drafts on Book V was particularly arduous and raised worries about methods of presentation and the numerous places where 'the comment sometimes becomes a dialogue in which one party is unfairly prevented from answering back'; it was with relief that, at last 'dégommé', he could turn to Book VIII, for which Gomme had left no notes. Nothing normal to a commentary was shirked, and the minutiae sometimes took most time; worries about the topography and purpose of

[13] 'Thucydides on the Causes of the War', *CQ* N.S. 9, 1959, 223–39; 'The Melian Dialogue and Perikles' Last Speech', *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* no. 186, 1960, 1–10; 'Thucydides and the Persians', *Historia* 10, 1961, 1–18; 'The Mytilene Debate: Thucydides 3.36–49', *Phoenix* 16, 1962, 64–85.

the fort on Eëtioneia persisted for several months. Good judges found his feeling for Greek and patience with the transmitted text superior to that of Gomme.

As he worked through the commentary, dissection was becoming increasingly unfashionable. There had always been those who had seen Thucydides as a flawless genius, and these were reinforced by a new generation of those who insisted on seeing the work as a completed literary whole to be read in order from beginning to end. He observed of one book on these lines, by someone he personally liked: 'This is not at all my world . . . sympathy with the notion that Thucydides's thoughts continually developed is seriously strained when the development has to be forwards from ii.65 to viii.97'. He could not accept what seemed to him to be flying in the face of observable fact. Enforced close attention to the particularly puzzling Books V and VIII could only strengthen his beliefs. The relationship of documents to text in Book V was a long-standing puzzle, and the old thesis that Book VIII contained parallel narratives which had not been pulled together looked more and more plausible the more he looked at it.[14] Giving far closer attention to the text than most, he never overlooked a problem or an incoherence in it. This did not result in a crude dissection into strata; it did pay close attention to what could be discerned about the processes of composition involved in writing a long work over a long period. In his hands and those of Dover, Thucydides has become a personality, not a monolithic authority.

As work on the commentary came to a close, he came under increasing pressure, particularly from Finley, to write a book on Thucydides, but resolutely refused on the grounds that other lower-level problems were more suitable to his age. This was regrettable, and surviving material is not sufficient to plug the gap, though there is a tempting batch of three or four lectures on the subject from 1963 or so ending 'He was certainly a great impressionist; whether he deserves the title of scientific historian is another matter.'

Apart from one or two small articles, his last completed work was for the *Cambridge Ancient History*, two chapters on the history of the Peloponnesian War from the Peace of Nikias to its end; they continue to show new thinking.

The project he selected for his final work almost brought him full circle. The work on Ephorus originally undertaken for the sake of Argos and the 'more extended survey of the sources for the period after 411, which in

[14] For an attempt at refutation see H. Erbse, *Thukydides-Interpretationen* (1989), which the state of his eyesight kept him from.

the event was postponed for the sake of the commentary on Thucydides'[15] would be subsumed in a book on Diodorus. He could not love him for his own sake, but found his use of his predecessors a satisfyingly tough subject. For the purpose, at 77, he applied himself to the problem that he always wrote everything at least twice,[16] and took to word-processing. He started with the topic which offered some hope of a solution, Diodorus' use of his chronographic source, and found Diodorus, though manifestly incompetent, at least more innovative than had been thought. He then moved on to characterise Ephorus in a substantial, though incomplete, piece. Though there is surely matter to salvage here, there is no real hope of getting a book out of what remains: chapter 1 consists of the first five lines (with two pages of notes), and he had embarked on an extensive course of reading on Diodorus' reputation across the centuries when his eyes began to give trouble and the first signs of his final illness appeared.

This renewed work followed a relatively fallow period caused by personal circumstances, and involved considerable will-power. He had always been particularly conscientious about personal obligations, and one could name many which he acknowledged and on which he spent time and energy. Above all, there had been the rising tide of concern for his wife Alison, the widow of Alan Blakeway, whom he had married in 1938. She had broadened him in ways which can now be only dimly discerned and brought a special flavour of fun and devilry to the household in Manor Place, but her last years took a great deal of energy, and he gave it unstintingly. After her death in 1983 there was a new start to be made, but he managed to fill his life effectively, and not only on Diodorus. Passionately interested in the pursuits and occupations of his two daughters and their husbands and children, he continued to contemplate the problems of his garden and look forward to the next opera. He took a variety of holidays, including a last one in America, offered counsel to friends in academic tangles, and did the rounds of Oxford's seminars.[17] These kept his critical faculties well up to scratch. Though he maintained his longstanding reluctance to conduct in public any argument which might take a personal tinge, he did not cease in private to express his extreme distaste for manifestations of pretence or pretentiousness. He set himself high intellectual standards and expected them of others.

[15] *JHS* 102, 1982, 15.

[16] The second draft was never all that similar to the first; it was not just a matter of removing adjectives, since he had never put many in in the first place.

[17] *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (1990), edited by Oswyn Murray and Simon Price, is dedicated to 'the most senior member of our seminar, who missed not a single meeting, and whose wise counsels have continued to guide each generation of Oxford graduates in Greek history for thirty years'.

This inner hard core was not visible in the courtesy and consideration which are the main memories of his more distant colleagues and the younger members of his Senior Common Room, which he frequented much more after Alison's death. These were confronted with what seemed an immensely tall figure, who turned out to be exceptionally mild of manner. They first had to learn how to 'interpret that distinctive Androvian style of utterance—a kind of vocal Linear B, allusive, elliptical and, above all, orotund. What the pebble was reputed to have been for Demosthenes a hot potato seemingly was for Tony—except that in his case so far from transforming his voice production it became an integral part of it'.[18] Once past that, they were entranced by the range of his conversation, based on wide and continually refreshed reading and listening. There were few things which did not interest him. One may single out music and opera, liable to produce a wide range of reminiscence extending back to Bayreuth in the 1930s, and the minutiae of politics. Essentially of the moderate left (never further, even in the 1930s), he had clear views about particular matters, but was seldom active.[19] Of North American politics he was simply a connoisseur, but a knowledgable one. The day before he died, on 13 June 1990, he was complaining of an imbalance of reporting which was denying him adequate understanding of the Canadian constitutional crisis.

It would be totally misleading to leave an impression of pure intellect. He had had more to absorb in the way of premature deaths and disasters of friends and contemporaries than most people, and they never left him unmoved. In the sunny periods, he maintained relations and affection, if only by a battery of unusual postcards, with a wide variety of people. They will remember not only his intelligence and his curiosity, but his humanity.

D. M. LEWIS
Fellow of the British Academy

Note. I have had particular help from Helen Forde, Judith Hunt, George Forrest and Herbert Nicholas, and have drawn on a file of correspondence covering over thirty years, some of it now too cryptic to interpret.

[18] H. G. Nicholas at Andrewes' funeral.

[19] His *Times* obituarist tells us that his Commandership of the Order of the Phoenix, conferred in 1978, showed appreciation of his less overt but no less effective support for a later Greek resistance movement.